

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Henry Higgins (Chair), Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Councillor Keith Burrows, Councillor Roy Chamdal, Councillor Raju Sansarpuri, Councillor Gursharan Mand and Councillor Jagjit Singh</p> <p>Officers Present: Roz Johnson – Head of Development Management & Building Control Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Alan Corcoran – Deputy Team Leader Dr Alan Tilly – Transport, Planning & Development Team Manager Salleh Jobbi – Legal Advisor Ryan Dell – Democratic Services</p> <p>Also Present: Ward Councillor Peter Smallwood OBE Ward Councillor John Riley (item 7) Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne (item 7) Ward Councillor Ekta Gohil Councillor Richard Mills</p>
54.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Adam Bennett with Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana substituting.</p> <p>Apologies had also been received from Councillor Elizabeth Garelick with Councillor Raju Sansarpuri substituting.</p>
55.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
56.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting on 07 May 2025 be approved.</p>
57.	<p>MINUTES OF THE AGM (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>

	RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting on 08 May 2025 be approved.
58.	MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>) None.
59.	TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THE ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>) It was confirmed that all items would be heard in Part I.
60.	THE ORCHARD INN 62963/APP/2024/3371 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>) Construction of a discount food store (Use Class E) with car parking, landscaping works, and other associated works, following the demolition of the existing building. Officers introduced the application. Councillor Peter Smallwood addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,751 residents had signed the petition in objection to the proposal, one of the largest planning related petitions the Council had received in decades, showing the strength of opinion • The heritage of Ruislip was important, and The Orchard was now locally listed • Councillor Smallwood thanked Lidl for their openness throughout the process • The Orchard was once a refuge and a social haven for Polish airmen and there was a spitfire memorial in the garden • The proposal itself was flawed on multiple fronts including highways and road safety • There was a five-way roundabout and there was the potential for vehicles overhanging the roundabout • Delivery vehicles reversing through the car park or mounting the pavement could be dangerous • The car park was not in line with sustainable travel targets of outer London • The proposed development was not air quality neutral • The drainage consultation raised specific unresolved concerns particularly regarding runoff • There would be a loss of biodiversity • If this application was approved, a connection to the past would be lost • The Committee was urged to support officers' recommendations of refusal Councillor Philip Corthorne addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Corthorne clarified that he was speaking only in his capacity as Ward Councillor • Officers were commended for their report, which highlighted the many ways in which the proposal failed from a planning policy perspective, including highways, site heritage, policy conflict impacts on the existing street scene, and residential amenity • Planning refusals must be robust • The Ward Councillors had met many residents in recent months about this

	<p>proposal, and the 1,700+ petition signatures were highlighted, showing the strength of local opinion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any proposal must be appropriate for the site and respect its heritage, something which this application failed to do Residents were thanked for supporting the petition The Polish Armed Forces 303 squadron association was noted for their support The Committee was urged to support officers' recommendations of refusal <p>Councillor John Riley addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There had been more engagement on this issue than almost any other The feeling locally was very strong in opposition There was another Lidl on Victoria Road in South Ruislip and one in Uxbridge There were also many similar shops in Ruislip High Street, and the need for an additional store was questioned The principal objection was highways The five-way roundabout was noted and often contributed to traffic congestion Officers were commended for their report <p>Members noted the strength of opinion through the number of petition signatures; the number of separate objections received; and the objection of the three Ward Councillors. There were substantial reasons for refusal.</p> <p>Members noted that while some of the points raised were not material planning considerations, officers had done a good job in highlighting issues.</p> <p>Members suggested that too much would be lost for little gain if the application was approved.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officers' recommendations</p>
61.	<p>42 THE LARCHES 9197/APP/2025/239 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of rear outbuilding and erection of a double storey side extension to form a new house with associated bin and cycle stores and separation of rear garden for private amenity space.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application.</p> <p>Members commended the officers' report.</p> <p>The Chair asked and officers confirmed that permitted developments rights had been removed, and there was no parking management scheme.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officers' recommendations</p>
62.	<p>12-18 PIELD HEATH ROAD & 2 PIELD HEATH AVENUE 76760/APP/2024/2720 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p>

Partially retrospective demolition of four dwellings (Nos. 12, 14, and 16 Pield Heath Road and 2 Pield Heath Avenue) and one Bed and Breakfast (No. 18 Pield Heath Road), and the subsequent erection of a part two storey, part three storey (plus basement) care home (Class C2), with car parking, landscaping, and associated works.

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum which included a number of minor alterations post publication of the report.

Councillor Ekta Gohil addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor:

- Councillor Gohil was speaking in objection to the application
- There was an issue of highways and parking
 - A 33% increase in capacity with no additional parking was a concern
 - The Council's transport officer had noted that there may be instances of off-site parking
 - This was an area already struggling with parking stress, especially with the hospital and a GP practice nearby
 - Policy DMT6 stated that developments should not exacerbate existing parking problems or pose a risk to highway safety. This application would do both
 - Pield Heath Road was a main thoroughfare for ambulances
- Under policy DMH7 proposals for specialist housing such as care homes needed to show a demonstrated localised need
 - There was not a 33% increase in need, especially with two other care homes nearby
 - This questioned if the increase in need was in the local vicinity or borough vicinity
- There was an issue of the impact on neighbouring properties
 - Neighbours had experienced months of dust, noise, blocked access and muddy roads due to construction. This application would prolong that disruption
 - There would be an increase in visitors and deliveries post construction
 - Policy DMHV11 was backed up by paragraph 130 of the national policy framework, which said that development should secure a high standard of amenity for both existing and future users. Based on the disruption so far and the increased intensity proposed, this standard had not been, nor will be met
- It was recognised that the application was recommended for approval, however the Committee was urged to refuse, or to defer for a site visit

Members asked for clarification on the increase in parking. Officers clarified that the number of parking spaces would increase from 14 to 19, and that the ratio would remain at 0.2 spaces per unit.

Members noted a previous site visit and highlighted potential congestion problems. Most local roads had a parking management scheme, and five additional spaces appeared inadequate for a 33% increase in capacity. However, reasons for refusal needed to be robust and refusal on parking grounds alone may be overturned at appeal.

It was noted that a potential redevelopment of Hillingdon Hospital would likely include additional parking spaces.

	<p>Members asked about planting trees and natural electricity. Officers noted that there was a landscaping condition including a replanting scheme. There were also biodiversity net gain requirements.</p> <p>It was noted that a 33% increase in capacity was a large increase, and it was clarified that there would be an additional 21 units.</p> <p>Members asked for clarity on the policy points raised by the Ward Councillor. There was a parking management condition which required a plan to be submitted prior to any above ground works. This would also need to include details on disability compliant bays to address accessibility concerns. Additionally, there was a need for care homes in the borough. The Policy team supported the application.</p> <p>Officers added that the previous planning approval contained a parking ratio of 0.2 spaces per unit. The current application maintained the same ratio and so it may be unreasonable to reject the current application on parking grounds.</p> <p>Officers noted that the London Plan was silent on car parking standards for care homes and so they had referred to the Local Plan, which allowed 0.2 car parking spaces per unit. The Local Plan would not allow the development to provide any more car parking spaces and so the proposal was policy compliant.</p> <p>Members reiterated that they were lacking robust reasons for refusal.</p> <p>It was noted that any existing conditions could be lost if a refusal was overturned at appeal.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officers' recommendations</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.00 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ryan Dell on democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.