

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

04 September 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillor Henry Higgins (Chair) Councillor Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair) Councillor Darran Davies Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Councillor Elizabeth Garelick Councillor Raju Sansarpuri Councillor Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> Roz Johnson – Head of Development Management &amp; Building Control Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Michael Briginshaw – Deputy Team Leader Alan Corcoran – Deputy Team Leader Christos Chrysanthou – Senior Planning Officer Dr Alan Tilly – Transport Planning and Development Team Manager Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Ryan Dell – Democratic Services Officer Naveed Ali – Democratic Services Apprentice</p>
73.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Roy Chamdal with Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana substituting.</p> <p>Apologies had also been received from Councillor Keith Burrows with Councillor Darran Davies substituting.</p>
74.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Adam Bennett declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 in that he lived close to the application site. He left the room during the discussion and did not take part in the vote.</p>
75.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 17 July 2025 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
76.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>

	<p>It was noted that there had been a request to defer item 6, and that only three Members were eligible to vote on this item (Councillor Higgins, Councillor Sansarpuri and Councillor Singh). It was noted that this request would be considered prior to considering the application itself.</p>
77.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
78.	<p><b>DYSON DRIVE, UXBRIDGE 78464/APP/2024/3196</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>The creation of 9 no. off-street parking spaces and planting of 3no. new trees.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which had been previously deferred for a site visit.</p> <p>Members considered the request to defer the item and decided to consider the application without deferral.</p> <p>The applicant and agent addressed the Committee and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was important to discuss the current application, and not future or other applications</li> <li>• Many people were affected by the current lack of dedicated parking</li> <li>• Safe and ready access to cars was a necessity</li> <li>• After the previous meeting and site visit, the applicant had been asked to implement a controlled parking scheme. This had been implemented for six months but ultimately failed</li> <li>• A large white van parked illegally had partially obstructed the road before it was clamped, and before it could be removed an emergency vehicle was unable to pass. Therefore, the controlled parking scheme was suspended</li> <li>• A parking control scheme was considered integral, but due to the narrow nature of the road, parking must be off street</li> <li>• This would allow for safe and clearer access for emergency vehicles, at which point a scheme could be reintroduced with far less kerbside, on-street parking</li> <li>• Parking controls were effective when balanced with health and safety concerns, which the application addressed directly</li> <li>• This application reduced the total number of on-street spaces, creating a safer environment</li> <li>• Nine new bays with a smaller kerb area would limit overall capacity</li> <li>• Residents could consider installing lockable posts to stop parking in the bays</li> <li>• The site visit allowed officers and Members to witness a refuse lorry entering and exiting Dyson Drive, which does not have a pavement. Vehicles passed at speed, very close to front doors and windows, which was a safety concern</li> <li>• The proposal would move these vehicles further away from residents' homes</li> <li>• The London Plan applied to both inner and outer London in equal measure, and in this case led to the opposite of what was intended, a less safe and healthy environment</li> <li>• The Planning Committee regularly approved applications that deviated from planning codes when the benefits outweighed the policy deviation. In this case,</li> </ul>

the significant health and safety benefits and the reduction in anti-social behaviour far outweighed the single policy deviation

- Members had the right to exercise their own judgement and overturn officers' recommendations
- A transport safety note had been submitted which set out issues of highway safety and anti-social behaviour
- Every application should be judged on its own planning merits, and in this case, there were merits and circumstances to overturn the recommendation

Members noted that during the site visit, the dust cart was travelling 5-10 mph.

Members noted that during the course of the application, additional elements had been required by officers. The applicant had provided on transport but not on parking enforcement.

Officers noted that there was an addendum which referred to a petition in objection to the application and in support of officers' recommendations.

Officers highlighted that there had been little mention of the purpose of the application. Was it that there was inadequate parking or was it that people from outside the road were parking in it? The scheme had been determined with 1.25 parking spaces per unit. The petitioner had referred to installing lockable posts but this, in officers' opinion, would not stop people parking and causing obstruction.

The lead petitioner in objection to the proposal had submitted a written statement, which was read out:

- This statement is presented to the Committee on behalf of the Hillingdon Alliance of Residents' Associations
- The petitioner supported the clear, professional, and now reinforced recommendation of the planning officers to refuse
- The petitioner recognised that residents had raised a petition in support of this application. However, the role of this Committee was to balance the wishes of individuals against the established planning policies that existed for the benefit of the entire borough. In this case, the officer's report demonstrated that the proposal was not a minor adjustment, but a significant departure from key strategic policy
- The officer's report was unambiguous. The core issue remained that approving an increase from 70 to 79 spaces, where the London Plan allowed a maximum of 46.5, would be a knowing and drastic breach of London-wide policy designed to manage transport effectively
- Since this application was deferred in March, the applicant was given time to justify this policy departure. Their new "Transport Safety Note" failed to do so. The new officer's report explicitly stated that the applicant's note "lacks the detail required to address the reason for refusal" and provided "no evidence to demonstrate that a significant parking issue exists". The Committee's own site visit directly observed a refuse lorry navigating Dyson Drive without obstruction, undermining the applicant's argument
- At this Committee's meeting in March, there were powerful arguments from the Council's own experts as to why parking policy matters. The Transport, Planning and Development Team Manager, noted that managing parking was one of the most effective tools the Council has to tackle the issues of climate change, air quality, and traffic congestion. The Head of Development Management confirmed that the current provision was not an "oversight", and that this

	<p>proposal represented a “stark departure from planning policy”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The argument that this proposal merely “formalises” existing informal parking was also addressed by the officers. They questioned whether adding more unmanaged spaces would solve the problem or simply encourage further car use and worsen congestion</li> <li>• Approving this application would set a dangerous precedent of over-provision of parking spaces, not only for the rest of the St. Andrew’s development but for the whole of our borough. It would weaken the Council’s ability to enforce its own policies and promote sustainable transport in the future</li> <li>• The Council’s Planning Team Leader, Head of Development Management, Transport Team Manager, and Legal Advisor all spoke with one voice against this proposal. They are the professional guardians of the borough’s planning integrity. After a deferral, a site visit, and additional submissions, their professional conclusion is unchanged and has only been strengthened</li> <li>• The Committee were urged to support officers, to be consistent in their decision-making, and to uphold the planning policies that were in place to create a more sustainable and less congested Hillingdon for all residents</li> <li>• The petitioners urged that this application be refused</li> </ul> <p>Officers’ recommendations for refusal were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused</b></p>
79.	<p><b>35 BROOKDENE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD 44049/APP/2025/799</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing two-storey dwelling and erection of a replacement two-storey dwelling with solar panels, associated bin storage, parking, electric vehicle charging and air source heat pump. Installation of vehicular crossover and alterations to landscaping including hardstanding for driveway, soft landscaping and new boundary treatment and siting.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum which highlighted two representations received post-publication, and revised conditions.</p> <p>It was noted that there was a typo in paragraph 6.1, under the consultation section. The most recent consultation period expired on 21 August rather than 21 March 2025.</p> <p>The petitioner addressed the Committee, showed some images, and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing four-bed house had two on-site parking spaces</li> <li>• Recent extensions at #11, #15 and #17 all had on-site marking provision for multiple cars</li> <li>• A reduction to one parking space for a 4-5 bed house was inadequate</li> <li>• The proposed location of parking was in close proximity to a T-junction, where cars often travelled at speed</li> <li>• All houses in this section of the drive had on-site provision for at least two cars as it was impossible to park on the road as it was too narrow</li> <li>• There was the opportunity to reproduce the current provision for two parking spaces</li> <li>• The planning report noted that the proposed dwelling was visually unassuming and not overly dominant. Petitioners disagreed with this. #35 was located at the highest point in the section of the road. The adjacent property #34 was 1.2</li> </ul>

metres lower

- The proposed facade was 50% wider than existing and will have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties
- There was currently a homogenous form and scale of existing buildings in this section of the road
- The planning report referred to #17 as similar in size to the proposal at #35. #17 was in fact very dominant, but its impact on the houses opposite was mitigated by a larger distance. The distance from #35 to the houses opposite was significantly shorter
- The planning report referred to the proposed sighting as centred on the existing dwelling, when in fact it was extended predominantly towards #34
- Historical planning documents suggested that the conservatory at #34 was not part of the original approved plans and lacked legal status
- Using the conservatory to justify the new siting was inappropriate
- Recent developments at #15 and #17 had no side windows facing adjacent properties
- The proposed #35 included windows that would project above the fence line
- The planning report noted an increased separation distance from #34, but this was only minimal
- Unlike the old conservatory, the new windows would serve a frequently used living area, increasing the impact on neighbours

The applicant addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- This application represented a carefully considered development opportunity shaped through extensive collaboration with Hillingdon Council Planning Department from the outset
- The applicant and agent had worked closely with the planning team to ensure that the proposals were aligned with local policy and contribute positively to the character of the area
- Council procedures were followed, including a pre-app, and all advice given was followed
- The proposal was for a self-built home, designed to fit comfortably within the existing streetscape
- The design took inspiration from the surrounding architecture
- The proposal was a fresh yet respectful addition to the estate, one that enhanced the visual character of the road
- While there had been some objections, many were not planning related
- On the width of the second elevation, this was similar to #34
- On parking, the main reason for bringing the car parking forward was the excessive distance from the pre-existing garage to the main entrance
- The window on the first floor would be obscure and so would have no overlooking impact on #34
- There were no planning grounds for refusal, and the proposal complied with relevant policies
- The Committee were asked to support the application and help bring forward a high quality, sustainable new home

Members asked why one off-street parking space was deemed appropriate for such a large property. The distance from the main entrance to the property boundary was insufficient to accommodate a standard parking space. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) existed on a tree located at the corner of the property, which would have prevented the installation of hardstanding for parking. Originally, the scheme had been

	<p>designed around retaining a tree in the front garden, which justified the provision of only one parking space. Although the tree had since been removed, an amendment was not required to increase parking provision.</p> <p>Members queried whether the condition preventing the garage from being used as a separate family dwelling was sufficiently robust and suggested the inclusion of restrictions on water and toilet facilities. Officers advised that the condition was considered strong and clearly stated that the garage cannot be used as a living room, bedroom, kitchen, or separate unit of accommodation. Access to the garage would be through the main dwelling. Recent appeal decisions supported the robustness of such conditions.</p> <p>Members asked whether the property was within an Article 4 Direction area and whether conditions could be imposed to prevent conversion to a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO). Officers confirmed the property was not within an Article 4 area. The property currently benefited from permitted development rights to be used as an HMO for up to six persons. Imposing a condition to restrict this use would be considered unreasonable under current planning policy.</p> <p>Members questioned whether planning legislation allowed for a minimum parking requirement. It was acknowledged that while the property size suggested more parking should be provided, there were no planning grounds to refuse the application based solely on parking provision. Existing conditions may be lost if the application were refused and subsequently approved on appeal.</p> <p>Members commended the applicant and agent for following the correct procedures, including the pre-application process.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
80.	<p><b>HAYDON DRIVE, EASTCOTE 17979/APP/2025/1314</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of 16 studio bungalows and the erection of 21 affordable family-sized houses with associated facilities.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum which contained a correction to condition two.</p> <p>Members noted the need for family sized homes and social housing and commended the design of the proposal.</p> <p>Members raised a query regarding the potential future use of the properties as HMOs, seeking reassurance that any such change would require planning approval. Officers advised that the development was proposed as 100% affordable housing, which would be secured via a legal agreement. This would mitigate concerns about future conversion to HMOs.</p> <p>Members requested officers to clarify the separation distances between Blocks B and C and neighbouring properties. Officers clarified that Block B was approximately 13.5 metres from the nearest neighbouring property at two-storey level; the ground floor</p>

	<p>projected closer at 10.6 metres; and the first-floor windows on the lower elevation would be obscurely glazed.</p> <p>Members asked whether there would be any windows on the side elevation of the front blocks facing existing dwellings. Officers confirmed that the relevant elevation would be blank, with no windows overlooking neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Members asked about the use of solar panels. Officers noted that the energy strategy included solar panels and heat pumps; a planning condition required implementation prior to occupation; and the scheme exceeded the London Plan's minimum carbon offset requirement of 35%, making it policy compliant. The development will deliver significant on-site carbon savings. Officers cannot insist on higher-grade solar panels beyond policy compliance. Planning decisions must be based on current technology and assessments. An informative could be added to recommend consideration of more efficient solar panels as technology evolves.</p> <p>Members asked for further information on parking and tree planting. Officers confirmed that 25 car parking spaces would be provided, including three accessible spaces, two motorcycle spaces and cycle storage. Tree planting and landscaping were included in the scheme. On parking allocation, officers confirmed this would be addressed under Condition 11, which covered parking management and allocation.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
81.	<p><b>MORRISONS SUPERMARKET, 41-67 HIGH STREET, YIEWSLEY, WEST DRAYTON 2370/APP/2023/1727</b> <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p><b>Phased demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site for a replacement foodstore (Class E), 158 residential units (Class C3), car parking, servicing and access arrangements and associated works.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, citing the addendum which contained minor updates to condition one.</p> <p>The site had a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3.</p> <p>Members expressed concern over reduced parking provision but acknowledged the precedent from previous inspectorate decisions.</p> <p>Members emphasised the need for redevelopment due to the site's long-term vacancy.</p> <p>Members requested clarification on social infrastructure contributions, particularly for education and youth services. Officers noted that education contributions were covered via Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Health contributions were included due to the affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Members queried the low number of three-bedroom units and questioned the adequacy of accessible parking (four spaces for 16 wheelchair-accessible flats). Officers responded that the unit mix reflected viability constraints; 11% were family sized. Accessible parking provision aligned with planning policy, with flexibility to convert</p>

	<p>standard bays if demand increased. The London Plan standard was for 3% accessible spaces with capacity to increase to 10%.</p> <p>Members requested a controlled parking scheme to prevent crossover between retail and residential parking. Officers noted that a parking design and management plan will be required prior to occupation, ensuring appropriate allocation and control.</p> <p>Members queried the number of single-aspect units and their daylight quality. Officers advised that the scheme had been reviewed by daylight/ sunlight specialists and complies with BRE guidelines.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
82.	<p><b>UNION PARK UP4, NORTH HYDE GARDENS 75111/APP/2025/739</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment of site to deliver extension to existing Union Park data centre campus consisting of (a) free standing data centre building; (b) energy, power, and water infrastructure; (c) site access and internal roads; (d) site security arrangements; (e) hard and soft, green landscaping; and (f) other ancillary and auxiliary forms of development.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum which contained minor clarifications.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about fire safety due to past incidents in the area and sought confirmation that the fire statement had been independently reviewed. The applicant had submitted a fire statement by a qualified third-party assessor. The London Fire Brigade had not commented on the application. Officers confirmed the fire strategy would be further scrutinised via condition.</p> <p>Members asked for confirmation of the building height, which was confirmed as 32.8 metres. Members also queried the lighting, which was confirmed as a 24/7 soft glow designed to be neighbour- and ecology-friendly.</p> <p>Members commended the application, citing its positive impact on employment and minimal public disruption.</p> <p>It was clarified that generator testing was regulated under condition 9, limiting testing to social hours (8 am–8 pm) and restricting total hours per year.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
83.	<p><b>FORMER GARAGE SITE ADJACENT 43 ST CHRISTOPHER ROAD 78334/APP/2025/1334</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing lock-up garages and erection of a pair of semi-detached</b></p>



### **dwelling with associated parking and external works**

Officers introduced the application. A verbal update was given, noting a written representation received today, which raised concerns about how the development could contribute to the decline of the street and referenced specifically the high number of HMO's; problems with parking; and that the site was plagued with rats.

Members raised concerns about emergency vehicle access via the narrow service road and asked whether double yellow lines could be painted and enforced. Officers noted that the road was not adopted highway and there were no proposals in the application to adopt it, therefore the Highways Authority would not be able to enforce yellow lines.

It was clarified that while the Highways Authority did not own the road, it was owned by the Council.

It was clarified that double yellow lines were requested down the access road itself.

It was noted that the development would either be built by the Council or sold with plans. If it was to be built by the Council, an informative could be added to ensure access for emergency vehicles. Alternatively, a condition could be added to ensure that details of access management were submitted.

It would not be affordable housing or rented accommodation.

Members queried the provision of street lighting due to anti-social behaviour concerns. Condition five required details of external lighting to be submitted and assessed. Officers noted that increased surveillance from new dwellings and lighting conditions should be sufficient.

Members asked about parking and officers confirmed one space per unit, in line with London Plan standards.

Members expressed concern about future extensions or loft conversions. Officers confirmed that Condition 15 removed permitted development rights for outbuildings, extensions, and roof alterations.

Members raised concerns about construction impacts on the narrow road and nearby residents. Officers confirmed that condition seven covered demolition and construction management, including traffic and access arrangements; air quality and dust suppression; storage of materials; and programme of works.

Members highlighted that some residents had reported not having received consultation letters. Officers confirmed that 10 neighbouring properties were consulted, meeting statutory requirements.

Members suggested restricting Saturday working hours due to proximity to residential properties. It was noted that standard working hours including Saturday mornings were consistent with national planning practice and cannot be altered without justification.

It was agreed to insert additional conditions/ informatives on Saturday deliveries, lighting and access.

Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote,

	<p>unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
84.	<p><b>560 SIPSON ROAD, WEST DRAYTON 829/APP/2023/312</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment of the site to accommodate a 7-storey 108-room hotel incorporating communal functions on the ground floor level and a basement level with associated parking and external landscaping works including coach parking, servicing areas, and planting.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application,</p> <p>Members highlighted recent news stories and asked about adding a condition to prevent the hotel becoming a hostel or people staying over 90 days. Officers noted that there was a proposed condition that would secure the 90-day concern (condition 28).</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
85.	<p><b>UNIT 5, 12 POWERHOUSE LANE 31917/APP/2025/996</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Temporary change of use (for five years) from cafe (Use Class E) to Local Community Use (Use Class F2).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application.</p> <p>Members noted that community spaces were always much needed and commended the Members of the Hayes Independent Party Group for their longstanding work to get more community spaces in the Hayes area.</p> <p>Members asked what type of community use this would be for. Officers noted that the Council was the applicant and would be obtaining a lease. The end user was not yet identified. The initial lease would be for two years of the five-year temporary change of use.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.35 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](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.