



# HILLINGDON LONDON

[Link to homepage](#)

[Council meetings, reports and decisions](#)[What's new](#)[Your councillors](#)[Cabinet member decisions](#)[Forward plan](#)[Calendar](#)[Committees](#)[Email updates](#)[Petitions](#)[Outside organisations](#)[Archived agendas, reports, minutes](#)[Your MPs](#)[Decisions](#)

## Agenda item

**72 Harefield Road - 25767/APP/2022/3190**

- [Meeting of Borough Planning Committee, Tuesday, 14th February, 2023 7.00 pm \(Item 99.\)](#)

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of building to provide 2 x 1-bed, 6 x 2-bed, 1 x 3-bed flats with associated parking and amenity space

Recommendation: Refusal

**Decision:**

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused**

**Minutes:**

Officers presented the application. It was noted that the Committee was not deciding this application – it was a non-determination appeal. A late request had been made by the applicant to submit updated plans, but this request was denied due to its lateness. Two previous applications had been made at the site, both of which had been refused, one of which was also dismissed on appeal. It was noted via the addendum that refusal reason 4 (loss of trees) was removed as a reason for refusal as the issues could be overcome through conditions. This left three reasons for refusal: bulk size, impact on neighbouring amenities, and level of amenity provided for future residents.

The lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee, making the following points:

- They were grateful for the officer recommendation for refusal, noting that signatories of the petition had been living in the area for between 10-40 years.
- It was important that visual amenities were not impaired in the area.
- The negative impact in terms of noise, air and visual pollution was noted.
- The Council was applauded for 'Putting Our Residents First' with the recommendation for refusal.
- It was noted that this stretch of road was narrow, and current parking lead to traffic using one side of the road, which posed a danger to drivers and pedestrians.
- The proposed car park would cause noise and air pollution due to being situated on the other side of a fence to a garden, and being located in the middle of a green space would lead to more parking on other local roads.
- This application represented over-development of a small site with the potential for over-occupancy and was not in keeping with the street scene.
- The lack of garden space and creation of balconies meant that there would be noise issues, blocking of light, and issues of the balconies overlooking gardens.

Councillor Burles attended as Uxbridge Ward Councillor and addressed the Committee, making the following points:

- This application had evoked an emotional response from the local residents.
- It was suggested that this land should be used for a house, not a block of flats – this was over-development.
- There would be loss of privacy, a lack of amenities/ garden space/ parking, issues of pollution and road access.
- Grateful for the officer's recommendation for refusal.

Councillor Burrows submitted a written statement as Uxbridge Ward Councillor, making the following points

- Opposition to the application was noted.
- This application was not very different from previously refused applications.
- This was over-development, which would have a harmful effect on neighbours and the street scene, including the preservation of trees.

- It was out of character with the rest of Harefield Road and there would be a lack of parking available.
- Requested that the Committee uphold the officer recommendation for refusal.

Members thanked officers for the report and noted that applications on this site had previously been refused, amended and refused again, before an appeal was also dismissed. It was questioned if the lack of car parking could be added as an additional refusal reason. Officers clarified that the level of car park was similar to the previous schemes and so there were no grounds for adding this as an additional reason for refusal. Officers further clarified that there were 13 car parking spaces proposed, while 13.5 spaces was the maximum permitted under the London Plan.

Members questioned the highways impact, and whether an adverse effect on highways could be added as an additional refusal reason. Offices clarified that 13 occupied car parking spaces would add 5 cars as trips to the network, and so there were no concerns over this.

Members asked about fire safety access and whether this could be added as an additional reason for refusal. Officers clarified that fire safety was covered on page 78 of the agenda. The alternative provision of sprinklers was noted. It was further noted that a fire safety condition could be added in the event of the application being approved.

Members noted that this was over-development and noted the non-attendance of the applicant/ agent. It was noted that granting this application would not be 'Putting Our Residents First'.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

**Supporting documents:**

- [3190 Final Reports, item 99.](#)  PDF 13 MB