

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

04 June 2026



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW

	Committee Members Present: Councillor Philip Corthorne (Chair), Councillor Darran Davies (Vice-Chair), Councillor James Bourke, Councillor John Garner, Councillor Daniel Singham, Councillor Ella Garelick, Councillor Jagjit Singh, Officers Present: Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager Grace Liu – Area Planning Service Manager Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Michael Briginshaw – Deputy Team Leader Mike Kemp – Deputy Team Leader Sally Robbins – Senior Planning Officer Richard Michalski – Highways Engineer Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Noor Alrashed – Legal Advisor Ryan Dell – Democratic Services Also Present: Councillor Sarah Hassoun
161.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>) None.
162.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>) None.
163.	TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>) RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 21 April 2026 be agreed as an accurate record.
164.	MINUTES OF THE AGM (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>) RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 14 May 2026 be agreed as an accurate record.

165.	MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>) None.
166.	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 of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.
167.	LAND AT RUSHMOOR CLOSE - 39470/APP/2025/728 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>) Erection of 2no. two-storey detached dwellinghouses with associated parking, landscaping and ancillary works (revised plans 12.03.26) Officers introduced the application. The lead petitioners attended and addressed the Committee, making the following points: • The petitioners thanked the Committee for the opportunity to address them <u>Conservation area</u> • The site was originally part of the rear garden of Brackenwood House and was now backland within Eastcote Conservation area • The character of this part of the conservation area was defined by openness, generous spacing between buildings and mature landscaping • Replacing this open land with two detached houses, driveways and parking would permanently erode those qualities • Once built upon, the openness of the site cannot be restored • Residents do not believe that the proposal preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area as required by law <u>Overdevelopment of the constrained site</u> • This proposal appeared to be the result of trying to fit two houses onto a constrained plot rather than developing a site that was naturally capable of accommodating them • The wider Brackenwood landholding had not been incorporated into the scheme. Instead, two substantial detached dwellings were compressed into a limited area, creating pressure on layout, landscaping and a spacious block pattern that defines Rushmoor Close • The proposal eroded the generous spacing between properties as a key characteristic of both Rushmoor Close and the Eastcote conservation area • The application was out of character with the local area <u>Unresolved ecology and biodiversity concerns</u> • No ecological survey had been submitted and the officer's report stated that the Council cannot currently be satisfied that biodiversity interests would not be harmed • The site may support nesting birds, bats, invertebrates and small mammals. Planning permission should not be granted first with ecological impacts investigated later <u>Parking, highway safety and emergency access</u> • Rushmore Cross already suffered from significant parking pressure

- The road was narrow and additional development would lead to increased vehicle movement and on-street parking
- Additional parking would worsen manoeuvring difficulties for residents, deliveries and refuse vehicles
- There were genuine concerns that emergency vehicles including fire engines and ambulances could be delayed or obstructed

Limited public benefit does not outweigh the harm

- The stated public benefit was the provision of two additional dwellings. Against that must be weighed the permanent loss of open land within a conservation area; harm to its spacious character and appearance; unresolved ecological concerns; and increased parking and highway pressure
- Residents submit that the harm clearly outweighed the very limited benefit

Members asked about parking provision. Officers advised that this was to the London Plan standard which the Council had to abide by. There would be a single space per dwelling, and no over-provision. It was suggested that there would not be a strong case to refuse the application on parking provision.

Members raised concerns about size and footprint, which appeared excessive and out of character.

Members also asked about a condition that there would be sufficient space for emergency vehicles to enter. Officers confirmed that the turning head was unrestricted, and new crossing facilities would deter parking.

Members asked how the low PTAL rating had been justified. Officers confirmed that they were bound by the regional standard for the scale of development, which was a maximum of 1.5 spaces per unit.

Members asked about preserving the conservation area. Officers advised that amendments had been made to reduce the height and to be set in from the boundaries. The ridge line was in line with neighbouring properties. Building materials were also in line with the area. The Conservation Officer had been consulted and raised no objections. Overall, officers deemed it acceptable. There was sufficient amenity space at the rear of both properties and so the application met the standards in terms of policy.

Members asked about the land supply. Officers advised that the five-year supply was not currently being met. There was a two-and-a-half-year supply as at the start of April. As such there would be a presumption in favour of the development unless it demonstrably outweighed the benefits. In this instance, officers had concluded that the scheme did not cause harm.

Members asked about the reference to impact on locally listed buildings. Officers advised that the distance from the site meant that impact would be minimal.

Members suggested and Legal officers confirmed that in the event of appeal, any planning conditions could be reduced or lost entirely.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved

168. **74 ST GEORGES DRIVE - 79535/APP/2026/11** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Erection of single storey rear extension, alteration to the roof of the existing single storey garage, conversion of the main roof to habitable accommodation comprising of 2 x side dormers and hip-to-gable extension to the rear, demolition of existing chimney, and expansion of raised patio area to the rear of the property (Part Retrospective)

Officers introduced the application.

Note: the YouTube broadcast was paused for the next part of the meeting.

The lead petitioner addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Policy DMHB 11 sought to safeguard neighbouring occupiers from unacceptable loss of privacy – this development introduced elevated windows and elevated patio
- Policy DMHB 11 also required a development not to adversely impact neighbouring amenity – this development appeared materially higher than approved
- Policy DMHD 1 required no unacceptable loss of outlook; no unacceptable visual intrusion; and a satisfactory relationship with neighbouring dwellings
- The proposal would lead to overlooking of neighbouring properties into habitable rooms, private amenity areas and gardens
- There were five properties in close proximity
- The application property was unusual as it originally occupied a materially elevated position relative to neighbouring properties on Copthall Road West and a lower position relative to its neighbour on St George's Drive, which had changed due to deposition of waste
- The relationship was not that of properties on level ground but a complex angled site impacting five neighbouring properties that originally had a significant stepped down ground level between them
- The property sat at an angle on the plot with the rear facing into the rear of homes on Copthall Road West – this was not a straightforward back-to-back relationship
- Ground levels had been materially altered during construction
- The full length of the garden had been raised through the large deposition of unknown waste materials
- The combined effect was materially different from the original small bungalow
- The development had not been assessed in its true context and relied on permitted development rights, separation distances and fallback positions
- A separation distance measured on a plan did not reflect the actual relationship experienced by neighbouring residents
- The report did not reference surveyed original levels or existing levels
- The report relied on previous approvals and fallback positions, whereas the real-world impact derived from the enlarged roof, dormers, hip-to-gable extension, raised floor levels, patio, and altered garden levels
- No daylight or sunlight assessment had been undertaken
- The cumulative impact on residential amenity had not been adequately demonstrated to the Committee
- The distance between 72 St George's Drive and 85 Copthall Road West was 23 metres
- The distance between the rear window of 85 Copthall Road West and 74 St

George's Drive was only 12 metres

- The cumulative impact across all alterations resulted in a materially greater effect on neighbouring amenity than originally assessed
- A site visit would allow Members to properly assess the site and understand the true relationships and impacts

Members asked and the petitioner clarified that the rear window looked directly into neighbours' homes.

Members asked and the petitioner clarified that rubble/ waste material was deposited across the whole garden. The patio was not the original level. This could be observed via a site visit.

Note: the YouTube broadcast was resumed at this point.

The agent submitted a written representation, which was read out:

- This statement is submitted on behalf of the applicant
- This is a proportionate part-retrospective application that brings a small number of detailed matters into line with the substantial works already lawfully consented at the property. The applicant respectfully asks the Committee to grant permission, with conditions
- The applicant publicly thanks the case officer for the constructive way in which the application has been considered, including the joint site visit in February and the iterative refinements that followed
- By way of context, two prior decisions of the Council, both made before any petition was registered, set what is already lawful at the property: a Lawful Development Certificate, granted last July, for the loft conversion, side dormers, hip-to-gable and a new gable end window; and a Prior Approval, also granted last July, for a single-storey rear extension extending four metres beyond the rear wall.
- Refusal of the present application would not undo either of those decisions
- The matters before the Committee are limited and discrete: an alteration to the existing garage roof; demolition of the existing chimney; expansion of the raised patio area, with a maximum step of 300 millimetres tied to the drawings; a 0.25-metre increase in the maximum height of the rear extension so the new ridge line aligns with the existing rear roofline; and minor window adjustments to the lawful loft scheme
- Each of these is addressed in detail in the written addendum already with Members. The case officer carried out a site visit in February. Following the visit, the front gable was removed from the proposal, the loft conversion was scaled back closer to the lawful baseline, and the patio was capped at 300 millimetres. The amendments were confirmed acceptable in April. There are no known objections from the statutory consultees engaged – Highways, Environmental Health and Drainage
- The applicant respectfully draws Members' attention to one recent decision on this same street. Number 23 was approved in August 2024 for the remodelling of a bungalow into a two-storey dwellinghouse – a materially more substantial scheme than the matters now before the Committee. That decision is the subject of section 4.3.5 of the written addendum
- Two final points on the petition. First, the opening sentence of Section 2 of the Supporting Statement contained a wording error: it referred to the "northern side" of the road where the property is in fact on the southern side, towards the northern end. The wording has been corrected. The submitted drawings,

location plan and both solar studies were prepared on the correct cardinal orientation throughout, and the error was confined to that single sentence of prose

- Second, the remaining matters raised in the petition – including overlooking, the 45-degree relationship, and the change from bungalow to two storey – are addressed in detail in sections 4 and 5 of the written addendum. The officer's recommendation is consistent with the findings in those sections, and with the relevant Local Plan policies on residential design, character and neighbour amenity
- The applicant offers the following six commitments and asks the Committee to attach them as conditions of any grant of permission:
 - Condition 1: the first-floor bathroom window in the east elevation will be installed with obscured glazing, fixed shut below head height, in accordance with the approved drawings;
 - Condition 2: the patio step is capped at 300 millimetres, tied to the drawings;
 - Condition 3: no further side windows or doors without the Council's permission;
 - Condition 4: materials to match the existing house;
 - Condition 5: before the rear extension is occupied or the patio is used, the applicant will notify the Council and invite a site visit to confirm the works match the approved drawings, with any material discrepancy to be the subject of a further application;
 - Condition 6: a drainage statement before the patio is in use
- With those commitments in place, the applicant respectfully asks the Committee to grant permission and bring this matter to a conclusion

A written representation had also been received from a Ward Councillor, which was read out:

- The application you are considering has raised a significant level of neighbour objections. I appreciate that this is a complex application with the number of permitted development elements within the overall scheme
- I would urge you to pay particular attention to the proposed patio and ensure that it is built from the natural ground level. The petitioners will have shown you photographs that the ground has been artificially raised before the patio has been constructed
- The rear dormer is now proposed to have a second window and given the close relationship to other properties and the road angle this will increase the opportunity for overlooking. I would request that this is refused
- To fully consider the relationship and overlooking issues in respect of this application I would suggest you consider a site visit

Members asked and it was confirmed that submission of additional information from petitioners was limited to five photos.

Members asked for more clarity on the 45-degree rule. Officers clarified that this applied to properties that were adjacent to each other. If a window that was adjacent to another property did not reach the 45-degree line, then it would pass the daylight/sunlight test. The distance from the windows of the neighbouring properties would be 10 metres. In terms of the garden, the requirement would be two hours of sunlight, and so it passed the daylight/ sunlight test.

Officers noted that there would be a window on the rear elevation given available

permitted development rights.

Members queried the implications if planning permission were refused, noting that the report stated that corrections could be made by conditions if approved. Officers advised that there were two fall back positions: prior approval allowed for the single storey rear extension; and planning policy allowed for four metres depth and three metres height for the extension. On the roof extensions, proposed dormers broadly aligned with approved development on the eastern side; and were slightly larger on the western side but set back. Officers acknowledged concerns but considered the impacts not significantly greater than already approved arrangements.

Members asked about the impact of photographs demonstrating overlooking into neighbouring properties. Officers noted that the image had been taken from a first-floor window. A degree of mutual overlooking already existed and would remain under permitted development. Officers did not consider the overlooking significant enough to warrant refusal.

Members asked about ensuring conditions had been met, and processes for if this were not the case. The Council did not routinely inspect all conditions and relied on public reporting. There was an active enforcement investigation already in place and if conditions were breached, enforcement action may follow.

Members asked about rubber material in the garden and potential contamination. Officers advised that there was no history of contamination on the site as it had historically been residential. A condition to test the site could be added if Members were minded to do so.

Members asked about mutual overlooking, given the distance of 9-10 metres. Officers noted that typically a 20-metre separation was preferred. Officers further advised that a restriction on windows to be fixed shut could not be supported because it was a habitable room (bedroom), though a condition for partial glazing could be added.

Members referenced a point in the Ward Councillor's submission regarding the level of the patio. Officers confirmed that a condition already required a reduction to permitted development height (0.3m), and an additional screening condition to prevent overlooking to neighbouring gardens.

Members queried concerns raised by petitioners regarding insufficient information (e.g. daylight/ sunlight assessments). Officers advised that the application met local validation requirements, and daylight/ sunlight assessments were not required for developments of this type. The applicant's stated commitments were reflected within proposed conditions. A follow-up inspection was anticipated given site history and ongoing enforcement case.

Members acknowledged residents' concerns but noted the risk of losing conditions if the application was refused and appealed and so supported approval subject to the strengthened conditions.

Officers' recommendations, subject to additional conditions were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved

169. **LAND ADJACENT TO 7 WEPHAM CLOSE - 79199/APP/2025/3131** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Erection of 5 new-build residential dwellings, with private amenity space, parking, refuse storage and cycle parking (amended drawings)

Officers introduced the application.

The lead petitioner addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- The petitioner had lived in the road for 25 years
- 91 residents had signed the petition
- One concern was vehicle access – construction vehicles, HGVs and refuse vehicles had trouble getting down the road. Refuse collections were made from the top of the road because the vehicles cannot get down the road
- Parking was already at a premium. 5x3-bedroom houses with only seven allocated spaces meant there would not be enough parking. Most households had two vehicles, some had more, some had none
- There was concern over the proposed bin store. The petitioner's professional experience of property management had highlighted that bin stores were rarely looked after; attracted vermin; and were used as a dumping ground for rubbish. Subsequently, refuse collection was not completed as the operatives cannot access the bins. Current refuse collection operations were commended. There had previously been a bin store on the estate, but this was closed 10 years ago
- The proposed development would be out of character with the estate
- Water pressure was another issue. Properties had to have pumps to make water flow correctly. Additional properties may lower the pressure further
- Separation distances were unclear
- Wepham Close was a tranquil, no-through area. This development would alter the environmental quality of the road and diminish residential amenity

Members requested clarification on the separation distances between properties. Officers advised that the proposed build was over one metre from the boundary of ownership. There was a significant separation distance between the proposed dwellings and adjacent neighbouring properties.

Members asked about water pressure, and about electrical capacity in relation to charging points. Officers confirmed that these were not material planning considerations.

Members asked about refuse collection arrangements and site access for waste vehicles. Officers confirmed that the Council had a statutory duty to collect waste. Where access was constrained, smaller refuse vehicles may be used, though operatives were experienced in manoeuvring in tight spaces. This issue would not justify refusal.

Members suggested delegating authority for discussion regarding removal or redesign of the bin store. Officers advised that the scheme had undergone significant revisions, including a reduction from six to five units, and a reduction in hardstanding areas. The location of the bin store had been changed from the near the site entrance to a smaller store adjacent to #7. Waste Services had no objection to the current arrangement. Members noted that removing the bin store could lead to more green space. Officers advised that this would likely lead to individual bin storage in rear gardens, which was impractical due to distance; waste being left informally at collection points and obstruction at property frontages. Officers concluded that the current arrangement

	represented the most appropriate and workable solution. Members queried the planning balance, particularly whether limited deficiencies were outweighed by overall benefits. Officers advised that while some units may not fully meet local standards (e.g. garden space) planning judgement required balancing competing considerations. Members queried and officers confirmed that all environmental considerations (e.g. contamination, flooding, environmental health) had been assessed. No concerns had been identified through submitted documentation. Members referred to air quality and asked how much additional traffic the proposed five new units would generate. Officers advised that this would be low trip-generating. Peak morning and evening periods were the key assessment points. Daytime movement patterns were variable and less predictable. Based on industry recognised statistical evidence it was estimated that there would be two to three vehicle movements per peak hour. Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. RESOLVED: That the application be approved
170.	TECHNOLOGY HOUSE - 76417/APP/2025/1879 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>) Change of use from mixed Class B8 (Storage and Distribution) and Class E (Commercial Business and Services) uses to mixed Class B8 (Storage and Distribution) and Class E (Commercial Business and Services) and Class F.1 (Learning and Non-Residential Institutions). Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum which noted a revised transport assessment and revised ground floor plan. It was noted that the additional information did not resolve the relevant reasons for refusal set out in the officer's report. The Chair noted that during his term of office as Mayor, he had discussed this application with the applicant. The Chair confirmed that no pre-decisions had been made on the item. The lead petitioner addressed the Committee and made the following points: • The Committee were urged to approve this change of use application for Kingsborough • The Church had had an extraordinary and lasting impact on individuals, families and the wider community over the past 23 years • The Church had played a significant role in the lives of the petitioners, providing spiritual guidance, community support, friendship and opportunities for personal growth • This demonstrated the enduring generational impact of Kingsborough and its importance as a stable and positive influence • Kingsborough was not just a place of worship, but a place of guidance, stability, encouragement, and its transgenerational impact cannot be overestimated • The Church had been a place where practical and spiritual support meet. Through its food bank, it had responded to local needs, and had provided

support for youth activities, Bible teaching, marriage support, financial and debt guidance, well-being, initiatives and help with employment and CV preparations. These have helped improve lives and strengthen the fabric of the local community

- Kingsborough had also demonstrated that it is a responsible and constructive community partner. It has worked closely with the Council, collaborated with other churches and maintained positive engagement with the police
- Regarding concerns about transportation, it was noted that attendance at church had been now supported by an agreement whereby many members travelled by car, public transport, car sharing or otherwise organised church transportation

The applicant addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- The applicant was speaking on behalf of their late father, who sadly passed away in May 2026
- For almost 25 years, the applicant's father had dedicated his life to serving the people of Hillingdon and the Kingsborough Centre was borne out of this
- Kingsborough was an organisation that had supported thousands of families across the borough through education, employment opportunities, childcare and practical assistance during times of crisis
- The application site would provide support for residents facing employment challenges, language barriers, financial hardship and mental health difficulties with social media use and youth violence prevalent in London
- This building would provide a safe and positive environment for young people
- It will enable the applicant to address the causes of poverty and social exclusion by tackling why families were struggling in Hillingdon
- The Hillingdon Food Bank had distributed more than 126,000 food parcels since 2010, supporting over 75,000 people
- During the COVID-19 pandemic alone, 17,000 food parcels were distributed to adults and children in need
- The nurseries had provided employment for more than 250 people and cared for over 1,500 children while maintaining affordable access for low income and single parent families
- Six registered businesses had been started by church members within the borough, contributing to local economic growth and employment
- These outcomes demonstrated a long-standing commitment to serving Hillingdon, partnering with the Council and delivering tangible benefits to local residents
- The report had identified three areas of concern, highway and pedestrian access, flood risk and air quality contributions
- The applicant was willing to cooperate fully with the requested air quality contribution
- On access arrangements, the proposed route through the Shell petrol station was not intended to be the primary means of access. It was presented only as an additional option.
- It was proposed that this could be vehicle access only, with a separate application for pedestrian access to follow at a later date
- Primary access would be from the rear of the property, supported by a minibus service, on-site parking, and available parking at nearby Tesco. A survey had proven that there were over 200 spaces available for the general public in Tesco Car Park on Sunday mornings during service times with no time limit enforced
- On flood risk, the building's former use involved IT infrastructure and high voltage server facilities with 80 members of staff. There were no plans for

	provide childcare services from the site and so the level of flood risk was lower than its previous use. The significant reduction in electric equipment and staff occupancy further reduced potential risk • The applicant had comprehensive health and safety procedures, safeguarding measures and risk assessments that they could share • Despite responding to concerns raised and submitting further information, the application had been informed that the application would be rejected, and not to submit any further submissions Members passed on their condolences to the applicant. Members noted that the application was well supported, but the hazards remained. The submission from Highways was also noted. Members commended the Kingsborough for the important work they do but noted that these cannot be separated from planning policy issues. There were major objections on pedestrian safety grounds. Officers advised that the Local Planning Authority's commentary had sought to remain consistent with previous feedback. It was emphasised that there was a desire to avoid the charity incurring significant costs associated with submitting a full planning application and supporting documentation where the acceptability of the site itself was uncertain. Members were informed that, despite efforts to identify appropriate mitigation measures to enable a recommendation for approval, no such solution had been found. Officers reiterated that the feedback provided was intended to be constructive and to prevent unnecessary expense for the applicant. Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. RESOLVED: That the application be refused
171.	HAYES BRIDGE RETAIL PARK - 78343/APP/2025/2925 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>) Proposed enabling works (site clearance and ground preparation). Officers introduced the application. Members asked about power to the site during development. Officers clarified that the proposals included a substation and low voltage transformer that would plug into the grid. Officers clarified that the demolition management and logistics plan set out a comprehensive list of mitigation measures including noise and dust. Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously approved. RESOLVED: That the application be approved
172.	HAYES PARK WEST - 12853/APP/2025/2844 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>) Partial demolition and redevelopment of the existing multi-storey car park to

	provide new homes (Use Class C3), landscaping, car and cycle parking, and other associated work. Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum which included updates to conditions and section 16 heads of terms. Members noted that there may be an unexploded World War 2 ordnance on the site and asked if an assessment had been carried out to confirm. Officers noted that there was a contaminated land condition, and that this was a previously developed site and so the presence of an unexploded ordnance was very unlikely. It was proposed that the contaminated land condition be reviewed and strengthened. Members asked about site entrances, and if it would be possible to ensure that the only entrance used for construction was on Park Lane. Officers advised that there was a construction management plan, which could be added to for clarity around access management. Members asked about the viability assessment in relation to affordable housing levels. Officers advised that a comprehensive viability process had been undertaken including employing a third-party consultant. This resulted in the conclusion that 10 affordable units was the maximum viable provision for the site. Officers further noted that there was an early and late stage viability review, which may represent an opportunity to add further affordable units. Including amendments to conditions, officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. RESOLVED: That the application be approved
173.	LAND AT AUSTIN ROAD (HAYES TOWN CENTRE) - 76550/APP/2026/460 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>) Submission of Reserved Matters Application (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) pursuant to Condition 1 of Application ref: 76550/APP/2025/2864 (Application submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary Conditions 3 (Approved Plans); 4 (Supporting Plans/Documents); 5 (Land Uses and Development Scope); 6 (Housing Mix); 7 (Phasing Plan); 9 (Residential Density); 10 (Building Heights); 19 (Landscaping); 22 (Parking Allocation and Management); and 50 (Wind Effects Assessment) of application reference 76550/APP/2023/2931 dated 01-05-2024. Section 73 application to vary Condition 3 of application reference 76550/APP/2021/4499 dated 28-09-22 (Hybrid planning application seeking OUTLINE permission (with all matters reserved) for residential floorspace (Class C3) including demolition of all existing buildings and structures; erection of new buildings; provision of a community centre (Use Class F2(b) floorspace); new pedestrian and vehicular access; associated amenity space, open space, landscaping; car and cycle parking spaces; plant, refuse storage, servicing area and other works incidental to the proposed development; and FULL planning permission for Blocks A and B comprising 80 residential units (Class C3); new pedestrian and vehicular access; associated amenity space and landscaping; car and cycle parking; refuse storage, servicing area, and other associated infrastructure to include temporary highways and landscaping works) to increase the parapet height by 50cm in the Detailed First Phase. Variation to increase the number of homes, to join blocks in

	phases 2 and 3, a reduction of parking to create green spaces, amendment to scale of street and relocation of community facility. Legal officers advised that this was a Council scheme, which was to be treated as though it was any other application. It followed the same statutory framework and as such Members cannot be whipped into voting a particular way. Officers introduced the application. Members asked about scope for overflow parking. Officers advised that the surrounding area was subject to controlled parking zones, which was a clause in the Section 106 agreement within the original application. This removed resident access to parking permits within the CPZ. Therefore, officers were satisfied that there would be no overspill parking into surrounding streets. Members asked about asbestos. Officers advised that the original application was subject to a contaminated lands assessment required by condition. There was also a construction management plan. Members asked about the implication on daylight and sunlight. Officers advised that there was a direction within the NPPF that a flexible approach be applied. There was an emphasis on introducing as many units as possible. Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. RESOLVED: That the application be approved
174.	HAYDON SCHOOL - 9556/APP/2026/461 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>) Construction of an Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights and an access footpath (Amended Red Outline on Location Plan) Officers introduced the application. Members referenced a similar application at another school whereby floodlights had to be portable and asked if this had been considered in this application. Officers advised that the two applications were different in the distance to the boundary with residential properties. The current application had a 63M distance and so was very different from the other mentioned application. Members asked about parking. It was noted that the facility would be open for community use and asked if this would include access to on-site parking. Officers confirmed community access to the car park which included 143 spaces. An accumulation survey had identified that approximately half of the car park would be used at peak times. Therefore, there were no highways concerns. Members noted from the photos that the current playing fields were in use, and so increases in noise levels were not expected to be significant. It was noted that floodlights could enable use of the artificial pitch for longer hours. It was noted that Sport England had not objected.

	Members asked if there had been any consultation with parents or school staff. Officers advised that it was not a requirement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority for the application to carry out a consultation. Some residents had advised that they were not consulted. There would have been a site notice. Members also asked about microplastic particles and related health implications. Officers advised that there were containment measures as part of the plans. Officers also noted that some of this would be covered by separate legislation. Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, agreed. RESOLVED: That the application be approved
175.	ADDENDUM (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.15 pm.

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.