

# Minutes



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

NORTH Planning Committee

19 May 2021

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Becky Haggar, Allan Kauffman, Steven Tuckwell (in place of Carol Melvin), John Osstell (Opposition Lead), Jagjit Singh and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager), Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer) and James Wells (Planning Team Leader)</p>
169.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Carol Melvin with Councillor Steve Tuckwell substituting.</p>
170.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a non – pecuniary interest in agenda item 13: Haste Hill Nurseries, Fore Street, Northwood Hills (71072/APP/2021/179) as the applicant was carrying out work in his garden. Councillor Morgan left the meeting and did not participate in the discussion or voting for this item.</p>
171.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 21 APRIL 2021</b> <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 21 April 2021 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
172.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>None.</p>
173.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> <i>(Agenda Item 5)</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that items 1 – 13 were marked Part I and would be considered in public and items 14 and 15 were marked Part II and would be considered in private.</p>

174.	<p><b>EXTENDING WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS IN LIEU OF PHYSICAL SPEAKING RIGHTS</b> (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the Committee agreed to permit those parties with valid speaking rights at planning committee meetings to continue to submit written representations in lieu of attending to speak in person, as set out in the updated Protocol (Appendix A).</p>
175.	<p><b>59 ELM AVENUE, EASTCOTE - 60130/APP/2020/4166</b> (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p><b>Erection of a residential building comprising 4 x 2-bed flats and 2 x 1-bed flats with associated bin storage and cycle provision including demolition of existing dwelling and corner drop kerb and installation of drop kerb and widening of front drop kerb.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, advised the Committee that a non-determination appeal had been lodged for this item and made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and raised concerns regarding the development's dominance, safety and the lack of family housing. A petition with 83 signatures had been submitted to the Council and 18 petitioners had also submitted written objections. It was noted that the centre of Eastcote had already generated 250 flats and it was family homes that were needed. Concerns were raised regarding the lack of available parking for the development and the impact this would have on surrounding areas. Concerns were also raised regarding the speed and volume of traffic between Lime Grove, Oak Grove and Hawthorne Avenue. Parking bays were located at the top of a busy junction that was used by both cars and pedestrians and this raised issues of both vehicle and pedestrian safety. Petitioners were surprised to see no mention of the safety issues and vehicles using Oak Grove or Lime Grove in the Transport Consultant's comments in the design statement. The petitioners urged the Committee to support their objections and refuse the application as per officer's recommendation.</p> <p>By way of written submission, the agent on behalf of the applicant for the application addressed. It was submitted that officers had found the parking provision and access to and from Elm Avenue acceptable, the quality of accommodation and external amenity to future occupants acceptable and the proposed development respected the privacy, daylight and general amenities of adjoining properties. The higher density flats development was supported by officers, and the width of the building was also determined to be acceptable. The building lines varied along both sides of Elm Avenue, and a corner location provided flexibility in terms of building lines in addition to erect a more prominent building which was sensitively designed. It was noted that roof level accommodation was not an alien feature to Elm Avenue. It was submitted that the Council did not specify a requirement for three-bedroom dwellings, and had this issue been communicated to the agent/applicant it could have been addressed. Members were requested to balance the benefits of the scheme that made efficient use of a wider than average corner plot. The development was in accordance with local plan policies and the newly adopted London Plan 2021. It was also noted that this application was already at appeal.</p> <p>Ward Councillor for Cavendish, Councillor Heena Makwana, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The petition and officer's recommendation were strongly supported. It was submitted that the sheer scale and bulk failed to keep with the character and appearance of the street scene and wider area. Elm Avenue had mainly</p>

two storey houses and there were many single storage garages to the sides of the houses creating a feeling of space throughout the road. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the street and did not optimise the need for family housing in accordance with the Borough's needs for family housing. Further, the proposed unit mix failed to provide sufficient family sized units, not taking into account configuration of all the roads at the busy junction. The proposed development would compromise pedestrian safety and for these reasons, the Committee was urged to refuse the application.

Members were mindful that the proposed development was out of character and the junction at Elm Avenue was busy. The Committee was informed that a Members enquiry had been received raising concerns regarding damage to the footway outside the junction, but this would be improved by the Council. This demonstrated that there was an issue there that had been caused by vehicles overrunning the footway.

It was noted that there were already two reasons for refusal relating to the size, scale and bulk and the unit mix. Members considered adding a third refusal reason relating to highways safety.

Subject to delegating authority to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration to add a third refusal reason relating to highways safety, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation subject to delegated authority to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration to include a third refusal reason regarding highways safety.**

176. **77 ST GEORGE'S DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 12943/APP/2021/589 (Agenda Item 8)**

**Alterations from brick to rendering, new non-openable window, installation of roller shutters in each window, installation of PV panels and replacement fence (part retrospective).**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.

By way of written submissions, a petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to photos that were included in the Officer's presentation. Concerns were raised regarding the appearance of the proposed development and the lack of continuity with the rest of the road. It was submitted that the alterations failed to harmonise with the original architectural composition of the original dwelling and was detrimental to the character, appearance and potentially the value of adjacent properties in the street. It was noted that the retrospective application was misleading as the window in the garage opened. Had the application been put in for planning permission prior to the commencement of works, it would have been refused. Rules had to be adhered to and if the property remained in its current appearance, there was a concern that it would open flood gates to inappropriate, and unsympathetic alterations. The Committee was urged to refuse this application.

The agent on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee and referred to supporting information that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting and included in the officer's presentation. The reason for the rendering was explained and the Committee was informed that it was purely an installation and sustainability issue. There was no coherent street scene as there was a mixture of styles, render and brick and side extensions as demonstrated in the photos. The adjacent property had a rear

extension which was white rendered. Examples were shown of the different types of properties in the area and it was submitted there was a catalogue of precedent. It was emphasised that the applicant had used materials on the basis of sustainability.

The Committee considered that there was a large difference with the brick, roller shutters and PVC panel. It was noted that the applicant had tried to change outlook and installation of the property, however Members were concerned that this out of character with any residential property in Ickenham.

The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation.**

177. **TELECOMMUNICATIONS WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP MANOR - 75613/APP/2021/1383 (Agenda Item 9)**

**Proposed 15.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base, 3 cabinets and associated ancillary works (General Permitted Development Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance).**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to photos that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting and included in the officer's presentation. Although the government was keen to for 5g network capacity, it was submitted that the location was inappropriate and a similar application only 100 metres from this site had been rejected previously. The proposed masts were hugely disproportionate in a residential area and constituted a significant eye sore in a pretty wildlife area. It would be visible from the retail parade 200 metres away and a potential hazard on the busy routes and island roundabout used by children and parents. The visual intrusion could not be justified. Locating the masts across the road may mitigate visual impact, however it was submitted that this was incorrect, and policies protected the outlook for residents. The masts would loom from nearby properties. It was submitted that the planning report had incorrectly cited the distance and it was explained how the proposed masts breached policies impacting residents. The Committee was asked to take all these factors into consideration and recognise the strength of feeling raised by the petitioners.

By way of written submissions, Ward Councillor for Manor addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Councillor Markham supported the petitions submitted and made reference to an application that was refused last year by reason of the size and siting of the proposed monopole and the size, scale and siting of the equipment cabinets, would create an obtrusive form of development which would add visual clutter to the detriment of the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene. It was noted that new application before the Committee simply moved the mast 180 Meters to the north east. It did not comply with the reasons for refusal given for the previous application. The Committee was urged to take into account reasons for refusal given last year as they were relevant this time as they were last. Members were urged to put local residents first and to refuse the application.

Although the Committee was keen to support 5g infrastructure, it was noted they had been in appropriate places. The proposed development would impact green space,

impact the street scene and be in contrary to policies. Members also noted that this was busy location and the cabinets would also be out of character. Members discussed overturning the officers recommendation on the grounds that:

The proposed development by reason of the size and siting of the proposed monopole and the size, scale and siting of the equipment cabinets, would create an obtrusive form of development which would add visual clutter to the detriment of the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies (2020).

A motion to overturn the officer's recommendations on the stated refusal reason was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed at a vote.

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

178. **26 HIGHLAND ROAD, NORTHWOOD HILLS - 49247/APP/2021/1060** (Agenda Item 10)

**Conversion of existing dwelling to a 2x2 bed unit with associated amenity space and parking.**

Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for refusal. However, the agents had recently submitted a Highways Technical Note to rebut the second reason for refusal. The Highway Authority have reviewed the Note and accepted that the London Plan (2021) parking standards should be applied to the application. As London Plan (2021) parking standards are met, the Highways objection is withdrawn and the second reason for refusal is withdrawn. It was clarified that the proposal was to create a 2 bedroom in an existing extension to a house, leaving the existing dwelling as one three bed unit. There was a third bedroom in the roof of the existing dwelling.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and outlined the history of the application and property. Neighbours were shocked at the proposed plans. The development was already an eyesore and misshapen and there were no houses similar nearby. A number of semi detached had been extended but had been done so with consideration and sympathetically. If this application was approved, it would allow others to do a similar harmful mess impacting the street scene with irregular shapes and sizes. Residents raised questions about the car park spaces and the number of cars used in the driveway. New resident street parking regulations were due on Highland Road which would dramatically reduce the availability of street parking. Concerns were raised regarding the parking near the property drive corner it would cause obstruction, endanger motorists and prevent access as it was such a busy road.

The agent on behalf of the application addressed the Committee and highlighted that this scheme was acceptable in principle. It would optimise the site to deliver homes in a sustainable location with good transport links and it was supported by policies. The units would be of a good quality design and contributed to housing needs in the Borough. No external alterations had been proposed to the existing building and the street scene would not be affected. Delivering new housing would outweigh any harm. The plot shape was not uniform on Highland Road when looking at adjacent properties and no harm would arise as a result of the proposals. Highways objections had been removed given technical evidence provided by the applicant. The development would

not affect the street scene, each unit would benefit a garden and the scheme provided a level of parking that complied with the standards. The Committee was urged to approve the scheme.

A written submission in objection to the proposal had been received from Ward Councillor Duncan Flynn. This was read out to the Committee. It was submitted that this application was an example of an attempt to squeeze an additional development into a location which has already limited space. Highland Road already had considerable parking issues and giving a green light to this application would only exacerbate these issues. The application would also fundamentally change the character of a classic inter-war suburban street scene which is typically of much of Northwood Hills and the surrounding area.

The Committee noted that Highland Road was a busy road and there had been numerous accidents at the corner near the property. Members discussed parking arrangements and were mindful that the property would increase the number of cars on the street. The Committee considered that the insufficient carparking and increase pressure on public highway were both areas of concern.

Councillor Allan Kauffman left the room during the hearing of the item and did not take part in the vote.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation.**

**179. 2 GATEHILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 10808/APP/2020/4164 (Agenda Item 11)**

**Demolition of two existing barns and the erection of two replacement structures.**

Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.

A petition from the Gatehill Residents Association had been submitted and written representations in objection to the application were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Concerns were raised regarding ownership, proposed extensions identical to previously withdrawn application, proposed internal subdivision into flats, disproportionately large extensions, contravention of policies, loss of privacy and light, misleading parking surveys, that the property was within a critical drainage area, ecological constraints and the property being subdivided or used as a HMO. It was requested that an additional condition be added to the effect that approval was given solely for a single family occupancy of the curtilage. The Committee was urged to refuse the application.

The agent on behalf of the application addressed the Committee and outlined the application. The previous refusal was based on over intensification of the plot and the application as refused. Since then amendments had been made to the application. It was noted that officers had taken the view that the impact on extension would result in some harm but would be moderate, the proposed rear and side extension would remain sympathetic and did not cause harm to the character and appearance to an area of special local character. The extensions did not create amenity problems for neighbours, met the 45 degree test, did not impinge on neighbours privacy, windows would be frosted or away from neighbours and there was no loss of light. There were no issues in respect of car park and the Committee was urged to approve officer

recommendations.

Written representations from Ward Councillor Jonathan Bianco and Ward Councillor Duncan Flynn were read to the Committee.

Councillor Bianco submitted that his objections to this proposal were the same as those voiced last time this property came before the Committee. The last application was to extend the property and then convert it from a single dwelling to four flats. This application was for an identical size building but instead was for a single dwelling. Concerns remained around further applications following for further development and if the Committee was minded to approve this application that they add a condition against future subdivision.

Ward Councillor Flynn submitted that by subdividing this property from a single dwelling into four flats would risk setting a precedent on the Gatehill Farm Estate, which had an Area of Special Local Character designation. The vast majority of properties on the Estate were single dwellings and permitting this application could open the floodgates for future applications for flatted developments on the Estate. This would significantly increase the density of the Estate, put pressure on car parking and fundamentally change the character of a pleasant and peaceful part of the Borough. For these reasons the application was opposed.

The Committee considered that the application met criteria and policies. Each application had been to be determined on its own merits. Members requested for a HMO condition to be added to avoid future issues and the materials condition be strengthened.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with 7 votes in favour and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, with an additional no HMO condition and reviewing the condition on materials.**

180. **173-175 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 1919/APP/2020/4231 (Agenda Item 12)**

**Conversion of existing second floor flat into 2 x 3-bed flats, involving conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 x rear dormers, and addition of first floor over existing single storey element to create an additional 2-bed self-contained flat, with associated amenity space**

The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.**

181. **HASTE HILL NURSERIES, FORE STREET, NORTHWOOD HILLS - 71072/APP/2021/179 (Agenda Item 13)**

**Demolition of two existing barns and the erection of two replacement structures.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.**

182.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 14)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</b></li> <li>2. <b>That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></li> </ol> <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and <b>paragraphs 1, 2 and 7</b> of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains <b>information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime</b> and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
183.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 15)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</b></li> <li>2. <b>That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></li> </ol> <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and <b>paragraphs 1, 2 and 7</b> of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains <b>information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime</b> and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.12 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on Telephone 01895 250636 or email [ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**