

## Minutes

### BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 January 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Farhad Choubedar Darran Davies Ekta Gohil Raju Sansarpuri Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Nesha Burnham Katie Crosbie, Planning Team Leader Salleh Jobbi Roz Johnson, Planning Services Manager Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Dr Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager</p> <p><b>Ward Councillors Present:</b> Councillors Philip Corthorne Jane Palmer Keith Burrows</p>
76.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gursharan Mand and from Councillor Steve Tuckwell with Councillor Darran Davies substituting for the latter.</p>
77.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
78.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND 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 24 November 2022 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
79.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
80.	<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>

	It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.
81.	<p><b>10 OAKWOOD ROAD, PINNER - 36748/APP/2022/2188</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing 2-bedroom detached bungalow and erection of a two storey purpose-built flat development to include 2 no. 1-Bed, 1 no. 2-Bed and 1 no. 3-Bed self-contained units with associated facilities including parking, cycle storage, refuse storage and private amenity.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application which was recommended for refusal. Reasons cited included its scale, size and siting. It was felt that the development would harm the visual amenity and character of the area and the residential amenities of neighbours. It would also fail to provide future occupiers with high quality amenity space.</p> <p>A petition in objection to the scheme had been received and the lead petitioner addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The petitioner lived in Ashley Close and his bungalow bordered the side elevation of the site hence he would be severely impacted by the development;</li> <li>• The current property at 10 Oakwood was in keeping with other buildings in the area – a large, detached family home;</li> <li>• The development would be a blow to the peace and quiet of Ashley Close;</li> <li>• The petition had 28 signatories; Northwood Hills Residents' Association had also objected to the proposal;</li> <li>• It was noted that Highways had raised no concerns regarding additional parking – this seemed unreasonable as there could be up to 14 cars at the site and only 5 parking spaces provided;</li> <li>• Commuters parking along the road could potentially hamper the passage of emergency vehicles. There would also be a risk to pedestrians and an increase in noise and pollution;</li> <li>• The development would not be in keeping with the area and would be inappropriate and overbearing;</li> <li>• There would be a loss of light and privacy to the nearest neighbour.</li> </ul> <p>Members commented that the proposed development was excessively large and would harm the residential amenity of no.12.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
82.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO 24 LEAHOLME WAYE - 76330/APP/2022/3014</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a 3-bedroom detached house together with a double garage and amenity space.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application advising Members that the proposal was deemed to be an inappropriate form of development and was recommended for refusal. The application site was located in a flood risk area and the Environment Agency had objected due to the inadequate Flood Risk Assessment submitted. A petition in</p>

objection to the proposal had been received with 197 signatories. Ruislip Residents' Association had also objected to the scheme. Members heard that the proposed development would not be in keeping with the street scene, did not meet requirements in terms of parking provision and was contrary to a number of planning policies. Moreover, there would be a loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers if the proposal were to go ahead.

The applicant was in attendance and addressed the Committee confirming that he was a Civil Engineer who worked in construction. The proposal was to build a home for himself and his family. The applicant had purchased the plot of land from Taylor Wimpey and had submitted a request to the Council for pre-application advice on 6 April 2021. He had subsequently met with planning officers to discuss the proposal in detail. The Committee heard that a tree report had been submitted and any trees removed to facilitate the development would be replaced. No objections had been raised in respect of the external amenity space. It was acknowledged that the planned garages were slightly smaller than was acceptable; however, the applicant was happy to accept conditions in relation to this. The applicant commented that the same set of drawings had been submitted twice yet the response from officers had been completely different on each occasion. In terms of the claimed reduction in value of surrounding homes, this was not a planning consideration. The applicant noted that there was a shortage of housing in the Borough and the proposed development would be in keeping with the local area. It was suggested that any technical issues could be resolved by way of conditions.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicant confirmed that he had purchased the land only.

Ward Councillor Corthorne was in attendance and addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents in objection to the scheme. He noted the strength of feeling in the community and the fact that the proposal was at odds with policy. The flood risk was a matter of considerable concern and Councillor Corthorne was pleased to note that the Environment Agency had objected to the scheme. He requested that the proposal be refused in line with officer's recommendations.

A written submission had been received from Councillor Peter Smallwood in objection to the scheme and was read out to the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- Councillor Smallwood fully supported the recommendation for refusal;
- A large number of local residents had objected to the proposal by way of a petition. Ruislip Residents' Association also objected to the scheme as did the three local Ward Councillors;
- Flooding was a significant concern in Ruislip and the application would increase the risk of flooding;
- The proposal would be visually obstructive and not in keeping with the local area;
- The loss of green space and mature trees was a concern;
- Neighbours, especially those at 1-4 Wheeler Drive, would be negatively impacted by the scheme.

The Planning Service Manager informed Members that pre-application advice was an informal process and was not binding. Officers were now in receipt of significantly more information in respect of the flood risk, the impact on trees and the loss of open space, hence the recommendation for refusal as set out in the report.

	<p>Councillors expressed concerns regarding the flood risk and the loss of mature trees and confirmed that they supported the officer's recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
83.	<p><b>1 ST CATHERINES FARM COURT - 77518/APP/2022/2760</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Sub-division of existing 3-bed Warden's flat to create 1 x 1-bed 1 person flat and 1 x 1-bed 1 person studio.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application noting that no external alterations were proposed. A petition had been received in objection to the proposal expressing concern that the development would compromise the current status of the sheltered accommodation for the over 60's. It was confirmed that, if the proposal were approved, this concern would be addressed by way of a condition.</p> <p>In response to their requests for clarification, Members were reassured that a condition would be attached to restrict use of the accommodation to sheltered housing for over 60s only.</p> <p>Members noted that the development would have no detrimental impact on the character of the area or on highway safety and raised no further concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.</b></p>
84.	<p><b>19 BEACON CLOSE - 17969/APP/2022/3338</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of four terraced dwellings incorporating landscaping, parking provision, waste and cycle stores.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application. It was considered that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The forward position of the bins, loss of trees, increased pressure on street parking, harm to protected species, lack of cycle store parking spaces and failure to meet the needs of those with disabilities were additional matters of concern and the application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>A petition had been received in objection to the proposal and a written submission from a petitioner was read out to the Committee. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the proposed buildings was inconsistent with the street scene. Beacon Close was a quiet cul-de-sac comprising large family homes;</li> <li>• The proposals represented over-development of the site with restricted amenity space;</li> <li>• The footprint of the development would encroach on the existing garden space of 19 Beacon Close and would result in the destruction of a large tree;</li> <li>• The development would have an excessively large hard standing area to the front to create parking and bin storage areas;</li> </ul>

	<p>The petitioner suggested the following additional reasons for refusal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development could result in 6-10 additional cars using the road and seeking parking spaces. Increased vehicle traffic in the road would have safety and nuisance implications;</li> <li>• there would be overlooking from the development into the rear garden of 24 Beacon Close;</li> <li>• the proposal would result in increased demand for parking in direct conflict with the U8 Parking Management Scheme;</li> <li>• there would be additional noise, disruption and traffic congestion linked to the demolition and construction phases of the project;</li> <li>• the presence of construction plant and vehicles would obstruct the turning circle at the end of the cul-de-sac and prevent larger vehicles from turning around.</li> </ul> <p>Ward Councillor Keith Burrows was in attendance and addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal and in support of petitioners. He observed that Beacon Close was a quiet cul-de-sac and many residents had lived there for decades. The proposal appeared to be for financial gain only and would be unacceptable due to its size and appearance. Pressure on parking would be an issue and Councillor Burrows had concerns regarding the bin sheds to the front and the cycle storage. He requested that the application be refused.</p> <p>Councillors sought further clarification regarding the reasons for refusal proposed by the petitioner in her written submission. It was confirmed that parking concerns had already been addressed in refusal reason number 5. The impact on 24 Beacon Close was not considered materially harmful since a degree of mutual overlooking was common in urban areas. With regard to the noise of the construction site, it was reported that, if approved, a construction management plan would mitigate this by way of condition.</p> <p>Committee Members felt the proposal would constitute overdevelopment of the site. There would be insufficient provision for those with disabilities and it would result in increased pressure on parking. Moreover, the proposed development would not harmonise with the local area and street scene.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
85.	<p><b>28 JACKS LANE - 76265/APP/2022/1716</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Part single; part three storey side extension (following part demolition of side garage addition and removal of chimney) with balcony and balustrade; replacement ground floor side door with window; reinstatement of front garage door; replacement ground floor rear windows/doors with new bi-fold doors and extended rear patio.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. It was noted that subsequent to the publication of the addendum, a consultation response had been received from the Environment Agency, confirming no objection. The application was recommended for refusal by reason of its bulk, height, size, siting and proximity leading to a harmful sense of enclosure and perceived loss of</p>

outlook to the first-floor bedroom window of 27 Jacks Lane, thereby harming their existing living conditions to an unacceptable degree.

A petition had been received in objection to the application; the lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- A petition with 44 signatures in objection to the application had been submitted – there were only 38 houses in the street hence this demonstrated the strength of feeling;
- It was suggested that additional reasons for refusal be included to address the concerns highlighted by the Conservation Officer in relation to the size and bulk of the proposed development, its harm to the character of the conservation area and its visibility from the Grand Union Canal;
- Concerns regarding the loss of daylight / sunlight impacting the resident at no.27 had not been included in the report;
- The report stated that views would be similar to the existing – this was inaccurate as the proposed development would result in direct overlooking into the neighbour's garden at no.27;
- The development would result in impairment of the private amenity of no.27.

The applicant was in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The applicant and his partner had a large family and needed more space to accommodate them;
- Pre-planning advice had been sought in June 2021 and plans submitted in May 2022. In response to concerns regarding the loss of outlook to the side, the applicant had worked with planning officers and had submitted revised plans for a less bulky development accordingly. The applicant had been surprised to see that the application was recommended for refusal due to concerns regarding a harmful sense of enclosure – he had believed that the application was compliant with policy and would be approved;
- The reason for refusal relating to the loss of outlook to the bedroom window at no.27 had not been mentioned previously. The applicant claimed that the window in question was a secondary window. Moreover, the 6m distance between the window and the proposed extension was acceptable and the outlook from the window would remain unchanged.

Ward Councillor Jane Palmer was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of the petitioners. Councillor Palmer noted that there appeared to be a discrepancy between the opinion of the Conservation Officer and that of the Planning Officer. She asked the Committee to take into account the concerns raised by the Conservation Area regarding harm to the Conservation Area and requested that an additional reason for refusal be added to the report in relation to this.

In response to this Members were reminded that the Conservation Officer was a consultee only and the Committee was not bound to follow their advice. Planning officers believed that (notwithstanding the concerns about impact on residential amenity), if approved, the development would appear subordinate thereby preserving the Conservation Area. An additional reason for refusal in relation to this was therefore not recommended. With regard to the impact on a side facing study/work room window referenced by the Petitioner, it was not recommended that the reason for refusal be amended to include this, as the room was not considered by officers to be a main habitable room. Moreover, it was not felt that concerns relating to privacy would stand

	<p>up to scrutiny should the matter go to appeal. In respect of asbestos concerns, it was confirmed that the Council's Contaminated Land Officer had raised no objections to the proposal. Members heard that planning officers had worked with the applicant to address design concerns; however, concerns regarding a significant window remained and the application was therefore recommended for refusal.</p> <p>In response to their requests for clarification, Members heard that the proposed development would be visible from the Grand Union Canal but, on balance, it was considered that the impact on the Conservation Area would not be harmful.</p> <p>Members expressed concern regarding the impact on no.27 and the harmful sense of enclosure and felt it was difficult to support the proposal.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
86.	<p><b>NORTH VIEW CAR PARK - 77570/APP/2022/2978</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Part use of the existing public car park for secured car pound comprising of staff office, fencing, and all associated external works.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that vehicles parked illegally in the Borough would be taken to the pound. There was capacity for 26 vehicles. Parking surveys had revealed that the car park was currently underutilised. The proposal would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and was recommended for approval.</p> <p>At the request of Members, it was agreed that an additional condition would be added to secure submission of a management plan in order to protect amenity and to minimise the risk of vehicle idling.</p> <p>Councillors raised no further concerns in respect of the application. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the addendum and the inclusion of a condition in respect of vehicle idling.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the inclusion of the condition set out in the addendum and an additional condition to secure submission of a management plan to set out how the premises will be operated in order to protect amenity and to minimise the risk of vehicle idling.</b></p>
87.	<p><b>EASTCOTE HOUSE GARDENS - 23846/APP/2022/3195</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Repairs to enclosing walls to gardens (Application for Planning Permission).</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application informing Members that Eastcote Residents' Association supported the proposal. The Conservation Officer and planning officers deemed the works to be necessary.</p> <p>Members raised no concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>

88.	<p><b>EASTCOTE HOUSE GARDENS - 23846/APP/2022/3197</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Repairs to enclosing walls to gardens (Application for Listed Building Consent).</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application informing Members that Eastcote Residents' Association supported the proposal. The Conservation Officer and planning officers deemed the works to be necessary.</p> <p>Members raised no concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
89.	<p><b>WEYBEARDS FARM - 42197/APP/2022/1124</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of existing barns into 5 (2 x 3-bedroom, 2 x 2-bedroom and 1 x 1-bedroom) residential units, including roof lights, alterations to fenestration, cladding with associated external works.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members heard that the proposed development was inappropriate development in the Green Belt by definition. However, it was considered that it would cause no greater harm to the Green Belt compared with the scheme approved previously in June 2020. It was felt that very special circumstances existed to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed parking provision and amenity space were acceptable and the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>In response to Members' queries, it was confirmed that the application would not set a precedent in terms of building on the Green Belt as each application submitted would be considered on its merits. Members were informed that the condition recommended by the Contamination Officer was noted in the report and would be included in the decision.</p> <p>Members sought reassurance in respect of the impact of additional lighting on local wildlife, including bats. It was confirmed that a specific reference to lighting could be added to Condition 8 to address this concern.</p> <p>Members had no further concerns in respect of the application. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the additional condition referenced in the addendum and the addition of a criterion to Condition 8 (landscaping) to require submission of details of lighting and how this will be operated in a manner so as to minimise light pollution.</b></p>
90.	<p><b>FORMER EMI SITE, DAWLEY ROAD, HAYES - 8294/APP/2022/2576</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of the single storey building and glazed link, in connection with the formation of a service yard and alterations to the warehouse building, including the insertion of loading bays and formation of parking for HGVs and cars.</b></p>



	<p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum.</p> <p>Members welcomed the conditions set out in the report and considered that the application had been thoroughly assessed by officers. No further concerns were raised. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 legal agreement and subject to the information in the addendum.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.50 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on [epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk) Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.