

Minutes

MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 October 2014

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Hensley (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling, Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), Ian Edwards, Henry Higgins, John Morgan and Brian Stead</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Judy Kelly Cllr Allan Kauffman</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, Syed Shah, Highway Engineer, Matthew Duigan, Planning Service Manager, Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor, Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer.</p>
73.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
74.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
75.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
76.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED INPUBLIC AND THOSE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 2 WILL BE HEARD IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1 public.</p>
77.	<p>FORMER ARLA FOOD DEPOT, VICTORIA ROAD, SOUTH RUISLIP - 66819/APP/2014/1600 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site to provide a foodstore with ancillary cafe (Class 1) and ancillary petrol filling station, cinema (Class D2), 5 x restaurant units (Class A3), and residential development consisting of 132 units, together with new vehicle and pedestrian accesses, car parking, servicing areas, landscaping arrangements, and other associated works.</p>

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

Members were aware that the application was a resubmission following the previous application that was refused in February 2014. The previous application had been refused for four reasons relating to sequential testing, retail scale, highways and planning obligations. Members noted that the key difference between the current scheme and the previously refused scheme was that the supermarket was smaller and the site layout had been improved.

The Chairman asked officers to clarify the vehicular access to the site. Officers informed the Committee that there were two vehicular accesses. One access was for the commercial side of the site and the other for residential.

Officers explained that the revised application had overcome the previous reasons for refusal. The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the town centre or others nearby. It was not considered that the development would lead to significant traffic impacts such that refusal could be justified on highway grounds.

The Council's highway officer explained to the Committee that the highways aspect of the scheme was still work in progress. A number of changes were needed which included road widening and reconfiguration of junctions subject to obligations of the S106. Officers further advised that any highway or traffic improvements would need to be approved by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling, Cllr Keith Burrows.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners both supporting and objecting the proposals addressed the meeting.

The petition submitted by Sainsbury's objecting to the proposals was addressed by Mr Bruno Moore who made the following points:

- There were two main points to the petition of objection which had been submitted by Sainsbury's. The first was to inform the Committee of the benefits Sainsbury's approved development would have and the second related to planning policies and the Arla site.
- Sainsbury's had given a long term commitment to South Ruislip.
- Sainsbury's proposals which included a new improved store with increased parking spaces would advance the retail experience at Sainsbury's.
- The existing petrol station would be refurbished.
- The Arla proposals had an impact on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres and should be refused.
- Sainsbury's was a preferential site.
- Arla proposals had failed to pass the sequential test.
- The application on the Arla site was at odds with the objectives of the NPPF and Hillingdon's own local plan.
- Full information on the effect of the proposed development on the existing South Ruislip Local Centre had been omitted from the Committee report which was a crucial omission.
- The proposal had failed 3 key tests.
- The Arla application if approved would prevent Sainsbury's from redeveloping as the proposal would no longer be viable.

The petition submitted by South Ruislip Residents Association supporting the

proposals was addressed by Mr Sid Jackson who made the following points:

- Had attended the first meeting regarding the application.
- Spoke as Vice-Chairman of South Ruislip Residents' Association which had approximately a 2,000 household membership.
- The proposals with regard to redeveloping the site had been on-going for the past 4 years.
- Details of the site and its proposals had been included at the Association's quarterly meetings where presentations were well received by those that had been present.
- Overall feedback was that about 80% of residents were in favour of the proposals.
- South Ruislip needed redevelopment and some leisure facilities for its residents.
- Traffic issues should be investigated further, particularly on the junction of Victoria Road and West Mead. The Council had an obligation to fix issues on Victoria Road.

The petition submitted by the applicant, Citygrove, supporting the proposals was addressed by Mr Tony Baines who made the following points:

- The old dairy had been vacant for 9 years.
- The proposals of a mixed development were exciting.
- 10% affordable housing would be provided.
- The site would consist of an 11 screen cinema.
- 536 new jobs would be created.
- The proposals would be a major boost to the economy in South Ruislip.
- Extensive consultation had been undertaken with residents and local businesses in the area.
- The proposals would offer competition and choice.
- Sainsbury's had planning consent granted in 2006 and in 2012 which suggested it was trying to monopolize the market.
- Sainsbury's had been given planning permission six times in Uxbridge but had not implemented any of the plans.
- 27 of the people objecting to the scheme did not live in South Ruislip.
- Funding had been secured of £100 million to redevelop the site.
- Demolition of buildings had already taken place so that building could commence in January 2015.
- The proposed opening date would be in Easter 2016.

Members questioned why the affordable housing had reduced from 17% to 10%. Mr Baines explained that the Council would receive £2.7 million for Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 money which would be paid to be spent on supporting the build, for example, by improving roads to cut down on traffic surrounding the site. The reduction in affordable housing was a result of the site being reduced in size in comparison to the previous proposals.

The Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture asked for Members to note page 5 of the officer's report which gave details of the recommendation. Officers explained that the applicant did not pass the sequential test for the previous application which had been refused. Harrow Council had concerns that they would lose trade from their town centre as there was a cinema located there.

Officers explained that the Council had to weigh up the benefits of developing the Arla site against the impact of not getting a new Sainsbury's store, and the benefits of the Arla site outweighed those presented by Sainsbury's proposals, however, should the

Arla site be approved for redevelopment it should not stop Sainsbury's from carrying out its approved application.

Officers informed the Committee that the application had been assessed in terms of the regeneration benefits that it would bring, which included the additional housing and the bringing of a derelict site back into use. It was considered that such benefits would outweigh the compromise of committed development within the town centre. The identified impact of the Asda proposal on the sales turnover of South Ruislip Local Centre as a whole (in the scenario that the Sainsbury's store redevelopment does not take place) amounted to -18.1%. Other stores in South Ruislip would not be competing with Asda; local businesses might actually gain more trade from increased footfall.

Officers reminded Members that the highway works were subject to other approval and that money from S106 would be used to mitigate any traffic impact from the site. Members questioned the close proximity between the commercial and residential units. Officers explained that the applicant had undertaken an extensive noise assessment which had been examined by the Council's Noise Officer and Environmental Protection Unit. The assessment was so robust that it had been undertaken as if the site was open 24 hours. An amendment was agreed to condition 32 to ensure that the development made adequate provision of children's play space in accordance with policy R1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan.

Members questioned whether there would be shadowing on some of the residential blocks. Officers informed the Committee that the proposals were fully compliant with regards to sunlight and daylight. Officers also explained that condition 34, which related to privacy measures, would cover any concerns relating to overlooking and privacy. Additionally an amendment was agreed to condition 33 that no residential phase of the development should commence until a sound insulation and ventilation scheme for protecting the proposed residential development from road traffic, rail traffic, air traffic and other noise including any air conditioning units has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Officers informed Members that there was a difference between a flood zone and surface water flooding. The Chairman highlighted to the Committee that condition 15 of the officer's report was very strong and robust and covered any concerns.

Members discussed the potential traffic issues that would arise if the site was approved. The proposals included 132 residential units, 5 restaurants, a cinema that would seat 1700, a foodstore and petrol station. Members were aware of the scale of the site and noted that the cinema would be predominately used outside of peak hours. The Council's Highway officer further explained that with improvements in place there would not be an adverse impact on the highway network. Members were assured that there was a full traffic assessment needed to be undertaken before officers are fully satisfied; however, officers were confident that further off-site modelling would alleviate issues and concerns.

Members were concerned that there were already issues associated with the junction of Long Drive and Victoria Road. Officers were aware that there was extensive queuing at peak times on this junction, and officers agreed there needed to be major improvements before a scheme of the proposed scale was built. Members were pleased to hear that there were measures to prevent rat running through the site.

Questions were raised regarding the recycling site and how close it was to the residential part of the site. The Committee agreed to delegate the final wording of

condition 25 to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour Lead to ensure that a designated area for recycled waste for customers to dispose of was away from residential properties, together with appropriate screening.

Members questioned why 3 hours free parking had been offered and whether this would be enough time for people using the cinema and other facilities. Officers informed the Committee that the applicant was fine with offering 4 hours. Members also questioned what parking arrangements would be offered to the church located on Victoria Road. Officers further explained that these concerns could be addressed and would be taken in to the S106 agreement. An amendment to condition 20 was agreed to ensure that an appropriate level of car parking provision was provided on site.

Members agreed for changes to the Heads of Terms to be amended and agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead outside of the meeting.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.36 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Danielle Watson on Democratic Services Officer: 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.