

Minutes

Central & South Planning Committee

Tuesday, 5 January 2010

Meeting held at Civic Centre, High Street,
Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Published on:

Come into effect on: Immediately

	<p>Members Present: Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Michael Bull Paul Buttivant Janet Duncan Patricia Jackson</p> <p>Officers Present: James Rodger, Mathew Duigan, Manmohan Ranger, Nikki Deol, Gill Brice</p>	
120.	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>No apologies had been received.</p>	
121.	<p>Declarations of Interest in matters coming before this meeting</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest notified.</p>	
122.	<p>To sign and receive the minutes of the previous meeting (to follow)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 24 November, 10 and 17 December 2009 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
123.	<p>Matters that have been notified in advance or urgent</p> <p>There had been no items notified as urgent.</p>	
124.	<p>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</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1 except Items 16, 17, 18 and 19 , which were considered in Part 2.</p>	

<p>125.</p>	<p>Land to the North of Terminal 3, Central Terminal Area, Heathrow Airport - 66456/APP/2009/2350</p> <p>Erection of a transfer baggage building (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 1995).</p> <p>66456/APP/2009/235</p> <p>The recommendation as amended on the addendum sheet was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved: That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
<p>126.</p>	<p>Terminal 2, Queens Building, P/O Terminal 1, CTA and P5 Car Park, Heathrow Airport, Hounslow - 62360/APP/2009/22323</p> <p>Variation of condition 27 (Building dimensions) of planning Permission ref.62360/APP/2006/2942 dated 02/07/2007: Development of a replacement passenger terminal building in the Central Terminal Area</p> <p>62360/APP/2009/22323</p> <p>Members asked for an informative to be added to advise that this approval relates strictly to the proposed application and does not indicate approval of any further applications.</p> <p>The recommendation with an additional Informative added by members was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning & Community Services to vary the original S106 agreement to refer to the new planning permission and to subsequently grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report, with an additional informative as follows:-</p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p>15. You are advised that this approval relates strictly to the proposed application and in no way indicates approval of any other application, including any application for an associated car parking building.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

<p>127.</p>	<p>Unit E, Prologis Park, Stockley Road, West Drayton - 18399/APP/2009/2119</p> <p>Reserved matters (details of siting, design, external appearance and landscaping) of Unit E (employment component) in compliance with condition 3 of planning permission ref.18399/APP/ 2005/3415 dated 02/03/2006 for variation of conditions 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22, 26, 9 and 30 (to allow separate phased submissions of details relating to residential and employment components of the development) of outline planning permission ref.18399/APP/2004/2284 dated 19/08/2005 for redevelopment of the site for a mixed-use development comprising Classes B1(a) and (c), B2 and B8 employment uses and Class C3 residential use up to a maximum of 101 units with associated access, parking and landscaping</p> <p>18399/APP/2009/2119</p> <p>Members asked for an additional condition to be added for the applicant to provide details of routes for Lorry's visiting the site to minimise the impact on the surrounding area. This was put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p>The recommendation with an additional condition added by members was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and an additional condition as follows:-</p> <p>A Deliveries and Servicing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of the routes which trucks will take to/from the site to minimise the impact of noise, traffic and vibration associated with lorry movements on residential amenity, and to minimise deliveries during peak hours, to combine deliveries in order to reduce numbers and frequency and to promote the use of quieter and less polluting vehicles.</p> <p>To safeguard the amenity of surrounding areas and to comply with policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the sustainability objectives contained in PPG1 and PPG13.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
-------------	---	--

<p>128.</p>	<p>Building 63 Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge - 56862/APP/2009/2247</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site to provide up to 7,200 sq m of light industrial (Class B1c) and/or general industrial (Class B2) and/or storage and distribution (Class B8) floorspace, including ancillary office floorspace together with associated car parking and landscaping (Outline Application)</p> <p>56862/APP/2009/2247</p> <p>Members asked for an additional condition to be added for details to be provided on the routes for Lorry's visiting the site and an informative to advise the applicant of the bridges with weight restrictions. The additional condition and informative was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>Members asked whether it would be possible to provide a public footpath through the Green Belt and landscaped areas.</p> <p>Officers suggested that this could be added to 3(iv) of the S106 agreement. The amendment as suggested by the officer was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>The recommendation with the amendment and additional condition and informatives was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:</p> <p>i) Travel plans to be prepared in accordance to be prepared in accordance with TfL's guidance and to include a bond quantum of £20,000.</p> <p>ii) A financial contribution of £25,000 towards air quality monitoring initiatives.</p> <p>iii) A contribution of £2,500 for every £1 million build cost towards construction training initiatives in the borough.</p> <p>iv) Public realm improvement works to 4 hectares of Green Belt at the southern end of the site. Including the restoration of the land and the ongoing management and maintenance at the applicant's expense and pathways for use by members of the public through the Green Belt and landscaped areas.</p> <p>v) A contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions to enable the management and monitoring of the S106 agreement.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
-------------	--	--

That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.

That if by 18th January 2009, the S106 Agreement has not been finalised, delegated powers be given to the Director of Planning and Community Services to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The development is not considered to have made adequate provision, through planning obligations, for contributions towards construction training or monitoring, or monitoring. Given that a legal agreement or unilateral undertaking has not been secured to address this issue, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document for Planning Obligations (Adopted July 2008).

2. The development is not considered to have provided appropriate mitigation measures, which in this case would be a travel plan to TFL guidelines and contributions towards air quality monitoring initiatives, to ensure that there would be no detrimental impact on local air quality within a designated Air Quality Management Area contrary to policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), Hillingdon's Air Quality Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 2002) and Policy 4A.6 of the London Plan (February 2008).

3. The development would fail to provide appropriate enhancement and landscaping of associated Green Belt Land in order to mitigate the impacts of the proposed built form and accordingly would result in a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the Green Belt contrary to Policy OL5 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007). e) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Director of Planning and Community Services under delegated powers, subject to the completion of legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers to the applicant.

	<p>That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out on the addendum sheet be attached.</p> <p>Add new condition:</p> <p>'The Deliveries and Servicing Plan approved in accordance with condition 3(ii) shall include details of the routes which trucks will take to/from the site to minimise the impact of noise, traffic and vibration associated with lorry movements on residential amenity, and to minimise deliveries during peak hours, to combine deliveries in order to reduce numbers and frequency and to promote the use of quieter and less polluting vehicles.</p> <p>To safeguard the amenity of surrounding areas and to comply with policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the sustainability objectives contained in PPG1 and PPG13.'</p> <p>Add standard condition N5</p> <p>Add informative:</p> <p>'You are advised that vehicular access routes to the site pass over bridges which have weight restrictions and as such you should ensure vehicles attending the site are of a weight which is appropriate given bridge weight restrictions.'</p>	
<p>129.</p>	<p>21 High Street, Yiewsley - 26628/APP/2009/2284</p> <p>Redevelopment of site for mixed use development comprising a 44 - unit apartment hotel, 1,320 m² of office space and 135 m² restaurant/bar, with associated access, car parking and landscaping (Outline Application for approval of access)</p> <p>26628/APP/2009/2284</p> <p>Officers in introducing the report advised the committee that resolution 2a (i) needed to be amended to change the wording to encompass all three uses.</p> <p>A Member asked whether it was acceptable to add a condition limiting the use of the bar and restaurant to the Apart Hotel and not the general public as it was not felt that it needed to be open to the general public. This had been successfully done on an application for a Hotel in Hayes.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

Officers advised that the application in Hayes had been for a Hotel not an Apart Hotel and it was not felt that the amount of demand would make it viable and should also open to the public as well as the residents occupying the Apart Hotel.

Concerns were raised about the height of the proposed building in relation to those in the surrounding area. The existing buildings are all 4 storeys and this development was proposing 6 storeys and this was not felt to be appropriate in this area. The proposal was felt to be unacceptable in the street scene and the adjoining developments and out of character with the area.

The Chairman reported that there was a lot of conflicts with this development and the committee need to make sure that the conditions are correct if members are considering refusing this application. Issues were raised in relation to whether delivery vehicles would be able to access the site satisfactorily.

In answer to the issues raised in relation to the refusing the application officers advised that Members needed to have regard to the previous reasons for refusal and whether this application overcame those reasons. In regard to the height the current application had been reduced overall and had been set back to address the visual appearance and out of keeping issues that formed part of the previous reasons for refusal. In relation to the delivery issues raised there was no specific allocated loading bay and deliveries would be managed within the site. The maximum weight for Lorry's accessing the site would be 7.5 Tonnes.

A member suggested that the application should be refused as there needed to be a better separation between the various uses on the site and sufficient area within the site to accommodate all the uses. It was suggested that an informative be added to reflect this if the application was to be refused.

Officers advised that this was an outline application and the issues raised by members could be addressed at the detailed stage. Members were reminded that they needed to be mindful of the previous reasons for refusal and consider whether this scheme overcame those reasons.

A member stated that it was not the uses on the site that was causing concern but the amount of development on the site was felt to be inappropriate and did not relate well with the other buildings in the surrounding suburban area.

It was suggested that the application be refused for the previous reasons for refusal set out on page 127 of the report omitting the reference made to the Grand Union Canal, with the final wording of the reason for refusal to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead. On being put to the vote this was agreed by the committee.

	<p>The recommendation with an additional 3 informatives added was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The proposed development by reason of the size, scale and design of the proposed building represents an overdevelopment of the site and would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the street, the character of the area and highway safety. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to policies AM7, AM 14, BE13, BE19 and BE32 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and policies 4B.1, 4B.3 and 4C.1 of the Mayors London Plan (February 2008).</p> <p>2. The development has not secured provision through planning obligations, for contributions towards public realm/town centre/canal side improvement to address the impact of the development on its surroundings, construction training or project management and monitoring. Neither has the applicant agreed through a planning obligation the provision of a comprehensive travel plan to TFL's latest guidance. The application is therefore contrary to policies R17 and BE32 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and the Councils Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for Planning Obligations and policy 3C.2 of the Mayors London Plan (February 2008).</p> <p>Additional Informatives added 152, 153, and 'You are advised that the application does not provide adequately for onsite car parking and service/delivery vehicles.'</p>	
130.	<p>1, 4, 5 & 6 School Approach, Fredora Avenue, Hayes - 63421/APP/2009/1411</p> <p>Single storey one-bedroom detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, involving demolition of existing 3 garage units.</p> <p>63421/APP/2009/1411</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear service alleyway blocked by applicant preventing access to rear of properties in Fredora Avenue. • Size of road needs to be seen to be appreciated and would 	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

- have safety implications for those using the road.
- There will be no access to school keeper's house if proposal goes ahead.
- Concerns about cars using the access as the footpath would be blocked on both sides of the access road.
- Impact on school traffic having to use the access at the other side of the school.
- Concern at the Human Rights Act not being used as a reason for refusal as the proposal would not provide a private and family life for the person occupying the school keeper's house.
- Consideration had not been given to the easement rights.
- This access is the only means of access to the surgery and school keeper's house.

The Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:-

- All Ward Councillors are objecting to this application and supporting the reasons for refusal
- The application if approved would be detrimental to the access to the Surgery.
- The proposal would be detrimental to the living conditions for the occupiers of the school keeper's house and this should be included in the reason for refusal.
- There is no other access to the school house and if the emergency services were called to the house the school would have to be unlocked for them to obtain access.

There was concerns raised in relation to the access and the Legal Advisor reported that this was a complex issue and was outside the remit of the Planning Committee. Any further work on the issue of access would be dealt with outside of the meeting. In regard to concerns over ownership of the land officers advised the committee that the correct certificates had been served and the applicant owned the land edged red shown on the plan.

The recommendation with an additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report and changes on the addendum sheet and an additional informative added as follows:-

'You are advised that had the Council been minded to approve the application conditions would have been imposed restricting permitted development rights.'

<p>131.</p>	<p>19 Silverdale Gardens, Hayes - 63644/APP/2009/2071</p> <p>Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as playroom (Retrospective application)</p> <p>63644/APP/2009/2071</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner raised the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal exceeds the width of the house and the permitted height. • Would create a precedent for others in the area. • Why is there a door and 2 windows in the rear of the outbuilding if being used as a playroom. • Outbuilding overlooks the kitchen and rear bedrooms of 61 Fairdale Gardens • A 2 metre block wall had been erected at the rear of the property • The windows and doors in the outbuilding overlooks 57 and 62 Fairdale Gardens. <p>The Ward Councillor attending the meeting and made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Ward councillors support the petitioner's objections to the proposal. • This is a large building on a small plot. • Doors and windows at the rear of the building overlooking properties in Fairdale Gardens. • If allowed this would set precedent for surrounding properties. <p>In clarification of the issues raised in relation to overlooking officers advised the committee that the block wall that had been built obscured the windows from the adjacent rear properties.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the distance of the proposed outbuilding to neighbouring properties officers advised that it was an acute angle and not sufficient to justify refusal on that ground.</p> <p>A member suggested that an informative be added to the refusal stating that the building was unacceptable by virtue of the windows at the rear being intrusive to adjacent properties. The informative was agreed by the committee.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
--------------------	--	---

	<p>The recommendation with the additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report with an additional informative added as follows:-</p> <p>'You are advised that the windows at the rear of the out building permit overlooking of adjoining residential properties and are not considered appropriate.'</p>	
132.	<p>8th Hayes Scout Group, Derwent Drive, Hayes - 8143/APP/2009/2250</p> <p>Erection of a single storey side extension and alterations to existing windows</p> <p>8143/APP/2009/2250</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote the application was approved.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
133.	<p>B.T. Skyport Telephone Exchange, Newall Road, Heathrow Airport</p> <p>15665/APP/2009/2485</p> <p>Installation of three Omni pole mounted antennas, one GPS antenna, two 0.3m dish antennas, one equipment cabin, one metre cabinet and associated feeder cables.</p> <p>15665/APP/2009/2485</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and on the addendum sheet.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
134.	<p>145 Station Road, West Drayton - 21936/APP/2009/203</p> <p>Change of use from a dog grooming centre (Sui Generis) to Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions) for use as Physiotherapy Unit and installation of ramp to front entrance</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

	<p>21936/APP/2009/203</p> <p>In answer to concerns raised in relation to the parking being provided officers informed the committee that there was a deficiency in the parking but the benefits of the application outweighed the potential parking issues.</p> <p>The Chairman suggested that an informative be added to advise the applicant that although this application was against policy guidelines the application was only being considered favourably due to its community health needs and close proximity to a public car park. The informative was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report, addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and an additional informative added as follows:-</p> <p>'You are advised that the permission is made on the basis that there are exceptional medical circumstances which justify the proposal and that there are public parking facilities within close proximity to the site.'</p>	
<p>135.</p>	<p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
<p>136.</p>	<p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report as agreed.</p> <p>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

137.	<p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
138.	<p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
	<p>Meeting closed at: 22.20 p.m.</p> <p>Next meeting: 26 January 2010</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Gill Brice on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.