

# Minutes

## CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 September 2010

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Mike Bull Paul Buttivant Peter Curling Jazz Dhillon Dominic Gilham Michael White</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> James Rodger Matthew Duigan Sarah White Manmohan Ranger Nadia Williams</p> <p><b>Also Present</b> Councillor Lindsay Bliss</p>				
32.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Judith Cooper, Brian Stead and Janet Duncan. Councillors Michael White, Mike Bull and Jazz Dhillon attended in their place.</p>				
33.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Mike Bull declared a prejudicial interest in item in the following items:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>Item 10 – Former National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Headquarters Porters Way, West Drayton</td><td>By virtue of having been lobbied by the developer.</td></tr><tr><td>Item 15 – 7 Colne Avenue West Drayton</td><td>As he had requested for the application to be reported to the Committee.</td></tr></table> <p>Councillor Bull withdrew from the room and did not take part in the decision of the applications.</p>	Item 10 – Former National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Headquarters Porters Way, West Drayton	By virtue of having been lobbied by the developer.	Item 15 – 7 Colne Avenue West Drayton	As he had requested for the application to be reported to the Committee.
Item 10 – Former National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Headquarters Porters Way, West Drayton	By virtue of having been lobbied by the developer.				
Item 15 – 7 Colne Avenue West Drayton	As he had requested for the application to be reported to the Committee.				

34.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There had been no items notified as urgent.</p>	
35.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I 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 would be considered in Part 1 and Part 2.</p>	
36.	<p><b>EASTERN APRON, CENTRAL TERMINAL AREA, HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW 64110/APP/2010/1567</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Baggage Connectivity component of Eastern Apron Subsurface Works comprising T2A early bag store basement, T2A to T2B baggage tunnels, T2B northern and southern baggage basements and safeguarded baggage tunnel connections towards any future T2C (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995)</b></p> <p>The recommendation for no objection raised was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That no objection be raised subject to the considerations and informatives set out in the officers report and additional consideration in the Addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
37.	<p><b>EASTERN APRON, CENTRAL TERMINAL AREA, HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW 64110/APP/2010/1569</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Passenger Connectivity component of Eastern Apron Subsurface Works comprising Vertical Passenger Movement Building (VPM) with link bridges to Terminal 2A and Terminal 1, subgrade passenger subway connection from T2A to T2B, Tracked Transit System (TTS) connecting T2A and T2B with safeguarded tunnels to T2C and additional Flight Connections Levels at T2B (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995)</b></p> <p>The Committee attached an additional consideration to advise the applicant that when the temporary building ceased to be in use, that it be removed.</p> <p>The recommendation for no objection raised was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That no objection be raised subject to the considerations and informatives set out in the officer’s report, the additional consideration in the Addendum, and an additional consideration as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>When the temporary Vertical Passenger Movement Building is no</i></b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

	<p><b><i>longer required for the operational requirements of the airport, the structure shall be removed and the site restored to its original state.</i></b></p> <p><b>Reason</b></p> <p><b><i>To ensure the external appearance of the development is satisfactory and that the development within the boundary of the airport is directly related to the operation of the airport in accordance with Policies BE13 and A4 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</i></b></p>	
38.	<p><b>LAND ADJOINING T4 BAGGAGE FACILITIES, HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW 24177/APP/2010/1530 (Agenda Item 8)</b></p> <p><b>Erection of an additional Alternative Baggage Facility (ABF) adjoining Terminal 4's existing baggage facilities (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended)</b></p> <p>The recommendation for no objection raised was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That no objection be raised subject to the considerations and informatives set out in the officers report and the additional consideration in the Addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
39.	<p><b>39 HIGH STREET, YIEWSLEY 24485/APP/2010/1443 (Agenda Item 9)</b></p> <p><b>Erection of a mixed-use development consisting of a single retail unit and a 46-bedroom care home together with pedestrian/vehicular access, car parking, landscaping, servicing and ancillary areas</b></p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the committee's attention to note the changes in the Addendum.</p> <p>The Committee amended the wording of Condition 23 in the Addendum to allow retail unit to operate from 08.00 hours to 18.00 hours on any day.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns about the boundary to the Grand Union Canal being a potential danger for future occupiers who may have dementia. Officers advised that future residents would be supervised by staff.</p> <p>In response to concerns raised about the issue of anti-social behaviour from people throwing rubbish into the canal, officers responded that a legitimate active use in the tow path would be in operation and would therefore mitigate this issue.</p> <p>A Member queried how visitors would gain access with a proposed automated door and expressed concerns about the lack of visitor</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

parking, particularly during peak times and at weekends in an area where Controlled Parking Zone was in operation. Officers advised that the Committee could attach an additional condition to ask the applicant to provide details of how the gate would be operated, and to provide details of access to disabled parking.

In response to a query raised about the potential traffic issues from cars being parked on the footpath, officers advised that this would only be an issue if the access gates were locked. This issue could be addressed by the Committee asking the applicant to outline how the gates would be managed for delivery vehicles.

The Committee expressed concerns about the 2.8m height of the car park, which was considered would not be sufficient for large delivery vehicles.

Members were asked to note that only a small retail unit was proposed and would therefore only have occasional deliveries. It was not envisaged that the amount of activity would create problems.

Members requested officers to report Condition 17 'Delivery and Servicing Plan' to be reported back to a Committee meeting for discharge.

In response to a comment about the proposed layout of just single bedrooms with no double bedrooms, officers advised that there was currently no guidance to address this issue. It was reported that officers had raised this issue with the applicant and the applicant had indicated that there was an overwhelming demand for single rooms, which was why doubled rooms had not been proposed.

The recommendation for Approval subject to a S106 Agreement was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed, subject to the changes and amendments in the Addendum and an additional condition.

### **Resolved**

**That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission, subject to the following:**

**A. That the Council enter into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following:**

- (i) A 10-year Green Travel Plan to be prepared in accordance with TfL's guidance and to include a bond quantum of £20,000, or alternative performance monitoring clauses as set out in the TfL Work Place Travel Plan Guidance.**
- (ii) A contribution of £9,966.82 towards health care provision in this part of the borough.**
- (iii) A contribution of £25,000 towards public realm/town centre improvements, including enhancements to the**

- canal.
- (iv) A contribution of £5,000 towards the advancement and implementation of British Waterways' Waterspace Strategy.
  - (v) A contribution of £25,000 towards air quality monitoring.
  - (vi) A contribution of £2,500 for every £1 million building cost towards construction training initiatives in the borough.
  - (vii) A contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions to enable the management and monitoring of the S106 agreement.

**B. That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the Section 106 agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.**

**C. That the officers be authorised to negotiate the terms of the proposed agreement.**

**D. That, if the S106 agreement is not completed by the application expiry on 20/09/2010 that, under the discretion of the Head of Planning and Enforcement, the application is refused under delegated powers on the basis that the applicant has refused to address planning obligation requirements.**

**E. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report be attached.**

**Condition 23 was amended to read as follows:**

***The retail premises shall not be opened to the public outside of the hours of 0800 and 18.00 any day.***

**Reason**

***To protect the amenity of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy OE1 and OE3 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).***

**F. Additional Conditions:**

***Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the access gate to car park , incorporating facilities for its operation by disabled persons, and capable of being manually operated in the event of a power failure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the access gate shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and maintained fro so long as the development remains in site.***

**Reason**

***To provide safe and adequate access for pedestrian and vehicles accessing the new parking area in accordance with Policies AM7***

	<p><i>and AM8 of the Hillingdon Development Plan Saved policies (September 2007).</i></p> <p><b>G. Condition 17 – Delivery and Servicing Plan: To be reported back to a Central and South Planning Committee meeting to be discharged on.</b></p>	
40.	<p><b>FORMER NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES (NATS) HEADQUARTERS, PORTERS WAY, WEST DRAYTON 5107/APP/2009/2348 (Agenda Item 10)</b></p> <p><b>Alteration to Condition 3 of planning approval) Proposed mixed-use redevelopment comprising: 773 dwellings comprising 12no. studios, 152no. 1- bedroom flats, 316no. 2-bedroom flats, 21no, 2 bedroom houses, 23no. 3-bedroom flats, 181no. 3-bedroom houses, 59no. 4- bedroom houses and 9no. 5-bedroom houses; Class D1 Primary Healthcare facility including room for joint community use (up to 1085sqm gea); Class C2 Nursing Home (up to 3630sqm gea); Classes A1-A3 Shop units to complement Mulberry Parade (up to 185sqm gea, depending on size of Primary Healthcare facility); Class B1 Business units including site management office (up to 185sqm gea); Energy Centre (up to 220sqm gea) with combined heat and power unit; foul water pumping station; associated access roads from Porters Way (and excluding all access including pedestrian and bicycle access from Rutters Close); 1085 car parking spaces; cycle parking; public open space areas; cycleways and footpaths; and landscaping works</b></p> <p>The recommendation for the resolution as agreed by the Planning Committee on 25 May 2010 be amended to replaced the wording of Condition 3 was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the resolution as agreed by the Planning Committee on 25 May 2010 be amended to replaced the wording of Condition 3 be approved.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
41.	<p><b>10 RALEIGH AVENUE, HAYES 58796/APP/2010/541 (Agenda Item 11)</b></p> <p><b>Conversion of existing dwelling to 1 one-bedroom and 1 two-bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space (Retrospective application)</b></p> <p>A representative of a petition received in objection to the application addressed the Committee. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urged that this retrospective planning application should be refused</li> <li>• The Parking issue was a concern for residents of Selan Gardens and Raleigh Avenue</li> <li>• The development infringed on private property.</li> <li>• Residents were installing a security gate to seal off access way</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

- Opening up the access way would lead to the loss of security for surrounding properties
- Opposed to parking in back gardens.
- Trees had been removed
- Concerned about the loss of privacy for Residents in Raleigh Gardens
- If application was granted, the breach of security would impact greatly on an 80 year old resident who had installed security system to her home
- Storage in the middle of the garden, seriously impacted on No 12, as it extended to the boundary of No 12, with a detrimental effect on the attractiveness of the house
- Concerned about compliancy (following advice from a gas engineer) of flues to right at the back door of residents (the Council had been contacted about this issue)
- Urged the Committee to refuse the application

In response to a query about access, the petitioner advised that only residents of Selan Gardens had access to the rear, which was on private land. Access was not closed off and there was no rear access for residents of Raleigh Gardens.

The applicant circulated photographs to Members and spoke about the application raising the following points:

- In respect of privacy, security and safety concerns, access to back gardens was acceptable in the UK, which therefore amounted to no extra ordinary request
- The alley way was 6m wide, which met more than the required standards at the back of Raleigh Avenue and Selan Gardens
- People could go in and out of their garages safely and securely
- The back garden of the application site was 6m x 6.5m which allowed for enough parking spaces in the back
- Had allocated additional space to provide a turning point
- The alley way was not a private property and residents had their own garages
- Other residents used the same rear access to access their properties
- Some residents had blocked the alley way by dumping rubbish of at least 3m wide
- Some garages had been converted into bedrooms; others had been converted into out-buildings.
- Deserved the same rights as other members of the community

In answer to a question as to whether there was a legal agreement for the use of the alley way, the applicant advised that he was not aware of any. Although he did not yet have a legal agreement for the use of the road, the applicant advised that he will be able to provide such an agreement.

	<p>A Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported the petitioners in their objection to the application.</li> <li>• That the development was for commercial gain.</li> <li>• No one should be confined to less than the habitable required standard of space</li> <li>• Concerned about the issue of parking and the potential problem of the use of the service road</li> <li>• Concerned about potential anti-social behaviour and unauthorised access</li> <li>• Concerned that the conversion had already been completed without planning permission</li> <li>• Suggested that if the officer's recommendation was agreed, that enforcement action should be taken</li> </ul> <p>For clarification officers advised that car parking spaces at the rear of the development was acceptable by the Council and manoeuvrability was not an issue. The issue was the right of way which appeared only to be available to the residents of Selan Gardens.</p> <p>Members noted that no vehicle would be able to manoeuvre in the parking spaces at the front of the development, as shown on the plans.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was refused, subject to the amendments in the Addendum circulated at the meeting.</p> <p><b>Resolved – that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report, subject to the amendments in the Addendum.</b></p>	
42.	<p><b>1 YEADING LANE, HAYES 47275/APP/2010/494</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from A3 (restaurant and cafes) to A3 (restaurant and cafes) /A5 (hot food takeaways), installation of extraction unit and an extension of hours from 0700 - 2000 on Monday to Saturday and 0900 - 1700 on Sunday, to 0700 - 2200 Monday to Saturday and 0900 - 2000 on Sundays and Bank Holidays</b></p> <p>In introducing the report, officers advised that revised plans relating to access to the kitchen had been received very late that day from the applicant. It was noted that the current plans did not show doorways from the serving area to the eating area or from the kitchen to the rear of the property.</p> <p>The Committee's attention was directed to the Addendum to highlight the replacement of the wording for Condition 2, an additional condition OM18 and other changes.</p> <p>A representative of a petition received in support of the application addressed the Committee. The following points were raised:</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area currently shown as a doorway was in actual fact a canopy line and not a doorway</li> <li>• The photographs showing the flue in the presentation was on the wrong side. It should be on the other side of the staircase.</li> <li>• Had been residing in the area for over 30 years and strongly supported this application.</li> <li>• Of the number of food outlets in the area, this food outlet was the only one where the food was fresh.</li> <li>• Strongly supported this application as a community and the applicant's efforts in keeping the area clear by providing 2 bins.</li> </ul> <p>A Ward Councillor in addressing the meeting commented that no objections had been received in respect of this application.</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to changes in, and to the Addendum.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, changes in, and to the Addendum.</b></p> <p><b>The wording on page 9 of the Addendum was replaced as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>Notwithstanding the details on the approved drawings, development shall not commence until details of door openings between the ground floor eating, serving, kitchen and storage areas and rear yard have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. The use hereby approved shall not commence until the door openings have been constructed in accordance with the approved details and these works shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development.</i></b></p> <p><b>Reason</b></p> <p><b><i>To ensure that adequate accessibility is provided for refuse and other purposes in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</i></b></p>	
43.	<p><b>LOCK-UP GARAGE SITE REAR OF 22 - 26, 28 AND 30 ST PETERS ROAD, COWLEY 66045/APP/2010/1477 (Agenda Item 13)</b></p> <p><b>Erection of detached bungalow with associated parking and landscaping, involving demolition of existing lock-up garages</b></p> <p>A representative of a petition received in objection to the application addressed the Committee. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had no objection to the proposal for disabled access but felt that the currently proposed location was in the wrong place.</li> <li>• Circulated photographs to Committee Members to demonstrate that a medium sized van would have problem manoeuvring the site, which may result in to disturbance and possible damage to</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

property.

- That if no adequate vehicular access was provided, delivery vehicles would have to park on the main road, which had restricted parking by single yellow lines from 8am to 5pm.
- A resident parking permit control parking scheme was in operation in St Peters Road and adjoining roads.
- There was a good risk that there would be some damage from construction vehicles.

The agent/applicant was not present at the meeting.

Officers advised that with respect to the issue of manoeuvrability, it must be noted that 8 garages were being replaced with 1 bungalow and that this issue was now less, compared to what was there at present.

During discussion, the Committee considered that a decision could not be made on this application, as there were a number of areas requiring further clarification and further details in order for the Committee to make an informed decision. These are listed as follows:

- Daylight/sunlight report to demonstrate that spaces within the building received adequate natural light to include the kitchen and other internal spaces.
- Details of boundary treatment that would prevent overlooking from access-way and still allow access for cars to the property and manoeuvrability. Boundary treatment to also include extensive visibility and adequate outlook from the dwelling.
- A statement of intent from the applicant that future residents would not be permitted to obtain residents parking permits, and that any garage users would be relocated to another garage of comparable size and quality.
- Details to be provided of types of the types of vehicles that were likely to access the site to demonstrate access.
- Officers to investigate whether 2 car parking spaces could be provided.
- That there should be a re-consultation if there were any changes to the plans and details before the scheme was reported back to Committee.

The proposal for the application to be deferred was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

**Resolved**

- 1. That the application be deferred for further clarification and details for the reasons set out above.**
- 2. That the application be reported back to Committee for a decision.**

44.

**20A KEATS WAY, WEST DRAYTON 53368/APP/2010/1505**  
*(Agenda Item 14)*

**Action by**

	<p><b>Conversion of existing dwelling to 2 three-bedroom dwellings (Retrospective application)</b></p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote, was refused.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
<p>45.</p>	<p><b>7 COLNE AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON      29673/APP/2010/13</b> <i>(Agenda Item 15)</i></p> <p><b>Erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension with rooflights and 2 rooflights in the rear roofslope</b></p> <p>The Committee attached an additional condition to ensure that the roof lights were no less than 1.8m.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed, subject to the changes in the Addendum circulated at the meeting and an additional condition.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Buttivant requested that his abstention from the decision be recorded.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report subject to the changes in the Addendum and the following additional condition:</b></p> <p><b><i>All roof lights shall be installed at a height not less than 1.8m above the finished floor level to the rooms to which they would provide light.</i></b></p> <p><b>Reason</b></p> <p><b><i>To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with Policy BE24 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</i></b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>
<p>46.</p>	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 16)</i></p> <p>The recommendation that further action that further action be taken was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</li> <li>2. That the committee resolved to release their decision and</li> </ol>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matthew Duigan</p>

	<b>the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</b>	
47.	<b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 17</i> )  This report was withdrawn by the Head of Planning and Enforcement as there has been a material change to the enforcement.	<b>Action by</b>  James Rodger Matthew Duigan
48.	<b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 18</i> )  The recommendation that further action be taken was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.  <b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b>  <b>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</b>	<b>Action by</b>  James Rodger Matthew Duigan
49.	<b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 19</i> )  The Committee attached an additional recommendation to allow the release of the decision to the public domain solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.  The recommendation that further action be taken was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.  <b>Resolved</b>  <b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b>  <b>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</b>	<b>Action by</b>  James Rodger Matthew Duigan
50.	<b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 20</i> )  This report was withdrawn by the Head of Planning and Enforcement, as the enforcement issue had been resolved.	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.17 pm.	

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