

Minutes

MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 August 2013

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) David Allam Dominic Gilham Michael Markham John Morgan Brian Stead Mo Khursheed</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Sports and Green Spaces Meghji Hirani, Planning Contract and Planning Information Syed Shah, Principal Highway Engineer Tim Brown, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p> | |
| 55. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Janet Duncan with Councillor Mo Khursheed acting as substitute.</p> | |
| 56. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Hensley declared non-pecuniary interests in items 6, 7 and 8. He left the room and did not participate in the items.</p> | |
| 57. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18 JULY 2013 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as an accurate record, subject to adding Cllr Brian Stead to the Members Present as he had been omitted in error.</p> | |
| 58. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> | |
| 59. | <p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THOSE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 2 WILL BE HEARD IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>All items were considered in Part 1.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | |
| 60. | <p>SWAKELEYS HOUSE, MILTON ROAD, ICKENHAM 23202/APP/2013/12 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Change of use of Swakeleys House from Office (B1) use and Sports (D2) use and the erection of 7 buildings for use together as a single residential dwelling (C3) and gardens; alterations to listed building; demolition of 1980s entrance foyer attached to northern elevation of Swakeleys House, Vyners House, the connecting link between Vyners House and Swakeleys House and the Ice House building; and associated landscaping and servicing works within surrounding grounds.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p>At the end of the officer presentation, the Chairman confirmed that Councillor Mo Khursheed would not be voting on items 6, 7 and 8 as he had not been present to hear the entire debate, including the officers' presentations on the items.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitions received in objection and support to the proposals were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The lead petitioner from the Ickenham Residents Association in objection to the application raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was unacceptable for a residential building to be built on the Green Belt. • The suggestion that the use of existing hard standing would not lead to a net loss to the Green Belt was rejected. • The proposal to knock down Vyner's House and replace this with several structures would far exceed the footprint currently produced by Vyners House and would also affect the openness of the site. • No special circumstances existed for the applicant to build on Green Belt land. • It was unlikely that a private owner would support the Ickenham Festival in future as the proposal sought the use of the site as private residential dwelling. <p>The lead petitioner from The Avenue Residents Association in objection to the application raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Avenue welcomed the proposal for a change of use for Swakeley's House but felt that the current proposal was not right for the site. • The proposal to increase the size of the dwelling was not sustainable. • The proposal would lead to increased residential development in the Greenbelt which was unacceptable. • The proposal sought to develop the site further which unsuitable development adjacent to a Grade 1 listed building. • The claims made by the applicant that Bowl's Club gave rise to privacy and security concerns was a spurious argument. | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |

- The risk of increased traffic in the Avenue both during construction and subsequently, resulting in increased wear and tear to the road and an increased risk to pedestrians.

The lead petitioner from The Swakeley's Bowls Club in objection to the application raised the following points:

- The closure of the Bowl's Club was not necessary.
- The Bowl's Club had a long standing history which dated back to 1920. The Club was run by volunteers and the officer report underplayed the value and role of the Club to the local community.
- The Bowl's Club did not pose a security threat to the grounds of Swakeley's House.
- The Bowl's Club did not detract from residential amenity and the proposal to use the site as a single dwelling.
- Any concerns an applicant might have about privacy could be met through the use of planting and screening.

The lead petitioner from The Ickenham Festival in support of the application raised the following points:

- The application site had remained unoccupied for ten years and a viable use had to be found for the long term protection of the building.
- The proposal would maintain and improve access to the site for the Ickenham Festival.
- The proposal would put the building back to beneficial use.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The site had remained unoccupied for 10 years and had been subject to vandalism and arson. This would cease when the property underwent a change of use.
- English Heritage had reviewed the proposal and supported the application.
- The removal of Vyner's House was an essential step to improve the setting of the House.
- Extensive public consultation had been undertaken by the applicant and proposals had been modified in response to the feedback which had been received.
- The Bowl's Club could not be retained as it posed security and privacy concerns for the use of the site as a residential dwelling.
- A significant amount of restoration work was planned by the applicant which would safeguard the fabric of the building for future generations.
- An additional day for the Ickenham Festival had been negotiated and agreed by the applicant.

The Committee asked the representative of the applicant a series of questions which related to the Bowl's Club, the security of the site and the retention of the public path. In response, the Committee were informed that public access around the building had made the potential sale of the building more difficult. It was noted that the Bowl's Club was used throughout the day and its proximity to the house made

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>pedestrian traffic a material consideration to the purchaser. In relation to security concerns, the Committee were informed that as Swakeleys House was private, with private gardens, the intention was to use a mixture of fencing and extensive landscaping including the use of trees and shrubs to enhance the security of the site. It was noted that the public path was an ongoing issue to which no solution had currently been found.</p> <p>In relation to concerns about building on the Green Belt, officers confirmed that a large reduction in hard standing would reduce the impact of the development on the Green Belt but there was a balance to be struck between the removal of various buildings and the construction of a number of smaller buildings in their place.</p> <p>Officers explained that in their view, the proposal to incorporate a number of smaller newly constructed buildings spread across a wide area would have less impact than the current configuration.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the site should be used as a private dwelling only and not for business or commercial purposes such as banqueting functions. Officers confirmed that condition 2 could be strengthened in this regard. It was also noted that steps should be taken to safeguard the amenity of local residents and a condition should be added prohibiting the construction and use of a heli pad within the grounds of the application site.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed by four votes in favour and one against that the application be approved subject to the following amendments:</p> <p>That Conditions 2 and 16 be strengthened to safeguard the amenity of local residents and for the exact wording to be agreed by the Chairman and the Labour Lead outside the meeting.</p> <p>That Condition 8 come back to Committee for consideration and agreement.</p> <p>That a further condition prohibiting the construction and use of a helipad be worded by officers</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>Approved as per agenda and addendum and additional condition preventing the installation of a helipad and amendments to conditions 2 and 16 to be agreed with Chairman and Labour Lead. All details relating to Condition 8 to be reported to Committee Subject to S106</p> | |
| 61. | <p>SWAKELEYS HOUSE, MILTON ROAD, ICKENHAM 23202/APP/2013/13 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Alterations to listed building; demolition of 1980s entrance foyer attached to northern elevation of Swakeleys House, demolition of Vyners House, the connecting link between Vyners House and Swakeleys House and the Ice House building (Application for Listed Building Consent).</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>See Item 6 for the discussions on this item.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>Approved as per the agenda.</p> | |
| 62. | <p>SWAKELEYS HOUSE, MILTON ROAD, ICKENHAM 23202/APP/2013/14 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of 1980s entrance foyer attached to northern elevation of Swakeleys House together with the demolition of Vyners House. The connecting link between Vyners House and Swakeleys House and the Ice House Building located within the grounds of Swakeleys House (Application for Conservation Area Consent).</p> <p>See Item 6 for the discussions on this item.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>Approved as per the agenda.</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |
| 63. | <p>PADCROFT WORKS, TAVISTOCK ROAD, YIEWSLEY 45200/APP/2012/3082 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Comprehensive redevelopment of site to provide three buildings of part 7 storeys and part 5 storeys comprising 208 residential units, 190 sq.m (approx) of Use Class B1 floorspace with associated public and private amenity space, hard and soft landscaping, lower ground floor parking for vehicles and bicycles, and alterations to 9 High Street to form new pedestrian route (involving demolition of all existing buildings other than no.9 High Street)</p> <p>Deferred from Major Applications Planning Committee 07/08/2013</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and the changes set out in the addendum. Concerns were raised about amenity levels and parking provision. In response, Officers confirmed that the scheme complied with the wishes of the inspectorate and in relation to parking, the scheme exceeded the TfL requirements.</p> <p>In the course of discussions, the Committee enquired whether any of the parking provision could be allocated to the B1 retail use of the site and Officers confirmed that this could be incorporated through an additional condition. The following amendments were agreed at the meeting:</p> <p>Condition 15: amended as follows: <i>The details pursuant to this condition shall include a final parking layout with 199 parking spaces.</i></p> <p>Condition 7: Add the words 'safe and secure' after 'details of' and before 'play areas'</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>In the Deferred paragraph amend reason 6 by deleting the number '2' and replacing with the number '1' in reference to parking spaces.</p> <p>Add informative:</p> <p><i>The applicant is advised that the detailed design of the underground car park must be undertaken with the input of fully qualified Structural and Highways Engineers.</i></p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed with five votes in favour, one against and with one abstention that the application be agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as per agenda and addendum, amendment to condition 15 and an additional informative concerning the parking allocation.</p> | |
| 64. | <p>HPH 4, MILLINGTON ROAD, HAYES 40652/APP/2013/1981 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Variation of condition 14 (contamination) of planning permission 40652/APP/2012/2030 granted 5 July 2013 for the Erection of a four storey building to provide 6,966 sq.m of Class B1(a) Office floorspace, provision of 70 associated car parking spaces at basement level, associated landscaping and ancillary works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided a presentation on the item.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |
| 65. | <p>HPH 5, MILLINGTON ROAD, HAYES 40652/APP/2013/1980 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Variation of condition 14 (contamination) of planning permission 45753/APP/2012/2029 (Erection of five storey building to provide 13,880sq.m of Class B1(a) Office floorspace, provision of car parking spaces at surface and basement level, associated landscaping and ancillary works).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided a presentation on the item.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</p> | |
| 66. | <p>SENATOR COURT, BELMONT ROAD, UXBRIDGE 68385/APP/2013/902 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Part demolition, part extension and refurbishment of existing building to provide modern office accommodation (Class B1) totalling 20,267sqm GEA (including car park and plant areas) of which 516sqm GIA floorspace to be used interchangeably for Class A1, A2, A3, B1 uses, and associated works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided a presentation on the item.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p> |
| | <p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.40 pm.</p> | |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454 . Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.