

Minutes**MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

11 February 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) Janet Duncan (Labour Lead) David Allam Wayne Bridges John Morgan Carol Melvin Raymond Graham</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Judy Kelly</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture Adrien Waite, Major Applications Planning Manager Syed Shah, Principal Highway Engineer Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor Nadia Williams, Democratic Services Officer</p>
40.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Michael Markham and Brian Stead. Councillors Carol Melvin and Raymond Graham attended in their place.</p>
41.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Hensley declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8 (Chadwick Building, Brunel University, Cleveland Road, Uxbridge), as he was an Academic Advisor at Brunel University. He left the room and did not take part in the decision of this item.</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 10 (St Helen's School, Eastbury Road, Northwood), by virtue of his child attending the school. He left the room and did not take part in the decision of this item.</p>
42.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 2 AND 10 DECEMBER 2013, 7 AND 22 JANUARY 2014 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 2 & 10 December 2013 and 7 & 22 January 2014 were agreed as correct records.</p>

43.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman agreed that item 16 on the Supplementary Agenda could be taken as an urgent item.</p>
44.	<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>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1, public.</p>
45.	<p>LAND ADJACENT TO 18 HIGHFIELD CRESCENT, NORTHWOOD 69582/APP/2013/3351 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>This application was withdrawn by the applicant.</p>
46.	<p>FORMER ARLA FOOD DEPOT, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 66819/APP/2013/1467 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a food store with ancillary cafe (total floor area of 8,539sqm) (Class A1) and ancillary petrol filling station, cinema (floor area of 5,937sqm) (Class D2), 5 x restaurant units (total floor area of 2,405sqm) (Class A3), 4 x shop units (total floor area of 382sqm) (Class A1 and/or A2), and residential development consisting of 104 units (21 x 1-bed flats, 67 x 2-bed flats, 12 x 3-bed houses, 4 x 4-bed houses), together with new vehicle and pedestrian accesses, car parking, servicing areas, landscaping arrangements, and other associated works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and directed Members to note the changes in the addendum circulated at the meeting. Officers also asked for recommendation refusal 3 to be amended by deleting reference to Victoria Road and Long Drive junction, to take account of any further validation works undertaken, which might affect further issues that may be raised.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, representatives of the petitioners and agent were invited to address the meeting. The representative of the petitioners objecting to the application was unable to attend the meeting and asked for their submission to be read out. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns relating to the proposed development had already been made known to the Planning Department • The scheme would result in unacceptable levels of additional traffic, as well as air pollution in South Ruislip, which already suffered from heavy traffic congestion and air pollution • Fully endorsed and welcomed Officer's recommendation for refusal • Accepted that the site would have to be re-developed and suggested that for national interest and for residents living in South Ruislip, it would be more appropriate to build affordable housing and a 24/7 walk-in medical centre similar to that in Pinner on the site. <p>The Following points were raised in support of the application:</p>

- Spoke as Vice-Chairman of South Ruislip Residents' Association with approximately 2,000 household membership
- Notice/publicity regarding the development of the site had been on-going for over 3 years where initial proposals had included a bowling alley, public house and a hotel, which were removed on request
- Developers were also invited to present their proposal for the development of the site at the Association's quarterly meetings where presentations were well received by those that had been present
- Updates on the scheme had subsequently been placed on the associations agenda over the 3 year period
- The South Ruislip Residents' Association members had agreed that the proposed development would be a great asset to the area
- People of different opinions had had the opportunity to make their views known
- Acknowledged that it would be naïve to assume that the proposed development would not impact on existing traffic problems
- The proposed development would give local residents the opportunity to recreational enjoyment.

In response to a point raised about there being a suggestion that the scheme should consist of housing and a medical centre, the petitioner responded that this suggestion was put to the vote and dismissed by a majority at Association meetings. Residents believed that Sainsbury's needed some competition but were mainly concerned about the issue of traffic, which they indicated would inevitably be affected, even if the proposal had been for a housing scheme with over 1,000 houses.

A Member commented that some residents would like a cinema and a choice of leisure facilities. The petitioner stated that residents wanted shopping facilities and the proposed development had been shaped by developers from this requirement. Residents were looking for amenities on their doorstep which had been lacking in South Ruislip for the past 30 years.

The applicant raised the following points:

- Outstanding issues could be addressed by condition
- The proposal would provide 650 new jobs as well as homes for families
- With regard to the statement in the report that a comprehensive survey of the findings of the retail impact assessment on retail centres in Hillingdon and Harrow had not been completed, advised that this had been undertaken by the applicant
- It had been demonstrated that South Ruislip Town Centre would not be affected
- Sainsbury's had been granted planning permission since 2006 and had not commenced work but then submitted an even larger application for scheme and only just started discussions for a temporary store
- This proposal would cause no harm to Uxbridge Centre
- Had approached local businesses and 24 had signed the petition supporting this application, as they felt that it would support South Ruislip
- Did not accept points of issue relating to adverse effect, as these could be overcome
- This was a family orientated scheme and did not accept the issues raised regarding Block D
- The restaurant units would be separated from residential units by 18metres and security ramp would be at ground level, not significantly raised, and separated by a retained boundary fence. Planting would be provided to add additional

screening

- If necessary, hours of delivery could be conditioned and suggested that the trees and landscaping comments were pre-dated
- There were no trees at the moment, due to surface water and attenuation but these could be provided.

Comments had been received from a Ward Councillor in support of the proposal.

A second Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- Supported the points raised by the Vice-Chairman of the South Ruislip Residents Association
- The scheme was extremely popular with South Ruislip residents
- South Ruislip was a very run down area at present and would benefit from such a development
- Subject to a number of conditions, would support this proposal.

Officers clarified that no objection had been raised against the proposed mix of cinema, housing, restaurants and retail; rather, the main concern was with the scale of the commercial development, which was centred on refusal reasons 1 and 2. Reduction of the scale would allow officers to move forward and be proactive towards moving the recommendation for approval.

Officers confirmed that the measured distance between existing restaurants and the proposed buildings was greater than that stated at 14.5 metres in the report.

In response to concerns raised about the location of parking spaces, including disable parking; officers advised that parking would be scattered around the residential units served and the requirement for disabled parking would be covered by a condition.

A Member added that they would support the development had it been smaller and included more housing and amenity spaces instead of the currently proposed huge cinema and supermarket. Supermarket of this size would impact on other supermarkets around the Borough and suggested the scheme should be more local rather than major as currently proposed.

A Member stated that a local centred development would be welcomed in the area, however, the proposed commercial development definitely needed to be reduced, as it this would inevitably impact on other supermarkets.

The Committee indicated that whilst the development of the site was welcomed, the commercial aspect of the current proposal was unacceptable within this area and a scheme in line with that required by local residents would be more beneficial.

In response to a query raised about the size of tracking for delivery vehicles to the area, officers advised that in terms of vehicle size, these were acceptable.

The Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture advised that once the Committee had made its decision, this would be referred to the Mayor of London. Should any of the refusal reasons give rise for further information/details, requested the Committee to give delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to take a view if further documents were submitted.

Members requested that the wording of Refusal reason 2 be strengthened in relation to

the impact on the position of South Ruislip in the Hierarchy of Town Centres and that the amended reason be agreed by the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

Members asked that the wording '(in particular the Victoria Road/Long Drive junction)' be removed from Refusal reason 3.

The recommendation for refusal, additional informative, amended wording and changes in the refusal reasons was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, was agreed.

Resolved:

1. That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report, subject to the above changes and that delegated powers be granted to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to remove Refusal reasons 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 should he feel these were overcome by amended plans or additional information prior to the issue of a decision notice.

2. That should the Mayor not direct the Council under Article 6 to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the officer's report (or as amended under 1 above) and subject to the addendum and the following amended wording for refusal reason 2 and additional informative:

Revised refusal reason 2

The scale of the development would result in the existing local centre increasing in scale to that of a centre with more retail floorspace than other Major Town Centres within the borough, which would result in a local centre out of scale with its position in the borough's retail hierarchy. This would result in impacts on other centres within, and outside the borough (Harrow) in terms of trade draw. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies E4 and E5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1, Policies 2.15, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 of the London Plan (July 2011), Policy PR23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 and the provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework..

Additional Informative

'You are advised that the Local Planning Authority expects all development proposals to accord with guidance contained within the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement - Residential Layouts. Should you be minded to lodge a new or amended application you should ensure that the development fully accords with this guidance including with respect to separation distances.'

47. **CHADWICK BUILDING, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, CLEVELAND ROAD, UXBRIDGE 532/APP/2013/3688 (Agenda Item 8)**

Retention of two storey pre-fabricated building for a period of three years.

Councillor Hensley withdrew from the room for this item.

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

Resolved

That subject to:

- No additional material planning considerations above those addressed within this report being raised before the end of the consultation period;

- Referral to the Greater London Authority and the Mayor not directing the Council under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 to refuse the application, or under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission; and

- Referral to the National Planning Casework Unit for the Secretary of State as a departure from the provisions of the Development Plan and the National Planning Casework Unit not directing the local planning authority to refuse the application.

That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to approved the application subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

48. **NORTHERN RUNWAY, HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW
41573/APP/2013/1288 (Agenda Item 9)**

Enabling works to allow implementation of full runway alternation during easterly operations at Heathrow Airport including the creation of a new 'hold area' at the western end of the northern runway, the construction of new access and exit taxiways, and the construction of a 5 metre high acoustic noise barrier to the south of Longford Village.

In introducing the report, officers directed Members to note the changes in the addendum circulated at the meeting. It was explained that with respect to the issue of noise, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) fundamentally disagreed with the methodology used to assess noise impact. No adequate measures had been proposed to mitigate the adverse effect of the development with regard to noise or air quality and there were concerns that inadequate justification had been given for the harm to the green belt area.

Offices advised that very minor physical work was proposed but major changes were proposed in the aircraft taking off and landing at the airport. Some areas would be impacted upon more than other areas and officers having examined the very lengthy Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) did not consider that the mitigation proposed would be adequate for those areas that would be affected by noise.

Member expressed concerns about the noise level and the detrimental effects it would have on residents, as well as on the concentration of children in Cranford school. The Committee therefore indicated that further work was needed to address this issue.

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

	<p>Resolved - That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report and subject to the changes in the addendum.</p>
<p>49.</p>	<p>ST HELEN'S SCHOOL, EASTBURY ROAD, NORTHWOOD 7402/APP/2013/3414 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>The installation of a 3-court dome structure over existing tennis courts, external lighting, permanent storage shed and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Councillor Morgan withdrew from the room for this item.</p> <p>The Committee asked officers to review Condition 5 to ensure it was consistent with similar applications in the Borough. Revised wording and additional informative to be agreed by the Chairman and the Labour Lead.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval and amendment to Condition 5 and additional informative 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, changes outlined in the addendum and amendment to Condition 5 and additional informative to read as follows:</p> <p>Amended Condition 5</p> <p>The external lighting hereby approved shall not be illuminated except between:-</p> <p>[0800 to 2200] Mondays - Fridays [0800 to 2100] Saturdays [1000 to 1800] Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Reason To safeguard the residential amenity of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties in accordance with Policy OE1 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p><i>'You are encouraged to install measures to ensure that the lighting is automatically turned off when not in use'.</i></p>
<p>50.</p>	<p>SOLID WASTE TRANSFER STATION, CIVIC WAY, RUISLIP 18124/APP/2013/1723 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Proposed works to Victoria Road Waste Transfer Station to include a bulky materials reception area as an extension to the existing waste transfer station building, associated vehicle management measures including amendments to the existing internal site roundabout, a new HGV queuing area, new staff parking area and new containerised waste storage bay.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and directed members to note the changes in the addendum circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p>

Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and the changes outlined in the addendum.

51. **FORMER ANGLERS RETREAT PUBLIC HOUSE, CRICKETFIELD ROAD, WEST DRAYTON 11981/APP/2013/3307 (Agenda Item 12)**

Demolition of existing single and two storey extensions and outbuildings associated with the public house. Retention and conversion of the original public house building to form 2 no. residential units plus the erection of an additional 14 no. residential units on the site, provision of a wild flower meadow, car parking, landscaping, amenity space and other associated works.

Officers introduced the report and directed members to note the changes in the addendum circulated at the meeting. Members were advised that the main issue was related to the principle of the development on green belt. No part of the areas in the opposite site had been shown to be in the flood risk area and the existing public house would be retained in an acceptable manner. The new blocks would be set quite far back and very special circumstances existed in this particular case.

It was highlighted that there had been historical issues relating to dumping in the area and the proposed development would resolve this and furthermore, issues relating to the unkempt condition of the land at the rear would also be addressed.

The Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture added that existing buildings on proposed site were over 4 years old and therefore could not be subjected to any action.

A Member stated that they were sadly opposed to this proposal for the mere fact that it would be offering much needed affordable housing but felt very strongly that they could not approve this application, as it would set a precedent. The Member also felt strongly that green belt policy should be strictly adhered to and highlighted that in particular, that development in the green belt area had already been given as an exception for education and residential developing would altogether be an unacceptable step.

A Member added that they considered the proposal to be a good development in an area that was fast becoming an eye saw and a tip. This application would develop Anglers Retreat Public House to make it habitable and adapt the field into a meadow at the same time.

A Member suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, a condition should be added to prevent the removal of landscaping.

Condition 10 was amended.

In answer to a query regarding floorspace, Officers advised that the current floor space was 830sq metres and the floorspace for the proposal would be 1260sq metres.

The Chairman added that the propose floorspace would be nearly 50% more and suggested that from single-storey to two-storey, this would inevitably have an impact on the openness of the area.

Officers added that Members would need to make a judgement as to whether the scheme would adversely affect the openness of the area. It was suggested that a site visit might be appropriate in assisting Members to make a decision. Officers would also provide further information relating to the design and access so that Members could

consideration whether the proposed scheme affected the openness or not.

The Legal Advisor advised that if Members had concerns over the issue of openness, it would be in order for the Committee to defer the application in order to make a site visit.

It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit and for further details to be provided.

Resolved- That the application be deferred for a site visit and for further details to be provided as follows:

- **Feedback what effect the removal of bunding would have**
- **Clarify how amenity spaces would be protected**
- **Provide further clarification on flooding issues.**

52. **FORMER RAF WEST RUISLIP, HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM 38402/APP/2013/2685**
(Agenda Item 13)

Erection of 55 tailored care living units (extra care accommodation) with communal facilities (variation of 38402/APP/2008/2733) and the erection of 25 retirement living (category II type) sheltered apartments with communal facilities including basement car parking.

In introducing the report, officers directed Members to note the changes in the addendum circulated at the meeting.

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

Resolved

That subject to no adverse issues being raised by English Heritage (Archaeology) that could not be dealt with by appropriate condition, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission, subject to the following:

1. That the Council enter into a legal agreement with the applicants under Section 106/Unilateral Undertaking of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure:

- (i) An affordable housing review mechanism,**
- (ii) Health contribution: a financial contribution to the sum of £17,333.60**
- (iii) Construction training.**

2. That if any of the heads of terms set out above have not been agreed and the S106 legal agreement has not been finalised before the 31st March 2014, or any other period deemed appropriate that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse the application for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to provide a commensurate package of planning benefits to maximise the health and social benefits (in particular affordable housing) of the scheme to the community. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies

	<p>(November 2012).'</p> <p>3. That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the S106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.</p> <p>4. That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.</p> <p>5. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</p> <p>6. That on completion of the S106 Agreement, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture under delegated powers.</p> <p>7. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives in the officer's report and changes outlined in the addendum be attached.</p>
53.	<p>WHITE HEATH FARM, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD 21558/APP/2013/3806 <i>(Agenda Item 16)</i></p> <p>Refurbishment of building including repair and redecorating the main entrance double doors, replace all existing windows with double glazed timber alternatives with single glazed profile, replace the natural slate roof, repair works to internal spaces and works to fire protect doors (Listed Building Consent).</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>That subject to the application being referred to the National Planning Casework Unit (NPCU), the application not being called in and the Local Planning Authority not being directed to refuse the application, that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives outline in the addendum.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.00 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.