

## Minutes

### MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 March 2015

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b> Councillors: Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), Duncan Flynn (Reserve) (In place of Brian Stead), Raymond Graham (Reserve) (In place of Eddie Lavery), Carol Melvin, John Morgan, John Morse (Reserve) (In place of Peter Curling), David Yarrow</p>
	<p><b>OFFICERS PRESENT:</b> Matthew Duigan, Planning Service Manager, Adrien Waite Major Applications Manager, Johanna Hart, Planning Officer, Syed Shah, Highways Officer, Nicole Cameron, Legal Services, Ainsley Gilbert, Democratic Services Officer, Charles Francis, Democratic Services Officer</p>
138.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Eddie Lavery, Peter Curling, and Brian Stead. Councillors Duncan Flynn, Ray Graham, and John Morse were substituting.</p>
139.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
140.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 21 JANUARY 2015 AND 10 FEBRUARY 2015</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 21 January 2015 and 10 February 2015 were agreed to be accurate.</p>
141.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Members were reminded that a supplementary item had been added to the agenda, which had been published as 'Agenda B'.</p>
142.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all matters would be considered in Part 1.</p>

143. **88-94 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM 52129/APP/2014/2996** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the construction of an 85 bed care home on the site of five existing houses. The building would vary in height between 1.5 and 2.5 floors, with the roofspace being used to accommodate some residents. A new access road and 40 parking spaces would also be built. Most of the existing landscaping facing Long Lane would be retained.

Officers outlined a number of issues relating to the application, informing members that:

- As the development was partly on garden land, the impact of the loss of such land had to be considered; however, this did not prevent developments from taking place where the benefits of the scheme outweighed this impact.
- The application site was within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, and as such the impact of the proposal on the conservation area had to be taken into account. Officers further explained that the Ickenham Village Conservation Area had been designated principally to protect three core assets: Ickenham Village Centre, Ickenham Manor, and Swakeley's House. The site was towards the edge of the conservation area and not close to any of the core assets.
- The site was 0.86 hectares and as such a full flood risk assessment was not required.
- There was a requirement for archaeological surveys to be undertaken by English Heritage; the recommendation was therefore for delegation of the decision to the Head of Planning, pending the result of these surveys.

Officers had identified four key areas which needed to be considered, and made comment upon them:

- the principle of the development, which was considered to be acceptable;
- the impact of the development on the conservation area, which officers felt needed further discussion. The recommendation was for approval as officers felt that the site's location on the edge of the conservation area and the limited impact of the proposal on the core areas made it acceptable;
- the impact of the development on neighbouring properties, which officers felt had been limited by intelligent design. It was noted that there would be at least 25 metres between the care home and the nearest neighbouring property, which was 10 meters in excess of the Council's policy requirement. There would also be a large amount of soft landscaping to screen the building from neighbours. The roof pitches had been amended during the application process to make them more sympathetic to the local area;
- the traffic impact of the proposal, which was considered to be negligible.

Attention was drawn to the addendum, which included additional conditions regarding deliveries, car parking management, and premature demolition.

Petitioners and their representatives made the following points:

- In their opinion, relevant planning policies were being ignored;
- The second consultation period ended only after officers had

recommended the application for approval;

- There was a surplus of care home places in the borough;
- Surface water flooding had long affected the area, and this proposal would make conditions worse;
- The proposal would harm the conservation area;
- Neighbouring properties would be blighted by the proposed building, including overlooking and reduced quality of outlook;
- Traffic surveys were felt to be inadequate;
- The potential for greater noise generation at the site owing to the care needs of patients;
- The proposed parking provision and arrangements were inadequate;
- The high number of trees to be felled;
- The supply of care home places in Hillingdon was greater than demand from the borough.
- The proposals constituted overdevelopment of the site.

The applicant explained that:

- Signature Senior Lifestyles provided accommodation and care for people with a wide range of needs.
- Facilities at homes were very good, and all rooms had en-suite bathrooms. The proposal also included two communal dining rooms, a cinema, and a spa bathroom.
- A survey by Caterwood Ltd. had shown that there was significant demand for additional care homes in the area, including dementia care, which the proposed home would provide.
- Signature Senior Lifestyles had worked hard to make the proposals sympathetic to the area, and had: reduced the height of the building, by as much as 1.5 metres in some places; increased the distance between it and neighbouring properties; removed windows from some walls.
- All high quality trees would be retained, and more trees would be planted than were currently on the site.
- Surface water would be carefully managed, using floodwater retention pods.
- The amount of parking would be sufficient for residents, visitors, and staff.
- The cost of living at a Signature Care Home started from £750 per month.

A letter from the Ickenham Residents Association was circulated by planning officers. The meeting adjourned from 8.02 until 8.17 to allow members to read and consider this.

When the meeting resumed, officers explained that most of the points made in the letter had been covered in the addendum report:

- Reference was made to the need for Hillingdon to contribute to the number of care home places required by London Plan.
- Separate legislation existed regarding the disposal of hazardous waste.
- Six months had elapsed between the application being validated in September and it being considered by the Major Applications Planning Committee, which was far longer than the standard thirteen weeks; it was not accepted therefore that the application was being rushed.

Councillors debated the principle of the application, and expressed concern about the amount of garden land which would be lost, and the high proportion of the site which would be built upon.

Councillors then considered the impact of the development on the conservation area. Points were raised about: the size of the building; the prominence of the proposed chimneys; the large difference between the density of the proposed building and the existing character of the area.

With regard to the impact on neighbours, members felt that the proposals would be detrimental to the outlook of some properties, and noted that the intensification of the use would also have an impact.

Members discussed the traffic implications of the proposal. They felt that the car park might need to be larger if significant numbers of partners chose to live with residents in the home, as they were more likely to drive. They were also concerned by the impracticality of the use of tandem parking spaces in a care facility. Doubts about the accuracy of the developer's traffic modelling were expressed.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused for the reasons and with the informatives set out below.**

**The proposal by reason of its size, bulk, scale, height, site coverage and loss of gardens, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous and overdominant, therefore failing to harmonise with the established character of the surrounding area and causing harm to the appearance of the street scene. The principle of intensifying the use of the site to the level proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the area and the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and the residential area as a whole. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One, and Policies BE4, BE13, BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policies 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan, guidance and the NPPF (March 2012).**

**Draft Informatives: I52, I53 and I59**

**Informative Archaeology: You are advised that had the Local Planning Authority not refused the application for the above reason it would have required that further archaeological works be undertaken in accordance with advice received from the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service prior to determining an application, and had the development been considered acceptable in other regards the Local Planning Authority would have imposed conditions to prevent development occurring until appropriate archaeological investigations had been undertaken.**

**Informative Planning Obligations You are advised that had the Local Planning Authority not refused permission for the above reason, and**

	<p>had the development been considered acceptable in other regards it would have required that the applicant enter into a legal agreement to secure planning obligations relating to highways works, a travel plan, construction training, employment training, air quality monitoring, and project monitoring &amp; management as set out within the Officers Report and Addendum to the Major Applications Planning Committee on the 5th March 2015.</p> <p><b>NPPF Informative:</b> The Local Planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of paragraph 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and has worked pro-actively with the applicant through extensive negotiations to address material planning issues wherever possible. Notwithstanding these discussions, the scheme was ultimately considered to fail to comply with the development plan for the reason identified above.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned from 9.23pm until 9.28pm.</p>
144.	<p><b>HAYES AND HARLINGTON, STATION ROAD, HAYES 10057/APP/2014/4338</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was to be considered under Schedule 7 of the Crossrail Act 2008. The application was for the approval of plans and specifications for the erection of a new station building, waiting room, external lift shaft and walkway, as well extended platforms and canopies. The existing, locally listed station building, would be demolished as part of the works. It was noted that changes to the highway were not covered by the application. Reference was made to the addendum report which gave details of additional comments received.</p> <p>Councillors felt that the station would be a great improvement, as it would be very accessible for disabled people. Members noted that the better train service to be offered by Crossrail would mean that more parking was required at the station, including more disabled parking. Members also felt that it was important to maintain the new access lifts.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per officers recommendations, subject to an additional informative relating to ensuring the lift is kept open and available for use.</b></p>
145.	<p><b>PRONTO INDUSTRIAL ESTATE AND 585 - 591 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES 4404/APP/2014/2506</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers explained that the application was for a change of use from use class B1 (c) - Light Industrial to class C3 - Dwelling House. The proposals would lead to the loss of unused light industrial space and the provision of 12 residential units. There was a surplus of light industrial space in the locality. A payment of £120,000 had been agreed in lieu of providing affordable housing.</p>

Councillors noted the relatively close proximity of units to each other, and were pleased that large windows were planned to allow natural light to enter the properties.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved as per officers' recommendation, subject to an appropriate Section 106 agreement being completed.**

146. **1 NOBEL DRIVE, HARLINGTON 46214/APP/2014/2827** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers explained that the application was for the conversion and extension of an existing office building to form a 200 bedroom hotel. An 83 space car park along with coach parking and pick up/drop off bays would also be provided. The extension would match the style of the existing building. The traffic assessment suggested a net reduction in traffic volumes from the existing use as an office block. Officers referred to the addendum report which dealt with on street parking issues.

Councillors raised concerns about the proximity of adjacent residential properties, and the noise which might be created by the hotel.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved as per officers recommendation, subject to the additional and amended conditions set out below, and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, and referral to the Greater London Authority.**

**ADDITIONAL CONDITION:**

**'No occupation of the development hereby approved shall take place until a noise management and mitigation scheme to address the impacts of noise from the open spaces (terraces and balconies) on the nearest residential occupiers has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation and maintained for the life of the development hereby approved.**

**REASON**

**To ensure the development does not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the nearest residential occupiers.'**

**AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 19:**

**19.2c - add (including details of the heights and design of balustrading around roof terraces)**

**19.3d - add reference to 4 motorcycle spaces.**

**REASON**

**Add policy BE24 into the reason**

147.	<p><b>WEST DRAYTON GARDEN VILLAGE, PORTERS WAY, WEST DRAYTON 5107/APP/2014/4304</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, which concerned the reserved matters of appearance and landscaping at the development. The proposals complied with all relevant policies.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per officers recommendation.</b></p>
148.	<p><b>CHEQUERS SQUARE, UXBRIDGE 35214/APP/2014/2232</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report. It had been agreed as an urgent item by the Chairman, in order to allow the Section 106 agreement to be agreed. The report recommended that the heads of terms of the S.106 agreement be amended to remove the need for a new lift and a new canopy to be provided.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>That the changes to the heads of terms be agreed as per the recommendation.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.05 pm, closed at 10.10 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ainsley Gilbert on 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.