

Minutes

MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 October 2015

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT:</p> <p>Councillors: Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling, Jazz Dhillon Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), Raymond Graham, Carol Melvin, John Morgan, Brian Stead and David Yarrow.</p> <p>OFFICERS PRESENT:</p> <p>James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Tim Brown (Legal advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
53.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr. Eddie Lavery, with Cllr. Raymond Graham substituting.</p>
54.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest made.</p>
55.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2015 were agreed as an accurate record.</p>
56.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman advised that he had agreed a request to consider an additional item that had not been on the originally published agenda. This related to a consultation response to the proposed construction of the M4 Smart Motorway, junctions 3-12.</p> <p>The reason for urgency of the item was as follows:</p> <p>The report related to a Development Consent Order consultation with the LB Hillingdon, with the deadline for submission of comments being 8th October 2015. In the interests of effective planning, a Council ratified report was urgently required in order to inform the development procedure set out by the Planning Inspectorate.</p>

57.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED INPUBLIC 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 on the agenda were Part I and would be heard in public.</p>
58.	<p>HEATHROW ENERGY CENTRE, CENTRAL TERMINAL AREA, HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW 62360/APP/2015/2664 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Proposed temporary enabling boilers with associated pipe work and permanent header building (Consultation Under Part 8, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, which was for the development of two temporary boilers, associated piping and a permanent heater building. The scheme was within the central terminal area at Heathrow Airport and would replace an existing building.</p> <p>The scheme was not within a constrained area and did not present any amenity issues to neighbours or highways issues. Accordingly, officers recommended that no objection be made to the proposals.</p> <p>The recommendation for no objection to be made to the application was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That: no objection be made to the proposals, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
59.	<p>SITE OF BUILDING 717 SHEFFIELD WAY, HEATHROW AIRPORT 50657/APP/2015/1974 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Reserved matters (Landscaping) application in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission reference 50657/APP/2013/2214 (Demolition of existing warehouse buildings and erection of 602 bedroom 8-storey hotel with associated car parking (Outline application including details of access, appearance, layout and scale - landscaping reserved)).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated, drawing attention to changes made in relation to the vehicle tracking drawings.</p> <p>It was noted that the application currently under consideration was a reserved matter that only related to landscaping at the site. Permission had previously been granted for construction of a hotel at the site.</p> <p>The site was not within a constrained area. The application included generous provision of trees and it was noted that space at the site was sufficient to allow access to buses / coaches and refuse vehicles. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>Following discussion, it was agreed that Council Landscaping officers would be asked to further investigate tree planting at the site and its role in helping to mitigate pollution in the area.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p>

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

60. **TEMPORARY CAR PARK SITE, SEALAND ROAD, HEATHROW AIRPORT 65688/APP/2015/142 (Agenda Item 8)**

Installation of a multi-deck car park to provide 9 levels of parking to provide 21 staff car parking spaces for the neighbouring Gate Gourmet Building and the remainder of spaces to be a commercial car park (Outline Application seeking approval of access, appearance, layout and scale).

Officers introduced the report. The application was seeking outline planning permission for the erection of a ground level car park, in addition to an eight level multi-storey car park with a total of 2,077 spaces. It was noted that 215 spaces on the ground level of the car park would be for use by Gate Gourmet employees. The proposals would provide adequate spaces for use by disabled persons. The upper floors of the car park would be operated as 'meet and greet' valet parking. It was noted that the site was not within a special area.

Officers considered that if the application were approved by the Committee, the parking spaces would fall within the total cap of 42,000 spaces for Heathrow car parks that had been imposed when Terminal 5 was granted permission. However, the situation in relation to cap was complex and it was considered that the cap applied to Heathrow Airport as a whole and not just to the airport operator.

The application was considered to be acceptable in relation to highways and it would provide adequate parking to prevent the build up of traffic in the vicinity. It proposals were considered to be of acceptable appearance. Officers, therefore, recommended approval by the Committee.

Members were referred to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. This proposed that a condition be included, in the event of the application being approved by Committee, to specify that the scheme would not commence until a scheme for an air quality and parking strategy had been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. A verbal addition was requested to specify that pickup for the 'meet and greet' parking was to take place off site and not in neighbouring roads.

Officers advised that an e-mail had been received at 3:30 pm on the day of the Committee meeting, which was after publication of the addendum. The e-mail objected to the application and requested sight of the legal advice that had been provided to the Council in relation to the parking cap. It was agreed that discussion was needed in relation to the legal advice provided to the Council. As the information was considered to be of legal professional privilege and related to possible legal proceedings, it was agreed that the meeting would move into Part II - Members only.

It was RESOLVED: That:

The meeting moved to Part II and the members of the public present were asked to leave the room.

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority

proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

It was RESOLVED: That:

The meeting moved back to Part I. Accordingly, members of the public were invited back into the room.

The Chairman advised the members of the public present that it had been necessary for the meeting to move into Part II - Members only to enable confidential legal advice to be discussed.

There was further discussion regarding whether hotels due to be built in the area would be included in the cap. A question was also raised in relation to the number of spaces currently used within the cap, as the figures provided by Heathrow Airport dated from July 2014. Members wanted confirmation that the July 2014 cap figure was still current and that no subsequent parking has been granted since that time.

RESOLVED - That: the meeting be adjourned to enable officers to seek clarification in relation to the parking cap.

RESOLVED - That: the meeting be reconvened.

Following a discussion between officers, the Chairman advised that, as there could not be certainty with regards to which parking provision would be included in the Heathrow cap, it was requested that the application be deferred to allow further investigation.

The request to defer determination of the application was moved, seconded and on being to the vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred and determined at a future meeting of the Committee, to enable officers to provide additional information as requested by the Committee.

61. **UNIT 3 (MEDIA HOUSE), SPRINGFIELD ROAD, HAYES 44110/APP/2015/2570**
(Agenda Item 9)

Change of Use from Use Classes B1/B8 to Use Classes B1/B2/B8.

Officers introduced the application which sought a change of use for the premises at Unit 3 (Media House), Springfield Road, Hayes. The application under consideration was similar to a previous scheme that had been submitted for the site.

The uses sought were all commercial and the application was considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report, which included the provision of cycle parking. Officers recommended that the application be approved by the Committee.

A Member was concerned that it might be possible for future use of the site to change from commercial to residential without further permission being required. Officers advised that it would not be permissible for use class B2 to be converted to residential

	<p>premises without planning permission first being sought. It was also noted that the application currently under consideration was from a business that was looking to create employment at the premises. Therefore, use for another purpose was considered to be unlikely.</p> <p>In response to a Member question that asked what the parking provision would be at the site, officers advised that this was set on page 71 of the agenda papers and that the proposals met the Council's car parking standards.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
62.	<p>5 STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON 65480/APP/2015/1862 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing public house and erection of 38 flats and 237 square metres of retainable floor space with parking, landscaping and amenity space.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and the addendum sheet circulated, noting that the current application was subsequent to a previous application for a similar development at the site. This was due to changed ownership of land. The scheme only differed from that previously approved in that the children's play area had been relocated and the car parking layout amended.</p> <p>In response to Member questions, officers advised that although the density of the site had been increased by the proposed changes to the layout, this did not constitute planning grounds for refusal as the development complied with planning standards and policies. In response to Member concerns about privacy and the distance separation between some of the windows of the development, officers advised that the angle between the affected windows was not a direct one and that, therefore, a planning condition was not considered to be justified.</p> <p>Officers recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to an S106 Agreement and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.</p>
63.	<p>M4 MOTORWAY (SMART MOTORWAY) HAYES - 71068/APP/2015/2700 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Development Consent Order application under the Planning Act 2008 to the Planning Inspectorate by Highways England for the construction of a smart motorway on the M4, junctions 3-12 (application accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment).</p> <p>Officers introduced the proposed consultation response, noting that Highways England</p>

had made an application to the Planning Inspectorate for development consent under the provisions of the 2008 Planning Act. The Council was not the determining authority and only had the status as a statutory consultee.

The proposals to create a Smart Motorway were considered by officers to give rise to a number of serious property, highways and environmental related concerns. Concerns were raised with regard to information about noise mitigation included by Highways England in their application. This included use of historical data and references to noise barriers, rather than noise fences. Officers advised that these issues were addressed within the consultation response.

The Chairman commended officers for the depth and detail provided by the report, with officers advising that a consultant who had worked on the Cranford Enquiry had assisted with production of the report.

The recommendation to agree the submission of the officer's report that objected to the construction of the smart motorway on the M4, junctions 3-12 was moved, seconded and on being to the vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED - That authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to issue the officer's report to the Planning Inspectorate as the Council's formal response to the consultation.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.15 pm.

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