

## Minutes



**MAJOR Applications Planning Committee**

**4 October 2016**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Henry Higgins, Brian Stead, David Yarrow, Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, John Oswell and Raymond Graham</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Richard Conroy (Senior Planning Officer), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Neil McClellan (Major Applications Team Leader), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer) and Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
57.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Morgan, with Councillor Raymond Graham substituting.</p>
58.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
59.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no minutes from previous meetings.</p>
60.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
61.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items on the agenda would be heard in public.</p>
62.	<p><b>36-40 RICKMANSWORTH ROAD</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of three detached dwellings and redevelopment to provide 24 residential flats (13 x one bedroom units, 8 x two bedroom units and 3 x three bedroom units), amenity space and associated car parking.</b></p>

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, citing the over-dominant appearance of the application, its visually intrusive nature, and access concerns as reasons for refusal. The petitioner argued that there would be an impact on both privacy and lighting for neighbouring residents, while proposed access to the site was on a hazardous bend that could create traffic issues.

The agent for the application then addressed the Committee, informing them that speed surveys were carried out on the road to ensure traffic concerns did not become an issue and the applicant had agreed to a road safety audit. The proposed landscaping by the road would be low in height to ensure better visibility for drivers, enhancing vehicle safety, and the proposal provided a high quality landscape and amenity setting with acceptable design and impact on the surrounding area.

Responding to questioning from the Chairman, the representative for the application confirmed that previous applications had been refused on the site, but those applications had less visibility for the access to the site.

Members expressed concern that the application had not done enough to allay fears on highways, with vehicles sometimes being required to cross two or three lanes of traffic when entering or exiting the proposed site, while cars often travelled around the bend at speeds which could make the access road dangerous to use.

The Principal Highways Engineer stated that hatching was painted on the road to move cars away from the kerb and improve visibility on the bend, and speed surveys that were undertaken by the applicant reported that around 85% of traffic passed through the area at 39mph. The proposal also achieved 70m of visibility for the access road, which was a large improvement on previous refused schemes and met the traffic requirements. Members were also informed that a proposed Road Safety Audit would be undertaken by an independent safety auditor and any road safety issues would prevent the scheme from going ahead via a section 106 obligation.

The Committee confirmed that it was still uneasy with the traffic plan and would like to see a more detailed design to ensure road safety was no longer an issue. It was proposed the application be deferred until the applicant can provide a more detailed traffic plan and a road safety audit takes place. This proposal was seconded, and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- That the application was deferred.

63. **IAG CARGO CAMPUS** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of a new 11,520sq.m (GIA) cargo handling facility (B8 use), ancillary buildings totalling 330sq.m and associated works including changes to site access and reconfiguration of landside and airside parking.**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Members confirmed they were happy with the plans and moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

- That the application was approved.

64.	<p><b>IMPERIAL HOUSE &amp; UNITS 1&amp; 2, VICTORIA ROAD, SOUTH RUISLIP</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Construction of a 2,554sq.m GIA (1,687sq.m sales area) Class A1 discount food store with associated access arrangements car parking and landscaping (involving the demolition of Imperial House, former Comet building and vacant Value Windows Ltd building) and external refurbishment / re-cladding of Bensons for Beds unit.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and noted the substantial addendum for the item.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke, having submitted a petition in objection to the application, and confirmed that he planned to withdraw the petition following discussions with representatives of the applicant. The Committee heard that the petitioner's main concerns were surrounding access and large vehicles operating near Stonefield Way, but he believed these fears were now allayed.</p> <p>The representative for the agent confirmed that the applicant would look at the revised amendment, and believed that there was now an agreement with the objectors.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that, while there was no longer an objection, the scheme before the Committee had now changed and the Members could not make a decision on an application without the revised plans available to them. As such, it was proposed to defer the item to see the revised plans, and also allow the applicant to comment on how they intend to deal with the Greater London Authority's concerns on the application. This proposal was seconded and put to a vote, where it was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was deferred.</li> </ul>
65.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Submission of details for condition 3 (Bridge Construction) and 4 (Details of Materials) for planning permission ref 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29 September 2010; hybrid planning application for Southall Gasworks Redevelopment.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and the Committee proposed the officer's recommendation; it was seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was approved.</li> </ul>
66.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Details pursuant to condition 7 (Construction Management Plan) of planning permission 54814/APP/2009/430; outline application.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and the officer's recommendation was proposed, seconded, and upon being put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was approved.</li> </ul>

67.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Submission of Details for condition 12 (Detailed Design of Western Link to Pump Lane) and 15 (Details of construction and surfacing of Pump Lane) for planning permission ref 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29 September 2010; hybrid planning application for Southall Gasworks redevelopment.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and the officer's recommendation was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was approved.</li> </ul>
68.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Discharge of Condition 19 (remediation) of planning permission ref 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29 September 2010.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and the officer's recommendation was proposed, moved and, when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was approved.</li> </ul>
69.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Submission of details for condition 24 (Invasive Species) for planning permission ref 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29 September 2010; hybrid planning application for Southall Gasworks Redevelopment.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and Members proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was approved.</li> </ul>
70.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>Discharge of Condition 30 (Ecological Management Plan), Condition 31 (Ecological Clerk of Works - relating solely to the appointment of the Ecological Clerk of Works) and Condition 32 (Habitat Surveys) of planning permission ref 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29 September 2010.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and the Committee proposed, seconded, and upon being put to a vote, unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application was approved.</li> </ul>
71.	<p><b>SOUTHALL GASWORKS SITE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>Submission of Details for Condition 34 (Flood Relief Channel) and 35 (Flood Storage Area) for planning permission ref 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29 September 2010; hybrid planning application for Southall Gasworks</b></p>

## **Redevelopment.**

Officers introduced the report to the Committee, and, following questioning from Members, confirmed that the Environment Agency and Flood/Water Management Officer were happy with the new flood management plans.

The officer's recommendation was proposed, seconded, and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

### **RESOLVED:**

- That the application was approved.

## **72. WATERLOO WHARF, UXBRIDGE (Agenda Item 16)**

### **Demolition of existing buildings, erection of four storey building containing 53 apartments and commercial unit together with associated car parking, access and landscaping.**

Officers provided an overview of the report and noted the addendum.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, commenting that the size and scale of the application does not complement the surrounding area due to its imposing height. There were also concerns regarding parking, as only one space was provided per unit, and fears that noise pollution from a residential development and emissions from cars would impact on residents' quality of life. Finally, the petitioner stated that an additional 53 apartments would put a huge strain on local amenities and services.

The agent for the application then addressed the Committee, confirming that the application design, including the wharf design and materials, were welcomed by the Conservation Design Officer. There was a complex planning history on the site, and the current application offered an increase in car parking to provide one space for each apartment, an improvement on previous applications. Access to the site would also be moved further from the junction and HGVs would no longer operate on the site, which has impacted upon current traffic in the area.

Councillor Tony Burles, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge South, then confirmed to Members his fears of the impact the application would have on local residents, and commented that the application needed to be looked at in greater detail.

The Principal Highways Engineer informed the Committee that the site currently generates around 50 trips per day under its existing use, and while the proposed new usage of the site may require more vehicles, there would no longer be HGVs operating in the area. He also confirmed that the proposed parking meets the Council's standards.

Councillors expressed concern that the height of the proposed building would result in overshadowing and have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties. Although Members agreed that the scheme was much improved on previous applications, the large scale of the design and its effect on residents in the area could not be ignored.

The Committee commented that the illustration highlighting the proposed building height did not include the gables, which made it difficult to fully understand the height of the building and its impact on neighbouring properties. To better understand the site, it was proposed that the application be deferred to allow for further details on the height, size and mass of the proposed building, while illustrations indicating the height of the

gables and potential overshadowing could also be provided.

The proposal was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

**RESOLVED:**

- That the application was deferred.

73.

**COUNCIL CAR PARK ON CENTAL AVENUE AND FORMER HAYES SWIMMING POOL, BOTWELL LANE, HAYES - 1942/APP/2015/4127 (Agenda Item 17)**

**Construction of an A1 discount food store with associated car parking and landscaping, re-configuration and resurfacing of Council car park with new access/exit.**

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum.

The Chairman noted that there was a petition in support of the application, and a representative for the applicant was in attendance to answer questions if necessary.

Members questioned the proposed route for the articulated lorries which would be using the site, and officers confirmed that there was no particular delivery route in place, although a condition was preventing deliveries from taking place in peak times. The Committee heard that the proposed plan for the lorries had been accepted on other sites and was considered acceptable.

Members moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

- That the application was approved, subject to conditions confirmed in the addendum.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 8.15 pm.

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

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**