

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

26 October 2016

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Henry Higgins, John Morgan, Brian Stead, David Yarrow, Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan and John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Kate Boulter (Democratic Services Officer), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Peter Loveday (Highway Development Engineer), Neil McClellan (Major Applications Team Leader), Jyoti Mehta (Trainee Solicitor) and James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement)</p>
74.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies.</p>
75.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Peter Curling declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 10, arising from the fact that he was an employee of Brunel University, and stated that he would leave the meeting during the discussion of the item.</p>
76.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no minutes for approval.</p>
77.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
78.	<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 were Part I and would be heard in public.</p>
79.	<p>WATERLOO WHARF, WATERLOO ROAD (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>A petitioner, speaking in objection to the application, made the following points:</p>

- The proposed development was in a busy community area which would be impacted by the size and scale of the development, which would not complement the area. The building would be up to five storeys in height which would overlook residents' properties and invade privacy.
- The community was concerned about the impact on Uxbridge Boat Centre. It was estimated that it could suffer a 50% loss of business if the development went ahead.
- Access to and from the development would put pressure on the surrounding roads and cause safety concerns as it was located on a bend with poor visibility.
- Residents believed there would be overspill parking from the development which would impact on surrounding roads. The development was on the outskirts of town and people tended to drive there rather than use public transport. The petitioners asked if the residents of the new development could be excluded from the area parking scheme.

The agent for the applicant addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The area was characterised by large developments of residential and commercial buildings of various styles. The building currently on the site was prominent at three storeys high with significant plot coverage. The proposed development was more visually appealing and would improve the area. A high quality building finish had been selected and there would be a landscaping scheme.
- Historic England had recognised the tall gabled fronted bays incorporated into the design preserved the character of the area.
- The applicant had carried out extensive negotiation with the Planning Department and taken into consideration objectors' comments.

A Ward Councillor, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- The owners of the boatyard were worried that they would be pushed out. Residents and businesses were concerned about the impact of the development on their lives, both during demolition and construction, and after the building was erected.

In response to questions from Members, officers advised that:

- It would not be possible to exclude residents of the new development from the area parking scheme.

The following points were made by Members during discussion on the item:

- A site visit had taken place which Members had found useful.
- The proposed development was of a high quality and the gables were an attractive feature. A condition should be added to make clear that the space behind the gables could not be occupied.
- Some Members were concerned about the height and would have preferred a development one storey lower.
- The officer's recommendation included protection for the Uxbridge Boat Centre.
- Members discussed how they could best secure the boating business on the canal.
- Members acknowledged that the types of businesses on the boat yards were rare involving old crafts.
- Although Members acknowledged that the applicant would be working with local

residents, Members were concerned that if the local residents made a petition against the noise on the boating yard, it would affect those businesses.

- Officers explained that in relation to the businesses on the boating yard, the strong wording of the S106 obligation was enough to provide comfort to the Committee.

A motion for the application to be refused on the grounds of size, height and bulk was moved and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost.

A motion for the application to be approved with an additional condition was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed.

RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation with the following additional condition:

"Condition 28:

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the roof space(s) shall not be used or converted to any form of habitable room or for any purpose ancillary to any of the dwellings hereby approved, including as a living room, bedroom, kitchen, bathroom, study or storage area."

80. **KINGSWAY HOUSE, HORTON ROAD** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application and drew Members' attention to the amendments on the Addendum.

A motion for the application to be approved with an additional informative was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed.

RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation in the report and Addendum, with the following additional informative:

"The Council will expect the applicant to take into account the following comments of the Canal and River Trust in any future reserved matters application: "We are keen to avoid a canyoning effect on the canal corridor. We would therefore like to see the future reserved matters proposal move the development further back from the towpath, with a reduced height, stepping down towards the canalside..."."

81. **BOWLS PAVILION & GREEN HILL END ROAD** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.

A motion for the application to be approved was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved.

82. **THE ARENA, BENNETSFIELD ROAD, STOCKLEY PARK** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application and drew Members' attention to the amendments on the Addendum.

During discussion on the item, Members expressed disappointment that the proposed development was not visually attractive, particularly in view of Stockley's status as a

	<p>landmark business park.</p> <p>A motion for the application to be approved with an additional informative was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation in the report and Addendum, with the following additional informative:</p> <p>" The Council will expect the external materials and details submitted pursuant to condition 17 to compliment the external materials and detailing of the adjacent Grade II Listed Arena building."</p>
83.	<p>BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Peter Curling, having declared a pecuniary interest, left the meeting for consideration of this item.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>A motion for the application to be approved with an additional informative was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application was approved.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.07 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact 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.