

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

14 March 2017

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), Peter Curling, Janet Duncan, Henry Higgins, John Morgan, John Oswell, Brian Stead and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Neil McClellan (Major Applications Team Leader), Manmohan Ranger (Transportation DC Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Planning Lawyer) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
137.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
138.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
139.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2017 be approved as a correct record.</p>
140.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
141.	<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 were Part I and would be heard in public.</p>
142.	<p>36-40 RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 69978/APP/2016/2564 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of 3 detached dwellings and redevelopment to provide 24 residential flats (13 x 1 bedroom units; 8 x 2 bedroom units; and 3 x 3 bedroom units), amenity space and associated car parking (Re-consultation following receipt of revised plans including highway works)</p>

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Members were reminded that the application had been deferred at the Major Applications Planning Committee held 4 October 2016, to allow the applicant the opportunity to submit a revised junction design for the entrance to the site, and a highways safety audit of the revised scheme.

In the interests of expediency, the Council's Highway Engineers had reviewed the existing design, traffic and speed data provided by the applicant and had produced alternative designs for the new access to the site, which had subsequently been adopted by the applicant's own highway consultant. A revised internal layout had been produced, that allowed for new pedestrian crossing facilities, revised siting for disabled parking spaces, and better access and egress for refuse lorries.

A stage 1 road safety audit had been completed for the revised scheme, which the application had passed. Officers confirmed that they believed that the actions taken had addressed the queries raised previously, and the application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement, as set out in the report.

Members sought clarity regarding the proposed changes to the application. Officers confirmed that the area in front of the parking spaces had been widened to allow additional turning space and access for refuse vehicles. Right turns out of the site would be banned, communicated to road users via road markings and signs. It was confirmed that this was not unusual, with many developments having similar turning prohibitions.

Approaches on either side of the site access would have anti-skid surfaces, whilst pedestrian access to the east of the junction would have tactile pavings and a central island. On the west of the junction, there would be a smaller island with a keep-left sign. Visibility requirements had been met, with 70m of visibility to the west and 90m to the east. As confirmed previously, the stage 1 safety audit had been carried out on the initial plans and had passed, with a stage 2 audit to be carried out on the detailed designs, once submitted. Stage 3 would be carried out immediately after construction, and stage 4 carried out one year after construction.

Members expressed concerns over the safety of pedestrians using the crossing on what was a busy road, where vehicles often drove at speed. It was confirmed that the previous position of the pedestrian crossing was on the west of the site access. Following Member feedback, the crossing had been relocated to the east, and the new siting had been through the safety audit and had been deemed to be safe.

Members questioned whether vehicles would need to reverse into the access road in order to turn out of the allotted parking bays. Officers confirmed that there was sufficient room within the site to turn, to avoid having to move into the road itself.

Members were satisfied that the revised proposal addressed the concerns raised previously, and the officer's recommendation was moved. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

As Councillor Higgins was not present for the item, he did not take part in the deliberation or vote on the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to conditions and the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as per the officer's report.

143. **FORMER ROYAL BRITISH LEGION, STATION ROAD - 11332/APP/2016/1595**
(Agenda Item 7)

Erection of 13 terrace dwellinghouses with associated parking, landscaping and external works, following demolition of existing building.

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Officers confirmed that the existing building was in a poor state of repair, currently vacant, and not fit for use. The British Legion currently attended organised meetings and events at the Yiewsley and West Drayton Community Centre, located approximately 90m to the south of the site.

The Local London Plan and NPPF policy all supported additional family sized houses, and the proposed buildings were considered to be of good quality and design, that would make a positive contribution to the local area. They were not considered to adversely affect the West Drayton Conservation Area, or the nearby Grade II listed building, Drayton Hall.

The Council's Conservation and Urban Design Officer had reviewed the proposal and considered that it would be acceptable in design terms. The proposed development had been set aside from nearby properties and would therefore have no impact on those properties due to its size and bulk.

In terms of transport, the Council's Highway Engineer was satisfied with the parking and access arrangements. The development would provide 20 surface parking spaces, which included 2 disabled spaces and 2 motorcycle spaces.

The development would reflect the 12 core principles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and the application scheme met the strategic policy objectives of the London Plan as well as the aims and objectives of local Council policy. It was therefore recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions and the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the items referred to in section 7.20 of the report.

Members expressed concern at the allocation of disabled parking spaces per residential block. Officers confirmed that the allocation of a parking space for Block 2, rather than having two spaces assigned to the main block, could be mandated via an additional condition, though this would result in the loss of a small amount of landscape verge.

Members raised concerns over the potential for overshadowing on Plot 8 due to its proximity to Plots 9 & 10. Officers confirmed that as this was a new development only the HDAS Residential Layout policy, which specified broader guidelines relating to daylight and sunlight, applied, rather than the HDAS Residential Extensions policy. Members conceded that, whilst concerns remained, on balance they would accept potential overshadowing on Plot 8 as the need for affordable housing was so great.

In addition, Members were mindful that the householder permitted development rights would allow further extensions to the rear of the properties that, together with the potential for future reorganisation of internal space to create more bedrooms, could result in the reduction of the minimum garden area required for a development on this size. For this reason, it was suggested that the permitted development rights be removed.

Members welcomed the scheme, and were minded to approve the application, subject to the Head of Planning agreeing the addition of conditions relating to the reorganisation of the disabled parking bays and the removal of the householder permitted development rights. The officer's recommendation, together with the aforementioned additional conditions, was therefore moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

As Councillor Higgins arrived partway through the presentation of the item, he did not take part in the deliberation or vote on the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to:

1. **conditions and the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as per the officer's report;**
2. **the addition of a condition to remove the householder permitted development rights; and**
3. **the addition of a condition to reorganise the disabled parking layout.**

144. **FANUC HOUSE - 26134/APP/2016/1987** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Demolition of existing office building and re-development of the site to provide a 4 storey building with basement parking comprising 40 residential units with associated car parking, amenity space and landscaping. Amended plans and supporting information received.

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application site was located at the southern end of Ruislip town centre, adjacent to the Grade II Listed Ruislip Underground Station and to the south of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The site comprised a modest two storey office building, and there were no objections to the loss of the office use or the building, which had little architectural or historical merit. There were no objections in principle to the site's residential re-development.

Following a number of pre-application submissions and a number of revisions to the current application, it was considered that the proposed building achieved an appropriate scale, massing and design for this prominent and sensitive site. The Council's Conservation/ Urban Design Officer had raised no further concerns with the scheme, subject to detailed design considerations and use of materials, which would be controlled by condition.

Members were informed that the scheme would not harm the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers. Although the scheme was slightly deficient in terms of satisfying amenity space standards, the scheme would predominantly provide studio and one bedroom flat accommodation within a town centre location, and in such circumstances design guidance advised that amenity space standards could be applied more flexibly. Currently the scheme met approximately 90% of the amenity space requirements, which was high for a town centre development, though this did rely on balconies to achieve that figure.

Therefore it was considered that the scheme, with all units having good sized balconies together with the provision of a good sized communal space, would provide an appropriate amount of amenity space and the standard of residential amenity afforded for its future occupiers would be satisfactory. It was highlighted that a park was located within easy walking distance of the application site.

The scheme would provide an appropriate level of off-street parking in the area, which had a high PTAL score, and the trip generation would not be detrimental to highway efficiency and/ or safety as compared to the existing trip generation of the office building. The scheme had also been carefully designed, with the building raised on its southern end to allow for flood waters to flow underneath, and provided appropriate mitigation so that the development would not result in flooding elsewhere. It was confirmed that the application had the support of the Council's Flood Advisor.

The scheme would safeguard the more important trees and ecological features on site and would provide additional trees and comprehensive landscaping, and included a green roof.

A total of 31 parking spaces were proposed, made up of 20 spaces, including 4 disabled spaces, in the basement (accessible via a car lift), together with 6 spaces located alongside the site entrance and 5 spaces retained from the previous office building. The proposal therefore achieved a parking ratio of 0.775 parking spaces per residential unit, which colleagues in Highways had confirmed was appropriate, given the high PTAL score.

Although the scheme did not provide any affordable housing, the scheme was supported by a Financial Viability Appraisal, which had been independently assessed and had confirmed that the inclusion of affordable homes would not be viable. It was confirmed that if the scheme was delayed, a review mechanism would be needed to review the finances of the scheme at that time, which formed part of the S106 Agreement. The scheme did make commensurate contributions to construction training, a travel plan bond, and public realm improvements in the area as part of the S106 agreement.

Considering the above, the application was accordingly recommended for approval subject to the S106 agreement, Heads of Terms, and conditions as set out in the report and as amended in the addendum.

Members sought further information regarding the absence of affordable housing from the scheme. Officers confirmed that the review mechanism referred to would become active if there was a significant delay in moving the scheme forward, intended to capture any uplift in value that could make a proportion of affordable housing viable, or to capture a payment in lieu of that affordable housing. The third party Financial Viability Appraisal conducted had confirmed that affordable housing was not viable on a scheme of this size, and therefore the applicant would need to increase the number of units in order to make such housing viable. The Committee was advised that the proposal could not be refused due to a lack of affordable housing.

Members were broadly supportive of the aesthetics of the proposed development, feeling that it was in keeping with the surrounding area. However, it was recognised that Station Approach was a busy road, with a high volume of buses. Concerns were raised at the proximity of the buses to the flats, which could render any balconies or windows unusable due to loss of privacy, noise and air pollution. Significant concerns were raised over the potential for harm to the occupants' health due to diesel fumes from the buses.

Additional concerns were raised regarding the suitability of disabled parking bays in a basement, serviced by a car lift. It was highlighted that should there be any problem with the lift, then disabled people could be left without access to their vehicle or even trapped within the basement. It was therefore felt that these bays should be relocated

to the ground floor instead. Officers referred to comments received from the Council's Access officer, who had confirmed that such a concern could not form the basis of a refusal reason. It was explained that the decision to have the majority of parking underground was due to the compact nature of the site and the intention to limit any impact upon the adjoining development, whilst maximising the parking spaces available. It would therefore be difficult to change this aspect of the scheme.

Members referenced the officer's report, which stated that additional work was required relating to flooding issues. Officers confirmed that they were wholly satisfied that the concerns over flooding had been resolved, and drew the Committee's attention to the addendum which contained additional information relating to flood and water management issues. Members contended that such detail should be presented to them.

Officers confirmed that Unit 8 of the site had obscured glazing throughout, and requested that, if Members were minded to approve the application, that the Head of Planning be delegated authority to agree an additional condition relating to an area of defensive space for the occupants of that dwelling.

Officers went on to confirm that the delivery and service plan referred to within the report had been submitted with the original application. As this was a residential scheme, the only servicing requirement would relate to collection of refuse. A condition requesting a ramp for waste bins could be expanded upon to include management of the refuse collections. In addition, as this was a residential site in an area with a high PTAL score, the transport bond was of less impact.

Members moved that the application be deferred, until such time that officers could return to the Committee with a revised scheme that addressed the concerns listed above. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed (Councillor Duncan abstained from voting).

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.54 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.