

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

6 April 2017

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling, Janet Duncan, Henry Higgins, John Morgan, John Oswell, Brian Stead, David Yarrow and Shehryar Ahmad Wallana (in place of Eddie Lavery).</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Neil McCLEllen - Major Applications Team Leader, Manmohan Ranger - Highways Advisor, Roisin Hogan - Planning Lawyer, Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information) and Anisha Teji- Democratic Services Officer</p>
152.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Eddie Lavery with Councillor Shehryar Ahmad Wallana substituting.</p>
153.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
154.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
155.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were Part I and would be heard in public.</p>
156.	<p>FORMER FRANK WELCH COURT, HIGH MEADOW CLOSE - 196/APP/2016/4645 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Officers also highlighted the addendum. Planning permission was granted in 2013 and the development is in the process of being built. The current planning application seeks permission to add three first floor extensions to the previously approved development. The combined extensions would provide a total of five additional care home bedrooms. Officers recommended this application for refusal on visual and amenity grounds.</p> <p>A petition was submitted in objection of the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following</p>

points:

- Initially the development was not a care home but a 31 flat residential building which had little impact on its surroundings.
- Residents were shocked by the scale, height, intrusive and dominating nature of these buildings.
- The initial visualisations of the building have been misleading.
- Residents bordering the development were being directly overlooked by large multiple windows. Properties based at the North and South sides of the development were being severely overlooked.
- The traffic and parking report focused on data which was seven years old and were from three homes all with excellent road and public transport links. Parking issues could arise from the proposed development, despite having closer public transport links.
- High levels of noise outside of legally permitted times caused residents stress and anxiety.
- Infringements have been reported to the developers directly, the Council, the Local Ward Councillor, the Environmental Department and the Unsociable Behaviour Department.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution the agent spoke and made the following points:

- The proposals comprise five bedrooms and a corridor at first floor level. The link would improve circulation in the care home by making the flow of movement more efficient and establishing better communication between the two halves of the home.
- The current arrangement of the development would be an inconvenience to staff working in the home as they will find it difficult to provide quick assistance to residents.
- The proposed increase in the number of bedrooms makes an efficient use of the site and provides more facilities within the home at reasonable costs, whilst also creating more rooms for people in need of the service.
- The planning officers' views in the report were subjective and both the applicant and agent disagreed with the view. The proposed developments were designed in a manner which fitted in with the original design and would fit comfortably in their setting.
- The designs met the commonly accepted standards for distances between windows. The effects brought about by the current proposal were marginal and not significant.
- The highways report submitted was professional, objective and independent.
- The original application compromised the building of the link between the homes, but after seeing the building constructed, it now made common sense to include the link.

A statement from Councillor Duncan Flynn, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills, was submitted on behalf of the local residents in objection of the planning application. The statement was read out by the Chairman. Councillor Flynn made the following points:

- Although the application already had planning permission, the current planning application presented an unacceptable increase in the size of the development.
- The development was surrounded by largely low level residential accommodation in Larkwood Rise and Daymer Gardens. The proposed extensions would increase the scale of an already large development which dwarfed neighbouring properties.

- If approved, the application would fail to harmonise with the surrounding residential area and would dominate the skyline of the area to the detriment of neighbouring properties.

Members accepted that this development was a much needed home for people and were not against the development in principle. However, in Members view, the development was out of policy. Members noted that there was a current enforcement investigation that had not yet been resolved. Members expressed disappointment at the situation as it often occurred where officers worked hard with developers to encourage them to build in accordance with approved plans, but this was not always the case. Members were concerned that the implementation of the proposed link would change the mass of the building and would join three buildings at first floor level.

A motion for the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

The application was refused as per the officer's recommendation.

157. **WIER HOUSE, RIVERSIDE WAY - 43495/APP/2016/1498** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Officers also highlighted the addendum. Planning permission was sought for the erection of a three storey building, to create 16 x 2 bed self-contained residential units, together with associated landscaping and parking. Officers made a recommendation for approval.

Some Members expressed concerns at building residential properties on land which was also being used for business purposes. There were factories that were open 24/7 on the site and it was considered that those businesses would be forced to close due to noise concerns that could be raised by residents at a later stage.

Members discussed the level of protection companies already working on the site would have. Some Members were also concerned about having a childrens' play area opposite the site, and also raised concerns about the level and quality of the amenity area, air pollution and traffic noise. Members commented that the design of the proposed works were poor.

Some Members considered that the application could not be refused on the grounds that the site had changed its principle use. The change of use to residential had been established. Further, some Members commented that the noise and air quality issues had been covered in the report.

Officers confirmed that the principle use of the land had been lost. Officers accepted that this was a largely unfettered industrial business area that could operate 24/7 and it was also one of the sites included Hillingdon's proposed Article 4 direction which will go through in November 2017. Any future changes of use will require permission from November 2017. Officers explained that given the comments from EPU, the noise surveys submitted, and the conditions proposed by EPU, it would be difficult to sustain a refusal on the basis that it would create future disturbances on the property from the IBA.

Officer summarised the issues raised by Members. Members would not be able to defend a decision that it was unacceptable to create residential property as the principle use of the land, as an industrial business use, had been removed. Residential

environment in terms of impact on future occupants have been covered in the report, however if Members were not satisfied with the points raised in the report, they could use this as a basis for refusal. The quality of the amenity space had been covered in the report, if Members considered this to be unacceptable, they could use it as a reason for refusal. The issue of design such as appearance and sighting would be difficult ground to use to refuse given the mixed design of developments within the area.

A recommendation to refuse was proposed on the basis of the impact of noise, disturbance, quality of outdoor play areas for children and quality of amenity space being provided for future occupiers

Members moved to overturn the officers' recommendation and seconded, and upon being put to a vote, there were four votes in favour, three against and one abstention.

It was noted that Councillors Peter Curling, Janet Duncan and John Oswell asked for their vote against overturning the officers' recommendation be recorded.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee:

1) refused the application and;

2) delegate to the Chairman and Labour Lead, to confirm the reasons for refusal.

158. **FANUC HOUSE - 26134/APP/2016/1987** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Officers also highlighted the addendum. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of existing office building and re-development of the site to provide a four storey building with basement parking comprising 40 residential units with associated car parking, amenity space and landscaping.

Members noted that this application was deferred on 14 March 2017 in order to allow the content of the addendum to be incorporated into the officer's recommendation to allow further amendments to be made to the scheme following queries raised by Members during their discussion of the scheme.

Members commented that it was great to see officers and developers working together and that this was a good scheme. Members questioned how refuse lorries would be able to obtain refuse bins and raised concerns about traffic hazards. Members questioned how delivery vehicles would be access the site. It was suggested that a condition be added regarding the refuse plan and also a landscaping condition regarding trees that absorb pollution.

Officers confirmed that vehicles would not be expected to reverse into the site and would have to stop at junctions. Where ever there are lay-by waiting restrictions, Council's vehicles are exempt which would allow them to stop and collect refuse. There would also be some parking spaces available which delivery vehicles could use.

A motion for the officer's recommendation, subject to amendments, was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote there were six votes in favour, one against and one in abstention.

RESOLVED:

	The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.
	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 on 01895 250636. 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.