

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

13 July 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), Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan, Henry Higgins, John Oswell, Brian Stead, David Yarrow and Raymond Graham (In place of John Morgan)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger – Head of Planning and Enforcement Mandip Malholtra – Pre-Applications Manager Matt Kolaszeski - Principal Planning Officer Roisin Hogan – Planning Lawyer Neil Fraser – Democratic Services Officer</p>
18.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Morgan. Councillor Graham was present as his substitute.</p>
19.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
20.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 JUNE 2017 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2017 be approved as a correct record.</p>
21.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that item 6 had been withdrawn, so the Committee would be considering items 7-12.</p>
22.	<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 marked as Part I and so would be considered in public.</p>

23.	<p>FORMER GARAGE SITE R/O 6-16 NELSON ROAD - 72704/APP/2017/1068 (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn from the meeting.</p>
24.	<p>WORLD BUSINESS CENTRE - 71487/APP/2017/1605 (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>Minor material amendment to planning permission re. 71487/APP/2015/47118 dated 23/05/2016: Erection of a four storey office building (Use Class B1) with basement parking and roof top plant (Outline application) to amend the approved plans, comprising alternative elevational treatment to the central section of the side elevations, an increase in roof height and a reduction in height of the roof top plant enclosure and delete condition 7 (Details of Revised Roof Plant Enclosure)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the permission granted in 2016 had resulted in a request for a minor amendment to the side elevation and overall height of the building, with a proposed increase in height from 15.1m to 16.73m above ground level. The increase in height was due to the finished ground floor level being marginally higher, and the service run on each floor being higher, than originally envisaged.</p> <p>Members were informed that the design of the building had stayed close to the design of the original outline, and provided a contemporary finish to the originally consented scheme. There were no objections to the overall height and design approach to the application, as the site was located on a section of the Bath Road that was wholly commercial in nature, and the proposed building was of a similar height and size to adjoining office buildings. For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>In light of the recent fire at Grenfell Tower, Members sought clarity over the type of aluminium cladding that was being proposed for use within the application. Officers confirmed that the Council's Building Control Team were responsible for such matters, not Planning. The team were in contact with the Department for Communities and Local Government and was sourcing a great deal of information on how to deal with such matters moving forward.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
25.	<p>BOURNE COURT - 11891/APP/2016/3583 (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>Demolition of all existing single/two storey buildings including outbuildings within the site and construction of residential development comprising 69 residential units, 71 car parking spaces and associated works</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the site layout displayed on the presentation was different to that within the Member Plans Pack. This was due to the addition of 9 parking spaces to allow for 1:1 parking for the one and two bed flats, with 2 spaces each for each of the three-bed units. These additional parking spaces had been added following the realignment of the previously proposed spaces. Members were informed that small street trees had previously been located within the proposed parking space. It was now proposed that these be removed, and replaced by feature trees at the ends of each parking 'strip'. This would result with a satisfactory</p>

landscaping outcome, together with a better parking ratio.

A key difference between the previously approved scheme and this was the proposed increase in units, from 49 to 69. This had been facilitated by the removal of some of the proposed houses and their replacement with a block of flats.

No objections had been raised to the principle of the development, given that it had previously been approved, and it was considered that the development would result in an acceptable appearance within the street scene, and would provide suitable landscaping and appropriate living conditions for future occupiers. It was considered that the application would have no detrimental impact on the amenities of nearby residential occupiers.

The addendum was highlighted, which showed the proposed changes to the site layout inclusive of the new parking spaces, which had resulted in slight amendments to conditions 3 and 10, and an amendment to the Head of Term 5, which related to the provision of a travel plan. This had been changed to specify a requirement of a travel plan statement, rather than a full travel plan, due to Transport for London (TfL) guidance which stipulated that for developments comprising between 50 and 80 units, only a travel plan statement was required. In addition, it was proposed that condition 17 be removed, and replaced with a car parking management strategy.

The officer concluded by recommending that the application be approved.

The Chairman advised that, as the bins and cycle stores were listed on the plans, conditions 10/2A and 2B could be removed. In addition, clarity was sought over whether living roofs were included within the proposal. Officers confirmed that the plans did include some living roofs, but no living walls.

Members sought comment from officers regarding the breach of the 45 degree sightline proposed at Block A, as the previous report appeared to state that there was no breach. With regard to the unit located at first floor level, officers confirmed that 15m was the standard overdominance distance, with 21m as the standard overlooking measurement. The proposed development was therefore sufficiently far away, with several gardens intervening, which meant that officers were not unduly concerned over the potential for overdominance in this instance. With regard to overlooking, it was recommended that the proposal be conditioned to include balcony screens and appropriate window arrangements to ensure sufficient privacy.

Members referenced the balcony of Flat 14, Block B, which overlooked the gardens of the adjacent road, and asked whether a privacy screen was necessary. Officers drew the Committee's attention to condition 16 within the report, and advised that this could be strengthened by way of delegated authority to the Head of Planning, to ensure all issues of overlooking were dealt with appropriately.

Members sought clarity over recommendation A)ii which stated that the scheme was to deliver 35% affordable housing on site, or to demonstrate how equivalent provision could be delivered elsewhere through an in lieu contribution. Members discussed the merits of amending this so that it mandated 35% affordable housing by habitable room, rather than by value. It was agreed that this be reworded by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Head of Planning being given delegated authority to amend condition 16; and 2. The Head of Planning being given delegated authority to amend the wording related to recommendation A)ii), in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead.
26.	<p>THE STRAIGHT, SOUTHALL GAS WORKS - 54814/APP/2017/604 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Variation of condition 2: Outline application Demolition of 22 houses; the remediation of the land and the redevelopment of the site to deliver a large mixed use development including residential, non-food retail, food retail, restaurants, bars and cafes, hotel, conference and banqueting, cinema, health care facilities, education facilities, office/studio units, sports pavilion, an energy centre, multi-storey car park and associated car and cycle parking, landscaping public realm, open space and children's play space. Full application New access roads from the Hayes By-pass and Southall town centre to the application site for vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access, including drainage and a flood relief pond. Widening of South Road across the railway line, widening of South Road over the railway line for the creation of a buys lane and three new access onto Beaconsfield Road. Two bridges over the Grand Union Canal and Yeading Brook to provide pedestrian and cycle access to the Minet Country Park and Springfield Road. 54814/APP/2009/430 dated 29/09/2017; to allow for the widening of the road to facilitate the addition of bicycle lane</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was to vary a condition of the original planning permission to enable the roadway of the western access, from Pump Lane to the main site, to be widened by 5.6m to allow for the addition of cycle ways as requested by Transport for London (TfL).</p> <p>The consented roadway, as approved, ran from Minet Country Park and predominantly sat on an embankment with bridges over both Yeading Brooke and the Grand Union Canal. The base of the structure holding the road would remain the same width as previously approved, and it would only be the roadway on top that would be widened. TfL, who would build and maintain the road, had assessed the proposal and had raised no objections. Similarly, the Council's Highways team had also not raised any objections, and it was felt that the addition of cycleways would promote the use of sustainable transport and reduce traffic in the future. It was therefore recommended that approval be granted.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
27.	<p>SOUTHALL WATERSIDE - 54814/APP/2017/1643 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Construction of new switchroom to enable operation of Western Access Road to the former Southall Gasworks site</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the switchroom would be 3.6m by 6.2m in size, located in an area which currently formed part of the Pump Lane highway verge. The immediate area surrounding the switchroom would feature gravel and would be shielded from view by planted screens, while the wider area would feature various planting including a 46sqm flower meadow.</p>

The facility would not be publicly accessible, with entry limited to authorised personnel only, and a condition relating to anti-graffiti paint was in place to limit antisocial behaviour. No objections had been received, and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

28. **FORMER ANGLER'S RETREAT PH - 11981/APP/2016/4626** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Demolition of existing former public house building and erection of a two storey building comprising of two residential flats, car and cycle parking and associated works

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the site sat within a wider development site that benefited from planning consent for the retention and conversion of the public house, and included existing development of 14 affordable housing units, now completed. Extensions and outbuildings that related to the former public house had been demolished.

The applicant had commissioned a structural and masonry survey, which had concluded that the former public house was structurally unsound and therefore unable to be retained, and thus the current application had been submitted to demolish the existing building and erect a new building that would replicate the appearance of the existing building. This would ensure that the new building would contribute to the character of the West Drayton Green Conservation Area in the same manner as that which would be removed.

The Council's Design and Conservation officer, and the West Drayton Advisory Panel, had raised no objections to the proposals. In addition, the 14 nearby residential units were affordable housing units, and the derelict nature of the former public house was preventing the full occupation of those dwellings.

The addendum was highlighted, which set out the proposal to delete conditions 6 and 9, as the development was of insufficient scale to require those conditions.

The officer concluded by recommending that the application be approved.

Members sought clarity on the size of the development required for conditions 6 and 9 to remain. Officers confirmed that condition 6 related to the construction management plan, usually attached to developments of 10 units or more. Condition 9 was confirmed to relate to the sound insulation scheme, but as the site was located on a quiet road, there was no real noise to mitigate by way of condition, and thus it was proposed that the condition be removed.

Members requested confirmation that, should the applicant wish to increase the size of the development, the Committee was empowered to mandate that the design remain the same, regardless of size. Officers confirmed that any application submitted in the future would be assessed on its own merits, but it was likely that the Council would seek to ensure the development was of a similar design to the former public house.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote,

	<p>unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
29.	<p>MINIATURE RAILWAY, RUISLIP LIDO - 1117/APP/2017/2188 <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p>Demolition of existing Ruislip Railway Society workshop and provision of replacement workshop building, landscaping and associated works</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the current proposal was for a marginally larger building, (an increase of 35sqm), and did not seek to change the existing function of the site. For this reason, it was considered that the proposal met the criteria set out in paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and therefore represented appropriate development within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The addendum was highlighted, which set out a proposed amendment to conditions 6 and 7, and confirmed that the environmental officer had not raised any objections to the phase 1 habitat survey.</p> <p>The officer concluded by recommending that the application be approved. This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
	ADDENDUM
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.40 pm.</p>

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.