

## Minutes



**MAJOR** Applications Planning Committee

**10 January 2018**

**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), Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan, Henry Higgins, John Oswell, Brian Stead, David Yarrow and Roy Chamdal (in place of John Morgan)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Roisin Hogan (Legal Advisor) Mandip Malhotra (Major Applications Manager) James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) Peter Loveday (Highway Development Engineer) Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
107.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies received from Cllr John Morgan, with Cllr Roy Chamdal substituting.</p>
108.	<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>
109.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 5 DECEMBER 2017</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes from 5 December 2017 were confirmed as an accurate record.</p>
110.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
111.	<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 would be considered in public.</p>
112.	<p><b>297 LONG LANE, HILLINGDON - 4860/APP/2017/2394</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for the redevelopment to provide a 4 storey residential building containing 33 residential flats comprising 3 x studios., 17 x1 bedroom, and 13x2 bedroom units with</p>

associated access, car parking and landscaping.

Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, noting that the proposed development would overlook nearby residential properties due to its height. No other building in the area had the same impact as the proposed development. The main objection was that the proposed development would compromise resident privacy in an excessive way and there were a number of security concerns. Images had been submitted by the petitioners which were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. The petition explained that these attempted to show that the tree line did not go towards providing a natural screening as indicated in the plans.

The agent for the application informed Members that since the application was last put before Committee in June 2017, extensive negotiations had taken place. The amendments included reducing the size and scale of the top floor, the removal of the balconies and windows on the top floor and the addition of two car parking spaces. An economic and marketing report confirmed that the proposed residential development would provide employment opportunities. The proposed building did not have street frontage due to its positioning to the rear of the shopping parade, as such the building would be largely screened from view by the surrounding buildings. The proposal had been designed to be sympathetic to overlooking neighbouring properties and the tract of land to the South was of benefit as a blanket TPO. In terms of highways, a highway improvement strategy had been proposed with £130k being payable towards air pollution and air quality. There were 36 off street car parking places and future occupiers would not have rights to parking permits. Affordable housing had been scrutinised and it had been deemed as unviable, however the applicant had agreed to pay £100k to offsite affordable housing provision.

In response to Member questions, the agent confirmed that it was unknown who owned the land along the boundary of the site. It was not owned by any neighbouring properties and it was landlocked. Trees were within the landlocked parcel of land. In relation to affordable housing, numerous matters were taken into account and as a result of the assessment, it was determined that affordable housing was not viable.

Councillor Ray Graham, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North was in attendance. He supported the petitioner and said that the development was overbearing due to its size, scale, bulk and density. This was within the context of the local scene and the properties in close proximity. The flat roof system did not make a difference and consideration needed to be given to the local infrastructure. Cllr Graham sought clarification on the TPO situation as no owner had been declared in relation to the strip of land it was on.

At the outset, the Chairman indicated that this was an approval report which was subject to a s106 legal agreement being signed by the applicant. If the applicant failed to sign that in accordance of the details in the report then it would be refused on that basis.

Members expressed concerns about who owned the land between the site and boundary and also the TPOs. Officers confirmed that the title of the land was transferred to a Ltd company in 2002, which was not the applicant. Officers also confirmed that there was an area TPO covering the whole of Tudor Way, and the TPO covered half of the constraints plan. Officers accepted there was a difficulty in confirming whether the trees had or had not been removed, however, assured the Committee that if any trees had been removed it was unlikely to be as a result of the

applicant as it was not to do with their land. There were no TPOs on the applicant's land.

Members wanted reassurance that the tree line existed as indicated in the applicant/agent's plans. If there were any trees in the applicant's application site that Members wished to retain, officers could seek to retain those trees. However, officers advised that this was a red herring as the trees were not in the applicant's control. The main key point was that there was a 38 metre distance which meant that there was no valid refusal reason concerning impact on Tudor Way properties as this was more than the usual standard 21 metres as per the Council's HDAS guidance.

Members questioned the matter of affordable housing. The Head of Planning confirmed in writing the report, officers were mindful that there had been a third party viability consultant, the District Valuers Service (DVS), and they were satisfied that the development was unviable. Officers had added extra text to confirm that not only did the DVS conclude that the development unviable, but they also concurred that there were abnormal costs associated with the development.

In response to Member questions, officers confirmed that the separation distance should be 15 metres but it was 13 metres and that there was a marginal shortfall in the separation distance. However, officers explained that this was facing a flank elevation rather than habitable rooms or windows. In relation to the secondary window serving a living /dining area, officers could require windows to be obscured and the conditions could be amended to reflect this.

In response to Member questions, officers confirmed that 1.8m is the average height to prevent issues of overlooking between premises.

On balance, Members bore in mind that this is policy compliant and considered there were no substantial reasons to refuse the application.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, six voted in favour and two abstained.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the Committee:**

- 1) approve the application as per officer's recommendation and the amendments in the addendum; and**
- 2) delegate authority to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to reword condition 9 to ensure it complies with the condition that is going to be used on the Nestle Factory site, the deletion of condition 11 and the deletion of any duplicate conditions.**

113. **RUISLIP BOWLS CLUB, MANOR FARM BURY STREET, RUISLIP - 45220/APP/2017/3865** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers gave a brief summary of the application. Planning permission was sought for a single storey extension to eastern elevation of club pavilion. Removal of two existing sheds to the east of the pavilion and replacement with new shed adjacent to the west of the pavilion. Enlargement of existing upper terrace. Revisions to existing fenestrations and access arrangements. Officers made a recommendation for approval.

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

unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations.**

114. **LAND AT CESSNA ROAD, HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW - 62360/APP/2017/3000** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought to amend condition 3 on a section 73 application. Changes included alterations to footprint, increase in height to include additional storey and roof top boardroom, increase in bedrooms provided from 298 to 360, relocation of elevated pedestrian link from first floor level to second floor level, revises external appearances, revised car parking, drop off lay by and internal arrangements.

Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members expressly asked for control of air pollution and noise to be included as conditions.

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

**RESOLVED:**

**That the Committee:**

- 1) approve the application as per officer's recommendation and the amendments in the addendum; and**
- 2) delegate authority to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to draft, review and finalise the conditions.**

115. **SWINDON ROAD, HEATHROW AIRPORT - 67622/APP/2017/4325** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced and provided an overview of the application. The application sought planning permission for the variation of condition 3 of a previous planning application to allow for internal reconfiguration to accommodate an addition 87 bedrooms and for an increase in the height of the atrium roof.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations.**

116. **GLAZE HOUSE, BEACONSFIELD ROAD, HAYES - 21940/APP/2017/3965** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for a change of use from Class B8 storage and distribution ware house to flexible Class B1c, B2, B8 use.

Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations.**

117.	<p><b>DICE, ST ANDREWS PARK, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2016/4442</b> (Agenda Item 11)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for reserved matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) for the erection of 101 dwellings together with associated parking and landscaping within the Town Centre Extension. Officers made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations.</b></p>
118.	<p><b>205 &amp; 207 HAREFIELD ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 73106/APP/2017/2980</b> (Agenda Item 12)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for extensions to both existing properties to create a single block of 20 flats comprising 5 x studio flats, 9 x1 bed flats and 6 x2 bed flats with onsite parking and amenity space, new access point, landscaping and ancillary development. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>Officers highlighted the addendum which included a request from the applicant to withdraw this item from the agenda. The addendum included the Head of Planning's reasons for not doing this.</p> <p>Cllr Ian Edwards confirmed that the email had been forwarded to him and telephone call messages had been left for him but he had not engaged with any conversation.</p> <p>Members noted that there were nine refusal reasons. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously refused.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendations.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.08 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact on 01895 277655. 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.**