

## Minutes



**MAJOR** Applications Planning Committee

**13 March 2018**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan, Henry Higgins, John Morgan, John Oswell, Brian Stead and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Peter Loveday (Highway Development Engineer), Mandip Malhotra (Pre - Applications Manager), Roisin Hogan (Legal Advisor) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p> <p><b>Other Councillors</b></p> <p>Councillor Shehryar Ahmed Wallana (Ward Councillor in attendance)</p>
141.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There no apologies for absence.</p>
142.	<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>
143.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> - That the minutes from 20 February 2018 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
144.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
145.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all agenda items would be heard in Part I.</p>

146. **COMAG - 24843/APP/2018/269** (Agenda Item 6)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 104 self contained units, community space, the provision of car parking, associated landscaping, drainage and other ancillary work. Officers highlighted the addendum, made a verbal amendment and made a recommendation for approval.

Two petitioners shared the five minutes speaking time and spoke in objection of the application. In total, the petitions had in excess of 400 signatures against the application.

In summary, the first petitioner submitted that the petition signatories strongly objected to the tower block development and it was out of character. The petitioner requested that affordable bungalows were built rather than flats with balconies overlooking neighbouring properties. The petitioner submitted that the rapid erection of high density flats had shocked residents and there was a concern that this would impact local nurseries, schools and surgeries. Traffic and the level of pollution had also increased in the area.

The second petitioner reiterated the points raised by the first petitioner. The petitioner submitted that the latest application was only seven dwellings smaller than the previous application that was refused. This application was still grossly overdeveloped in terms of bulk, size, height and overlooking existing housing. It was far too high for the street scene and traffic in the area would increase. The Comag site was situated directly next to two storey Edwardian buildings and close to a housing estate. Residents were already experiencing anti social behaviour caused by the densely populated over developed site. Local residents had to change their way of life to live. The petitioner stated that there was no local infrastructure to support this type of development.

Both petitioners asked for the application to be refused.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee. The agent spoke in support of the application. He drew the Committee's attention to a number of key points. Since the previous application, the applicant had worked closely with officers to respond to the concerns raised and worked on the reasons for refusal. The applicant had active dialogue with local residents. The revised application had reduced in size, bulk and was smaller in scale, reducing from eight to seven storeys. There had been a redesign that featured traditional roofs reflecting the local character. The agent submitted that this was a town centre site within 100 m of the cross rail location and people were obliged to make the most out of this. In relation to affordable housing, the scheme provided 35% affordable housing including family size accommodation. Parking was provided with a ratio of 1:1 alongside electronic parking points and motor cycle spaces. In terms of highways, the scheme would result in a net reduction in vehicle trips compared to current vehicle use on the site. In relation to amenity, all new homes would have the appropriate distance in accordance with policy. Boundaries had been set back to avoid overlooking. All neighbouring amenity spaces had passed the overshadowing test and there would be no unacceptable use of light, overlooking or privacy. He urged the Committee to follow the officer's recommendation.

In response to a Member question regarding sun light and its impact on residents, the agent confirmed that the question was whether there was a significant adverse effect on residents. He confirmed that there would be an adequate level of day light and sunlight. The Chairman also asked the applicant's agent if they'd withdraw the appeal if tonight's application was approved. The agent said he understood that to be the case.

Cllr Shehryar Ahmed Wallana, Ward Councillor for Yiewsley addressed the Committee. He summarised the proposed changes to the development. He submitted that the applicant could agree to reduce the footprint. Cllr Ahmed Wallana's main concern was the impact on residents and he submitted that unless the building was minimised, the application should be refused.

Members clarified whether the bulk of the property was the same. It was confirmed that at the back of the site, a storey had been taken off. The overall character of the wider area was varied with mixed architecture and use of materials.

Members commented that the site visit was useful. Members accepted that the applicant had gone some way to address the concerns raised previously and this was a better scheme than the previous one. However, there were still some concerns in relation to a tree on the corner. The Chairman drew Members' attention to the addendum in relation to the tree. There was some doubt whether the tree could be retained.

Members questioned the town houses. All the other town houses in the area had straightforward picture roofs. The roof in question was a gable roof and was distinctly different from neighbouring roofs. There was no attempt to make it within the character of the area. Members accepted that there was a transition period in the area, but considered that it should not be at the cost of existing residents. Although parking, allocated spaces and electronic vehicle charging points were all good factors, some Members were still concerned about the bulk on Winnock Road.

Officers clarified that this was a new development and the area was changing. The current proposal took greater steps to address some of the previous concerns raised. When this was heard previously there were significant concerns regarding day and sun light. Officers confirmed that based on BRE guidelines, there would be no loss of sun or day light. Officers explained that although this was a suburban location, the Council had to take account of local, regional and national plans to optimise development. This development was in accordance within planning policies. The use of materials used could be controlled through the creation of a materials condition.

Members refused this application once and laid down the changes to be made. Members expressed sympathy towards residents. However, Members noted that amendments and revised plans had now been submitted and the concerns raised had been addressed. Members questioned whether it would be in the best interests of residents to refuse this application. Members considered that, on whole, this was a balanced amendment to a previous application that was properly rejected due to its impact on residents. The bulking and the mass had been adjusted so that it met some of the concerns with regards to the urban setting. Members discussed the impact of sun and day light and accepted that there had been proper studies that indicated that the standards were acceptable.

Officers provided a verbal addendum update that the need for a review mechanism was not required as the scheme delivers a policy compliant scheme. It was delegated to the Head of Planning to make this change prior to a formal decision being issued.

The Chairman noted that there was a suggestion to remove future permitted development rights to extend the height of the property. The Chairman suggested delegating this to the Head of Planning to word.

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

five votes in favour and three votes against.

**RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to:**

- a) the section 106 agreement;
- b) the changes in the addendum;
- c) delegating authority to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to draft, review and finalise the conditions;
- d) adding a condition stating 'notwithstanding the stairs shown on the plans hereby approved adjoining 2 Winnock Road, revised submissions for these steps shall be submitted in writing for approval'; and
- e) imposing a condition seeking the removal of any future permitted development which may permit roof extensions.

147. **MALT HOUSE, 281 FIELD END ROAD - 23156/APP/2017/4464** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of existing building and erection of 27 residential units comprising 24 flats and three houses including car parking, landscaping, access and associated works. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Officers provided a verbal addendum update that the need for a review mechanism was not required as the scheme delivers a policy compliant scheme. It was delegated to the Head of Planning to make this change prior to a formal decision being issued.

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

**RESOLVED - That the application be approved subject to:**

- a) The changes listed in the addendum; and
- b) amending condition 9 to include further elevational fenestration and eaves details for the dwelling houses hereby approved.

148. **UNIT E, PROLOGIS PARK - 73366/APP/2017/4345** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the effluent treatment plant within existing service yard with resultant realignment of service yard fence and reduction in site landscaping. 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.**

149. **CLUB HOUSE, FIELD END RECREATION - 73434/APP/2017/4640** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the demolition and replacement of existing club house. Resurfacing of existing access road and provision of 23 new hard surfaced car parking spaces (including two disabled bays). Officers made a recommendation for approval.

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

<b>RESOLVED - That the application be approved.</b>
---

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.08 pm.
---

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