

## Minutes



### MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

19 February 2019

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, John Morse, John Oswell, Devi Radia, David Yarrow, Nicola Brightman and Robin Sansarpuri</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Richard Michalski (Highways Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
120.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies received from Cllr Steve Tuckwell, with Cllr Nicola Brightman substituting, and also Cllr Janet Duncan, with Cllr Robin Sansarpuri substituting.</p>
121.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor David Yarrow declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 as he had prior involvement with the application. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Alan Chapman declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 9 as he had prior involvement with the application. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
122.	<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 the meeting held on 30 January 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
123.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
124.	<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 were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>

125. **10-12 HAREFIELD ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 16299/APP/2018/1849** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Councillor David Yarrow declared a non-pecuniary interest as he had prior involvement with the application. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 blocks (part 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12 storeys) to provide 267 self-contained units (32 x studios, 107 x 1- bedroom, 115 x 2-bedroom and 13 x 3-bedroom) with commercial floor space at ground floor level (Use Classes A1, A2, A3 and B1) and associated landscaping, including public realm improvements, provision of 9 accessible car parking spaces and ancillary works. Officers made a recommendation for refusal and highlighted the addendum.

Three petitioners spoke in objection of the planning application. Members had regard to the additional photographs submitted by the petitioners which were circulated to Members, officers and the agent prior to the meeting.

The first petitioner took the Members through the photographs and explained what each photograph showed. In summary, the petitioner submitted that the proposed development would overlook a number of back gardens on Lancaster Road and the height and rear access of the development would mean a constant flow of people accessing walkways close to the already existing properties. Families on Lancaster Road would feel vulnerable with their children playing outside and there were also concerns raised about light pollution. The size, height and bulk of the proposed development would be unsympathetic to the local area and there would also be a large amount of shadowing to local gardens. To conclude, the petitioner stated that the current development would be an eye sore to the current town centre landscape, it was not in keeping with the local surroundings and there were no other buildings in the area that imposed on resident properties in such a way. There would be a loss of natural light and there would be disturbance and a detrimental impact on residents.

The second petitioner submitted that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site, as it was too large, too high, not in keeping with the local surroundings and adding pressure to local services and infrastructures. It also involved the loss of two valued retail outlets which had been used by local residents for some 25 years. The nearest equivalents were six miles away. There was already a huge pressure on the area with the substantial growth of housing stock in Uxbridge. St Andrews Park was an example where there was already an impact on GPs, schools and other essential services. Until there was an enhancement of in the size and scope of GP practice services, additional strains should not be allowed. The addition of 500 sum occupiers would add additional pressure on roads and pavements. The scale of the proposed development disregarded the local buildings, conservation areas and diminished the local character adversely. Concerns were also raised about the privacy of occupiers and there was a worry that there was limited opportunity for natural light which could have a negative impact on residents' health.

The third petitioner highlighted issues around car parking and submitted that it was beyond comprehension that a car free development was ever considered for the site. Public transport was the norm for Central and inner London areas, however in Uxbridge, an outer London area, it was unsuitable. The petitioner submitted that to include eight residential spaces and one commercial space was ludicrous for 267 homes. The development was not in accordance with the Council's adopted standards, which were reaffirmed in 2017. The Council considered 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling to be reasonable, the petitioner questioned why the developer should be

allowed to override this. There would be an abuse of parking restrictions, and there were already parking pressures in the area. Using public transport or bike was not always a viable solution. Secondly, the petitioner highlighted the increase pressures on traffic congestion, with regular vehicles entering and exiting the development as a result of online deliveries. If the site was to be gated then traffic queues were more than likely leading to an increase on traffic congestion during rush hours. On Sunday when restrictions did not apply, more cars were parked on the roads, already causing difficulty driving down roads.

Representatives of the application addressed the Committee. The applicant submitted that the group was a 228 year old residential developer, undertook their own construction and managed completed developments. This site offered all the characteristics of a successful development, sat within a vibrant centre, and provided occupiers easy access to shops and employment. The scheme included a gym and the development would not be gated. Retails parks were becoming increasingly redundant, inaccessible and not formally protected for planning policies. They were sustainable locations for optimising residential developments, which could bring a range of economic benefits. It was appreciated and recognised that the proposed development would change the landscape from a low density retail park. Policy requirements were all kept in mind. Change and improvements had been made as result of the comments which were demonstrated in the reduction of residential properties from 300 to 267 homes. Making the best use of previously developed sites in metropolitan areas had been benefited from planning policies. Council now faced new housing targets and the site was one that could be brought forward quickly. Representatives confirmed that legal advisors wrote to officers highlighting a number of concerns about the officers' report. Representatives noted that the 46 new trees had not been added to the report. The GLA considered the development to be in line with London plans. Representatives submitted that there were a number of refusal reasons which could be negotiated further. There had been limited time to respond to all the points and the officers' report.

In response to Member questions, it was confirmed that the development was not a gated access and the ground floor mixed use element of the development would be used by residents of the development. Further, it was noted that negotiation had been ongoing for 18 months and the size of the development had reduced by 15 % so there had been cooperation with officers.

Councillor Martin Goddard, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North, addressed the Committee and accepted that there was a pressing need to increase housing stock in London. Hillingdon had exceeded its annual targets and in December 2017 outlook indicated an overachievement of homes. In summary, this application placed a disregard for Uxbridge residents. If this regime was allowed, there would be in an increase on parking congestion, overshadowing local homes, loss of two retail sites, harm to heritage and pressure on local resources. There were six petitions against this application with signatures from 267 local residents. 142 comments and objections were also received in contrast to 46 comments in support, who were mainly from students who would not necessarily be long term residents. The applicant had submitted a document that showed only 11 residents had been spoken to as part of the consultation process. The residents of Hillingdon did not want this development and requested for officers to add over dominance, loss of privacy and overshadowing to properties as factors in refusal reason 7.

The Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration advised the Committee, in response to the request for an amendment/addition to refusal reason 7, there was an average of up to 40 metres between the development and Lancaster road. The size and scale of the development would not be just to Lancaster Road but other properties

near the site. When there were large number of properties affected, these properties are not specified. The refusal reasons in the report were sufficient and the change proposed was not accepted. There was a concern about the agent retaining current landscape rather than planting 46 new trees.

The Legal Advisor confirmed to the Committee that the statutory procedure needed to be followed when planning applications were made and reports to be considered by Members needed to be published at least five clear working days in advance. This requirement had been fulfilled as the agenda was published on 11 February 2019 and the correct statutory procedure had been followed. There was no obligation on councils to go back to developers/ applicants when the report had been published asking for further comments. If the Council had to do this. It would be difficult to make a decision on any planning application as further comments would always be submitted. Therefore, the Legal Advisor was satisfied that there was a lawful basis for Members to make a decision on this application.

Members considered that the application was out of character and not in keeping with what was already there. It was noted that the retail units could fail, remain unoccupied leading to disrepair. It was also noted that there was a housing requirement in Hillingdon, however this needed to be done in the right place with the right density. After taking into account all the information before it and hearing from both the petitioners and representatives of the application, Members took the view that this development was not in the right area.

Members questioned whether reasons in the daylight and sunlight report could be included as a refusal reason. The Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration confirmed that the guidelines allowed a degree of shadowing of gardens and this would not form a refusal reason.

Members considered it important to identify all the shortcomings in the report. It was questioned whether accessibility was adequate for all blocks as there was only one lift. Officers confirmed that the applicant had responded to this and the access officer was satisfied.

Members noted the potential development of the adjoining police station site and the fact that policies prevented development that impinged/blighted upon neighbouring properties. Members questioned whether this could constitute a refusal. Officers confirmed that Given the separation distances, this would not be a strong grounds for refusal, the site is also not an allocated site within the emerging local plan.

The Committee then moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation and amendments in the addendum.**

126. **JOHN CRANK BUILDING, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE, HILLINGDON - 532/APP/2018/3375 (Agenda Item 7)**

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the erection of a new 7 storey 7 learning and teaching centre with associated landscaping and access works, involving the demolition of the existing John Crank building. Officers made a recommendation for approval and highlighted the addendum.

Members noted that this was good work between the developer and officers and the results of a productive working relationship. In response to Member questions, officers confirmed that drainage and water management issues were governed by proposed conditions.

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 recommendation and variations in the addendum.**

127. **AXIS HOUSE, 242 BATH ROAD, SIPSON - 43794/APP/2018/2779** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the erection of a 6 – storey 157 bedroom hotel including plant room on the roof, the excavation of a basement to provide car parking and associated landscaping. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application and section 106 be approved, subject to the amendments in the addendum.**

128. **FORMER MASTER BREWER SITE, FREEZELAND WAY, HILLINGDON - 4266/APP/2017/3183** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Councillor Alan Chapman declared a non-pecuniary interest as he had prior involvement with the application. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the construction of a residential-led, mixed use development comprising buildings between 4 and 9 storeys to provide 437 residential units (Use Class C3); employment floor space (Use Classes B1(a-c)); flexible commercial floor space (Use Classes A1/A3); associated car and cycle parking; and hard and soft landscaping, plant and other associated ancillary development. Officers made a recommendation for refusal and highlighted the addendum.

Three petitioners addressed the Committee for a period of ten minutes.

The first petitioner spoke on behalf of the Ickenham Residents Association, and submitted that the application should be refused as it was gross overdevelopment of the site. In summary, this application was against the current London Plan, and this site was in suburban area and the density was a problem. The tall buildings would dwarf neighbouring buildings and was out of character with the neighbouring area. The tall building would form a blot on the landscape and views would be permanently marred and the local plans sought to protect these issues. The quality of living would be low for residents as a result of air and noise pollution. Parking pressure and traffic congestion concerns were raised. Ickenham played its part in creating housing. The petitioner asked the Committee to reject the application by way of its height, bulk and design. The profile would mar the skyline, the quality of life for residents would deteriorate, parking and traffic congestion had not been considered and it went against plans. The petitioner requested that the developer listened to resident concerns.

The second petitioner spoke on behalf of Oak Farm Residents Association. The petitioner submitted that the proposed development would need to harmonise with the local area, in order to be considered acceptable by residents. The proposed development would heavily impact on the local character of the area. The proposed increase in scale was too great and the blocks would dwarf its surrounding. There had been no assessment of the impact on local wildlife.

The third petitioner spoke on behalf of the occupants on Ickenham Manor and Long Lane Farm. The petitioner submitted that the applicant had not assessed the impacts of the proposed development on Long Lane farm and their Ickenham Manor assessment was flawed. The sensitivity of Ickenham Manor was very high due to its architectural importance. A high adverse impact was the case in this application as the development would add towers up to 30 metres in height. Long Lane Farm was also a historic building and was the heart of Ickenham's community. The petitioner requested that the application be refused.

The agent of the application addressed the Committee. In summary, the agent submitted that the applicant had undertaken extensive consultations with the planning authority for a period of some 25 months. The application has evolved over time which had resulted in a series of amendments. The current proposals responded to the representations received from local and strategic determining authorities and it was noted that the applicant also sought to respond to technical comments received from the planning authority in the last two weeks, which informed the reasons for refusals. However, it was confirmed that the responses would not be considered by officers and not included in the final decision on the application. The applicant's vision for the development was to provide a high quality development that would revitalise the long term vacant site. It was aimed to be a vibrant site including creation of a new neighbourhood, the delivery of a mix of uses for a sustainable location, new homes and opportunities for local people. The planning authority did not object to the principle of the development of the site. Some of the refusal reasons could be governed by conditions or clarifications. The application was in line with all policies and requested for it to be approved.

In response to Members questions, the agent confirmed that the applicant had engaged in lengthy discussions with the officers.

Councillor Wayne Bridges, Ward Councillor for Hillingdon East, addressed the Committee and stated that the height and density of the application would have a significant and negative impact on the community. Many residents considered that this was an overdevelopment and would be out of character. It did not take into account the impact on local public services, traffic congestion and the impact of overflow. Also residents of the development could also be impacted as a comprehensive noise impact report had not been provided. The Ward Councillor understood the concerns of residents in relation to traffic on Long Lane which was soon to become worse with the construction of HS2. There would be a significant impact on the grid locked area. The Ward Councillor recognised that this site was vacant for many years and hoped that a sensible and pragmatic approach would be used in the development of this site. The Ward Councillor encouraged the Committee to refuse this application.

Members considered that this application ought to be looked at in the context of planning policies. The interests of Hillingdon was crucial and the Committee noted the concerns raised by the local Ward Councillor in respect of detrimental impacts to local residents. Members noted the parking standards and the reliance of vehicles in the Borough. Members were not against development on this site but considered that it had to be the right development in accordance with relevant policies.

The Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration advised the Committee, that ecological mitigation was included as part of refusal reason number 10.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation and amendments in the addendum, subject of Stage 2 referral.**

129. **297 LONG LANE, HILLINGDON - 4860/APP/2018/3719** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the redevelopment of the former dairy depot to provide a 4 storey block containing 36 residential units with associated access, car parking and landscaping. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Officers confirmed that the s106 parking permits condition needed amendments and requested for this to be delegated to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Members considered that there was no impact on residents, outlook or street scene.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

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

- 1) delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to amend the condition regarding permit parking; and**
- 2) the variations in the addendum.**

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.41 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.**