

## Minutes



**MAJOR** Applications Planning Committee

**15 July 2020**

**Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London**

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, John Morgan, John Morse, Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin, Becky Haggard and Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer), Richard Phillips (Principal Planning Officer) and James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration)</p>
29.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Eddie Lavery with Councillor Alan Chapman substituting for him.</p>
30.	<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>
31.	<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 of the meeting dated 16 June 2020 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
32.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
33.	<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 items were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
34.	<p><b>THE FORMER STAR PH, HILLINGDON - 8057/APP/2019/3862</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a part 4, part 5 storey building accommodating 14 dwellings (9 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed flats) and commercial space, and the erection of a separate 2 storey building with roof accommodation to provide 2 x 3 bed houses, car and cycle parking and private and communal amenity space.</p>

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that there was planning history on the site including a number of schemes dismissed at appeal. The development was considered to be acceptable in many respects, but was recommended for refusal due to concerns regarding its height, scale and bulk. It was felt that the proposed development would be incongruous as it would fail to respect the established pattern within the street scene and would not contribute positively to the area's character. Moreover, the Committee was advised that the scheme had not secured a Section 106 agreement to mitigate its development impacts.

A written submission in support of the application had been received from petitioners. Key points highlighted included:

- The regeneration of the brownfield land would provide new homes for local residents who were desperately in need of housing;
- The homes would be of a good size and quality with over one third of them being family homes of 3-beds or more;
- The new shop would assist in regenerating the parade and surrounding area which would, in turn, assist in the recovery of the local economy in a post-Covid world, providing a new business and new job opportunities;
- The development would help in the provision of jobs to aid the economic recovery both locally and nationally.

A further written submission had been received from the agent for the application. Members were advised that:

- The applicant was agreeable to all the Section 106 requirements agreed for the second scheme which had been recommended for approval;
- The scheme in question was identical to the second scheme in all respects, with the exception of the proposed additional floor in the apartment block;
- Buildings along the Uxbridge Road mainly comprised shopping parades with flats above and a variety of commercial premises, many of which were in a state of disrepair. Architectural styles varied;
- There were examples of taller buildings including Legion House (854 -864) and the building on the corner of Pole Hill Road; these did not appear to be out of keeping with the street scene;
- The proposed four storey block would be set back between 2 and 3 metres with three storey façade. The proposed five storey block had the same set back from the facades making it akin to the aforementioned examples;
- The scope for regeneration in the road was immense. Higher buildings would create higher land values that encouraged development;
- 3 objections had been received which did not relate to the scale of the proposed development. 3 letters of support and a petition in support signed by 91 local people had been received. 15 additional letters of support had been submitted more recently;
- The benefits of the proposal included - use of a vacant brownfield site, well-designed buildings respectful of neighbouring amenity, commercial unit to ensure vibrancy of the local economy, provision of much needed housing, a developer ready to commence work; dwellings which met or exceeded space standards – all with private outside space, flats with balcony / terrace, 4 family dwellings, well-designed communal garden, amenity space which exceeded the Council standards, the opportunity for the adjoining Transport House to be developed at a similar scale and significant CIL payments

Members expressed concerns regarding the height and scale of the proposed development and the Committee commented that it would amount to over-development and would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. Further concerns were raised regarding disability access and air quality. The Committee was advised that, although preferable, two lifts were not deemed to be essential in a scheme of this size. It was confirmed that the matter of air quality was covered in the reasons for refusal. Members requested further clarification regarding screening between apartment 4's bedroom and the garden area. It was confirmed that the floor plan was somewhat deceptive and, in reality, the windows were considerably higher than the garden and there would be no overlooking issue. In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that soundproofing to the door serving the amenity space was not necessary. Moreover, Members were informed that the platform lift would be used infrequently therefore soundproofing would not be required.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

35. **THE FORMER STAR PH, HILLINGDON - 8057/APP/2019/3861** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of a part 3, part 4 storey building accommodating 10 dwellings (6 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed flats); 112 sqm of commercial space at ground floor level with car and cycle parking and private and communal amenity space and erection of a 2 storey building with roof accommodation comprising 2 x 3 bed houses, car and cycle parking and private amenity space.**

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that this application was very similar to the scheme considered under item 6, but was a smaller development with a lower flatted block. The scheme was considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbours, quality, accessibility and highway impacts. The access officer had expressed concerns regarding the inclusion of only one lift in the development. However, it was noted that a Condition was included in the addendum requiring details of a lift maintenance and repair strategy to be submitted. The application was recommended for approval subject to a Section 106 agreement and the recommended Conditions.

In response to questions from the Committee it was noted that, according to the plans, units 4, 8 and 10 did not appear to have doorways to access their balconies. This was an oversight in the drawings and it was agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to amend the relevant planning Condition to ensure that all units had access to their balconies.

Members requested that the parking spaces be allocated solely for the use of residents of the flats. It was agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to add a Condition in relation to allocated parking for the development. Councillors commented that they were strongly in support of the inclusion of Condition 7 which required an energy assessment to be submitted to demonstrate how the development would achieve a zero carbon target.

Members requested further clarification regarding the development's parking spaces and asked if these could be active or passive electrical charging points. It was agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to ensure the best possible outcome in terms of the provision of electrical charging points. In response to questions

from the Committee it was further confirmed that opening hours at the Commercial Unit to the front of the development would be restricted as set out in Condition 21 of the officer's report.

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

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be approved + Section 106;
- 2) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to amend the relevant planning Condition to ensure all units have doors to access balconies;
- 3) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to add a Condition in relation to allocated parking for the development;
- 4) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to ensure the best possible outcome in terms of the provision of electrical charging points.

36. **OUT OF BOROUGH CONSULTATION, UNIT 5 BULLS BRIDGE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE HAYES - 39705/APP/2020/1560** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Out of Borough Consultation by LB Hounslow:**

**Site: Unit 5, Bulls Bridge Industrial Estate, Hayes**

**Proposals: Change of use from A1 (non-food) retail to open A1 (including food) retail, subdivision of the existing unit to form two A1 retail units, car park reconfiguration, external alterations and associated works (LB Hounslow ref: P/2019/3227)**

Officers introduced the application and advised Members that, although not within the Borough, the proposal had the potential to have an impact on the London Borough of Hillingdon. Members were informed that the Council's policy team objected to the proposal on the basis of an inadequate sequential test and impact assessment, including the failure to assess the impact of Covid-19. It was considered that the proposal could have a detrimental impact on the viability and vitality of Hayes Town Centre and the Uxbridge Road, Hayes Minor Centre. It was recommended that an objection be raised to the application as it contravened policy.

Members noted that we were in a changing situation and queried whether this would stand up under appeal. However, it was noted that the application contravened planning policies. Members had no further comments.

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

**RESOLVED: That the London Borough of Hillingdon objects to the proposal.**

37. **THE DICE SITE, ST ANDREWS, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2019/771** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**This item was withdrawn prior to commencement of the meeting.**

38. **FRAYS COURT, 71-72 COWLEY ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 13010/APP/2020/1758**  
*(Agenda Item 10)*

**Change of use from offices (Use Class B1a) to residential (Use Class C3) to accommodate 23 residential units (Application for Prior Approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)).**

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that a previous proposal for the conversion of the office building to 19 residential units was approved in May 2020. The current application would increase the number of units by 4. The proposal could only be considered against transport and highways impacts, contamination risks, flooding risks, the impact of noise from commercial premises on future residential occupiers. Members were advised that officers recommended that prior approval be granted.

Councillors commented that the proposed development was close to the town centre and would provide useful accommodation for people working nearby. Members enquired whether a Condition could be put in place restricting this development to a maximum of 24 units. It was confirmed that the internal sub-division of the development was not within the Council's control. Should the developers wish to increase the number of units in the future, they would need to reapply and the new application would then be assessed on its merits.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved + Section 106**

39. **SOUTHLANDS ART CENTRE THE GREEN, WEST DRAYTON - 12569/APP/2020/1585**  
*(Agenda Item 11)*

**Change colour of external doors and re-build steps on entrance path (Retrospective) (Listed Building Consent).**

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that the site comprised of a Grade II Listed Building established in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. The site was located within the West Drayton Green Conservation Area, Green Belt and Air Quality Management Area. Councillors were advised that the proposed change in colour was to improve the appearance of the building and the re-building of the steps was to improve access. The Council's Conservation and Urban Design Officer and Tree and Landscape Officer had raised no objections. The application was considered appropriate and was recommended for approval.

Members raised no objections noting that it was a fantastic site which was well worth a visit.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.20 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250636 or email (recommended): [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk). 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.**