

Minutes



MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 March 2021

Meeting held VIRTUALLY - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman) Alan Chapman Janet Duncan John Morgan John Morse (Opposition Lead) Carol Melvin Becky Hagggar Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration) Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager) Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services) Steve Clarke (Democratic Services Officer) Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
125.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
126.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
127.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2021 be approved as a correct record.</p>
128.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
129.	<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</p>

(Agenda Item 5)

It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.

130. **DOUAY MARTYRS SCHOOL, CARDINAL HUME CAMPUS, 86 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM - 6683/APP/2020/4068** (Agenda Item 6)

Demolition of existing buildings, construction of new single storey permanent school building to rear, construction of temporary teaching accommodation for part of construction period at ground and first floor levels, new hard and soft landscaping (amended plans 18.02.20).

Officers introduced the application highlighting the site within the Douay Martyrs school campus that the application pertained to and that the site was within a conservation area and adjoined a locally listed building. Members were informed that the development would demolish existing single storey blocks within the school and create a permanent single storey building with a temporary first floor to establish a more fit for purpose development. There would also be a single storey temporary ancillary building.

Members were informed that the temporary first floor development would last for 12 months and would be used to provide teaching space whilst Block A was being refurbished. The works regarding Block A would be subject to a separate planning application that was not categorised as a major development.

The Committee were shown images of the existing buildings that the application sought to demolish. These were seen to be in a significant state of disrepair. The application was recommended for approval subject to conditions stated in the officer's report and the outlined Section 106 agreement.

The Committee were generally supportive of the scheme noting that the existing buildings were no longer fit for purpose. It was confirmed that condition 5 would ensure an environmentally friendly green roof is installed once the temporary first floor development has been removed. It was further confirmed by officers that the single storey temporary ancillary building was also subject to a 12-month lifespan and would be removed within that timeframe.

Members queried the loss of privacy impact on 19 Gilbey Close. Officer's acknowledged the element of harm from overlooking to the flank elevation of number 19 Gilbey Close but emphasised that this was temporary due to the 12-month lifespan of the first-floor development. Further to this, and in relation to potential light pollution, Members asked for an additional condition regarding automatic switch-off lighting to be installed.

The Committee requested that the landscaping condition 5.1.c be amended to add a requirement, where possible, that planting was to be as pollution absorbing as possible. It was confirmed by officers that this addition could be made.

Greywater recycling was highlighted as an area where an additional condition may be required. It was noted that the Flood and Water Management Officer was satisfied with the drainage report; it was put forward that either a bespoke greywater recycling condition be added to comply with the drainage report, so long as the report covered greywater recycling, or that a SuDS condition be added requiring further details with regard to greywater recycling.

A query was raised regarding condition 16 in relation to whether the cap on pupil and staff numbers represented an increase in the current permitted numbers. It was confirmed that the numbers did not represent an increase however, there were no previous conditions controlling the number of pupils and staff on-site, hence the need for the condition to be included. It was noted that the Schools Team had advised on the proposed numbers for the pupil and staff cap.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the additional conditions discussed by the Committee and highlighted on the addendum, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved;
- 2) That an amendment be made to condition 5 to include the planting of pollution absorbing trees;
- 3) That an additional condition be implemented with regard to the requirement for automatic switch-off lighting; and
- 4) That either a bespoke greywater recycling condition be added to comply with the drainage report, or that a Sustainable Drainage Systems condition be added requiring further details with regard to greywater recycling.

RESOLVED:

- 5) That the application be approved;
- 6) That an amendment be made to condition 5 to include the planting of pollution absorbing trees;
- 7) That an additional condition be implemented with regard to the requirement for automatic switch-off lighting; and
- 8) That either a bespoke greywater recycling condition be added to comply with the drainage report, or that a Sustainable Drainage Systems condition be added requiring further details with regard to greywater recycling.

131. **KEITH HOUSE, NORTH HYDE ROAD, HAYES - 27189/APP/2020/2181** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Demolition of the existing retail warehouse and re-development of the Site to provide a mixed-use development comprising 150 residential units (Use Class C3) and flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class B1b/B1c), within two development blocks, with associated amenity areas, landscaping, car parking and all ancillary and enabling works.

Officers introduced the item noting that the site was split into two parts, east and west; Members were informed that the application pertained to the west side of the site, it was likely that a separate application would be submitted for the east side of the site.

Members attention was drawn to the addendum which stated that the proposed number of three-bedroom units within the affordable housing allocation had increased from two to four at the request of the Council's Housing team. It was further noted that,

although the overall development would not provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing, it was agreed by officers that amount provided was the maximum viable amount within the tenure that best meets the needs of the Borough.

Members were informed that concerns were raised with regard to the number of proposed parking spaces and the impact on the local highway network. It was noted that proposed parking allocations came to 0.43 spaces per unit which was deemed to be, on balance, acceptable. The site was also deemed to be well connected and that mitigation measures such as highway improvements, parking permit restrictions, a car club scheme and a controlled parking zone review, were all secured by the Section 106 agreement.

Members welcomed the additional three-bedroom affordable housing units but asked for clarification with regard to amenity space and the designated public open space. It was confirmed that the public open space would be accessible by the general public, not just residents of the development. In relation to amenity space, it was noted that private amenity space, such as balconies and roof terraces, had been separately assessed to communal spaces.

A specific concern was raised as to compliance with policy DMCI 4, Open Spaces in New Development; whereby the proposed development was seen to provide a significant shortfall of what is required from the policy. Officer's noted that due to the difficulty of delivering the policy requirement within a scheme such as this, mitigation measures had been put in place of financial contributions to improve local areas of public open space, this was then deemed to be policy compliant.

With regard to daylight and sunlight issues, Members highlighted that 40 rooms out of 144 in the 'affordable block' fail to meet 'no-sky line' target values. It was noted that, although there were daylight and sunlight failures, a scheme such as the one proposed would expect a certain level of daylight and sunlight issues, these weren't deemed significant enough to warrant a reason for refusal.

In relation to the density of units, Members were concerned that the provision of 238 units per square hectare exceeded local policies requiring a maximum of 170 units per square hectare. It was noted that the proposed density was compliant with the requirements of the newly adopted London Plan (2021), albeit since publication of the new London Plan, local policies may have become out of line with acceptable requirements. On balance, officers deemed the density levels to be acceptable. Members were discouraged by the new density limits in the London Plan which were seen to be at the expense of the quality of living environment.

Further concern was raised as to the non-conformity with policy H5 of the London Plan (2021), that there should be a 50% threshold level of affordable housing on gross residential development on Non-Designated Industrial Sites. Members were informed that policy H5 states that there should be a provision of 50% affordable housing unless it is demonstrated through a viability review that the maximum reasonable percentage of affordable housing is being provided. A viability review had been received and the proposed number of affordable housing was deemed the maximum reasonable amount.

Clarification was sought with regard to highways access. It was confirmed that there would be new vehicular access to the site from North Hyde Road and access from Keith Road would be for cyclists and pedestrians only; the proposals had been subject to a road safety audit and were found to be satisfactory.

Members also highlighted a need to add a landscaping condition with regard to the planting of pollution absorbing plants and trees. Officers confirmed that this would be possible.

Though condition 29 of the officer's report confirmed that full details of the mechanical ventilation heat recovery system within the buildings would be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, Members requested the condition be amended to clarify that the entire development demonstrate appropriate mitigation to minimise the risk of overheating of the residential units.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the changes discussed by the Committee and the amendments listed on the addendum, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed by six votes to one, with one abstention.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved;**
- 2) That the relevant condition be amended to include a requirement for pollution absorbing trees; and**
- 3) That condition 29 be divided into two parts for the purposes of clarification.**

132. **23 STONEFIELD WAY, RUISLIP - 25508/APP/2020/4269** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Variation of Conditions 2 (Approved Plans) and 11 (Material Stack Height) of planning permission Ref: 25508/APP/2014/3570 dated 02-03-2015 (Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a Builders Merchants (sui generis use) with associated access, servicing, parking and outdoor storage) to allow for the increase in storage heights within the existing builders yard up to 3 metres around the perimeter of the site and up to 4 metres within the centre of the site, with associated amendments to re-configure the car parking, customer loading bay and servicing area arrangement.

Officers introduced the item noting that the entirety of the site was within a designated business area. In 2015, planning permission was granted for redevelopment of the site to provide a builder's merchant yard, a limit on the height of stacking was imposed within the yard area, this was primarily done for visual amenity reasons. In the years since, a further application was made to increase the height of external stacking in the yard to 5 metres, this was deemed excessive and the application was refused; this decision was appealed against which was subsequently dismissed.

The application in front of Members was to allow a storage height of three metres around the perimeter of the yard and four metres within the centre of the yard. The application was recommended for approval.

The Committee were generally supportive of the application but highlighted some concerns around enforcement of the height limit. It was noted that any breach of the height limit could be reported to the Council by officers, Councillors, or members of the public if they felt the storage height was too high.

The three metre height limit around the perimeter of the yard was highlighted as a

cause for concern as this was higher than the perimeter fence and as such, could pose a safety issue to pedestrians walking by should materials not be secured appropriately. It was noted that the applicant had proposed to install anti-collapse mesh to the stackers which would assist in preventing spillage of materials onto the public highway. Due to the importance of having the anti-collapse mesh installed, Members requested an additional condition ensuring compliance of having the anti-collapse mesh in situ at all times.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the additional condition discussed by Members, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved; and
- 2) That a condition be added in relation to the implementation and retention of anti-collapse mesh.

133. **19-22 CHIPPENDALE WAYE, UXBRIDGE - 67544/APP/2020/3709** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) for planning consent reference 67544/APP/2019/1978 dated 11-06-19 for the Erection of a block of 12 No. flats comprising of 7x1 bed, 4x2 bed and 1x3 bed apartments with associated parking, landscaping, access and amenity. The proposed changes are as follows: 1) Flat 1 extended to the rear to provide M4(3) requirement. 2) Flat 5 extended to the rear as per Flat 1 to simplify construction. 3) Lift/Stair core mirrored internally. 4) Rear elevation behind lift core goes up to main roof to simplify construction. 5) Balcony support posts added to simplify construction. 6) Roof over Flat 12 balcony removed to simplify construction.

Officers introduced the item noting that the application sought to vary previously approved plans to make minor changes to the development as listed in the officer's report; namely that flat 1 was to be extended to the rear to provide M4(3) requirement. The application was recommended for approval and it was highlighted that the development would still be subject to all conditions and head of terms that were previously imposed.

Members were encouraged by the development now meeting M4(3) requirement. The officers' recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

134. **BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL, OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR A MOTORWAY SERVICE AREA BETWEEN M25 JUNCTIONS 15 AND 16 NEAR IVER HEATH - 39707/APP/2021/177** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Out of Borough consultation for outline application for a Motorway Service Area between M25 junctions 15 and 16 near Iver Heath with all matters reserved, comprising vehicular access from the M25, a controlled vehicular access from the A4007 for staff and emergency vehicles only, facilities buildings, Drive-Thrus, fuel filling stations, electric vehicle charging, hotel, parking facilities, service yard, vehicle circulation, landscaping, woodland and amenity spaces, a Sustainable Drainage Systems, a diverted public bridleway; together with

associated mitigation and infrastructure and with earthworks / enabling works including mineral extraction.

Officers introduced the item noting several areas of concern regarding the proposed development as listed in the report; namely that a separate access route for Motorway Service Area staff, as outlined in the proposed plans, was deemed unnecessary.

The officer's recommendation was that an objection be raised on behalf of the London Borough of Hillingdon in relation the application.

Members echoed the concerns of officers and criticised the number of proposed Motorway Service Areas within a relatively short distance from one another, in addition to being planned on land within the Green Belt.

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

RESOLVED: That delegated powers be given to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration to issue a response to Buckinghamshire County Council objecting to the application.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.10 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steve Clarke on 01895 250693 or email: sclarke2@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.