

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

19 May 2021

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan. John Morgan, John Morse (Opposition Lead), David Yarrow (in place of Carol Melvin), Becky Haggar and Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager) and Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager)</p>
146.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Carol Melvin with Councillor David Yarrow substituting.</p>
147.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
148.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 21 APRIL 2021 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 21 April 2021 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
149.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
150.	<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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items 1 – 11 were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>

151.	<p>EXTENDING WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS IN LIEU OF PHYSICAL SPEAKING RIGHTS (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee agreed to permit those parties with valid speaking rights at planning committee meetings to continue to submit written representations in lieu of attending to speak in person, as set out in the updated Protocol (Appendix A).</p>
152.	<p>5 OTTER HOUSE, COWLEY BUSINESS PARK, COWLEY - 63329/APP/2021/1326 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from offices (Use Class B1a) to residential use (Use Class C3) to create 36 studio apartments (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)).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval. Applications 63329/APP/2021/1326 and 53180/APP/2021/1325 were heard together however the Committee voted on the items separately.</p> <p>A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to a presentation that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. The Committee was informed that two petitions had been submitted in objection of the applications, with one of petitions having over 1100 signatures. It was acknowledged that only certain factors could be taken into consideration when determining the applications, however petitioner concerns were reiterated to the Committee. A history of the site, land conditions and agreements were outlined, and it was emphasised that this once an idyllic meadow between two water ways. Concerns were raised regarding the protection of the diverse wildlife and the protection of residential privacy and amenities. Concerns were also raised regarding the deterioration of the corridor that could lead to fragmentation of the links in the green chain. It was questioned how the wildlife would be protected and also how the Council could maintain strategic pledges whilst risking the wildlife corridor.</p> <p>It was noted that other office spaces in Hillingdon had been granted Article 4 Directions and questions were raised why it had not been done in this site given the impact of the pandemic. It was submitted that the impact of traffic was underestimated particularly in light of additional residents living in the area and additional online deliveries. Concerns were further raised regarding pollution, contamination, flood risk and the pressures on sewage and waste disposal with the additional residents living in the area, loss of amenity and character. It was questioned whether a friendly fence could be erected to protect the wildlife. It was noted that authorities had a duty to preserve nature for future generations, as once it had gone, it had gone. The Committee was encouraged to comply with pledges made and it was asked whether the change of use could be stopped in order to preserve the rich habitat to avoid the fragmentation of the wider green corridor, the safety and privacy and amenities of residents and the character of the area.</p> <p>In response to Member questions to the petitioner, it was confirmed that the woodlands had pumps to avoid flooding however due to the level of water it was difficult to manage and pumps needed to be used continually to control the level of water. It was unclear who maintained the pumps.</p>

The agent for both the applications addressed the Committee highlighting that the office was vacant and 39 apartments for Otter House and 29 apartments for Water House had been proposed. Housing shortage was a factor in the development purpose. Otter House included 76 parking space with cycle and refuse provisions, 36 onsite, 4 disabled and 4 visitor spaces. Waterside House had 106 car spaces, with cycle and refuse provision .51 on site, 4 one site and 4 visitor spaces. Given the onsite availability, there was no adverse impact on highways safety or surrounding roads. The wider site had no known contamination risks. Although the site was located in a flood risk level one area, the change of use would not increase this. The current scheme had been reviewed and confirmed as acceptable subject to a maintenance plan. It was confirmed that there was not expected to be any impact on noise which had been confirmed by officers. The plans showed that each apartment would benefit from good levels of natural light. The significant local interest was noted, however the scheme remained compliant with relevant assessment criterias and was acceptable. Further, this was demonstrated by the Council's approval of previous applications at the site in 2020. The site had also remained vacant for several years and remained occupied by squatters and different communities. The development would contribute to housing and make good use of land that added positive contribution to the wider area. The Committee was urged to approve the applications in line with officer recommendations.

In response to Members questions, it was noted that the wider landscape area was under the management of the business park management. Although the additional carpark spaces did not meet the maximum criteria, it was clarified that one space per dwelling was adequate. It was also clarified that the agent was unaware of any covenants on the site and the windows were large and served every habitable room.

The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration informed the Committee that the planning system had changed significantly and only the five material planning considerations were permitted to be considered. It was highlighted that they were all studio flats and the parking allocation was sufficient. The proposal could was unpreventable, however conditions had been proposed to control the proposals. A condition preventing access was important and would address the issues relating to woodland, security and ecology. Other conditions had already been imposed, but this one was very important. The Committee was advised that the pumps could be conditioned to ensure that they would be maintained and an informative relating to wildlife and protective species could be imposed to address some of the petitioner concerns.

Members noted that this was a prior approval application and only material planning considerations could be taken into account. Following officer clarification, it was noted that the development would most likely see 20 cars during the am rush hour peak and this could be accommodated by the network. The Committee discussed the increase in deliveries and amending condition 3 to include a delivery bay on site.

It was confirmed that air quality was not a material planning consideration and the site was located in flood risk zone 1 which was in the lowest risk area. However, the Committee considered that a condition regarding pumps would alleviate flooding concerns.

Subject to reviewing the conditions to update the number of visitor car parking spaces at both Otter House and Waterside House, adding a delivery bay of both sites, adding a condition regarding the maintenance of the Frays River pumps and information regarding protective species, the officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with seven Members voting in favour and one abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to the additional information in the addendum and conditions.

153. **FORMER NESTLE FACTORY, NESTLES AVENUE - 1331/APP/2021/751** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Section 73 application seeking a variation to Condition 61 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission ref: 1331/APP/2019/1666 dated 11-09-20 (Section 73 application to vary Condition 9 (Residential Condition - Approved Plans) of planning permission ref: 1331/APP/2017/1883 dated 28/06/2018 (Part demolition of existing factory buildings and associated structures, and redevelopment to provide residential dwellings (Use Class C3), office, retail, community and leisure uses (Use Class A1/A3/A4/B1/B8/D1/D2), commercial floorspace (Use Classes B1c/B2/B8) and Data Centre (Sui Generis), amenity and playspace, landscaping, allotments, access, service yards, associated car parking and other engineering works) (as amended by application ref: 1331/APP/2020/50 dated 06/02/20)).

The amendments to the approved plan proposed: Alteration to the elevations of Unit 4 involving 4 no. new loading docks (totalling 12 no. with 8 loading docks permitted by planning permission ref: 1331/APP/2017/1883 (as amended)), 1 no. roller door and 2 no. pedestrian doors, and the alteration to the dock pit, and minor alteration to internal layout to office.

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members considered that the amendments to the application were good and noted that they attracted economic development.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation and the additional information in the addendum.

154. **T C M HOUSE, NEWPORT ROAD, HAYES - 61202/APP/2021/847** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Section 73 application to vary Condition 2 (Approved Plans) and Condition 4 (SuDS) for a Minor Material Amendment (MMA) to planning permission ref. 61202/APP/2019/3510 (Demolition of three existing buildings (Use Classes B1(a) and B1(c)) and erection of a four storey residential hostel building (Sui Generis) containing 28 units, comprising 13 x 1-bedroom, 8 x 2-bedroom and 7 x 3-bedroom dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping and children's play area).

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

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

155. **1 & 1A BATH ROAD, HEATHROW - 35805/APP/2020/3289** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection

of a six storey 237-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) (landscaping reserved for subsequent approval).

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation and section 106.

156. **TAYLOR WOODROW DEPOT, BROADMEAD ROAD, YEADING - 327/APP/2020/2840** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Deed of Variation to Section 106 associated with planning permission ref: 327/APP/2000/2106 dated 17/5/02:-

'Phased redevelopment and part refurbishment of site/buildings (currently used for general industrial/ storage, offices and sports complex purposes) which straddles Hillingdon and Ealing boroughs, to provide mixed use, 1 to 8 storeys, development, comprising 705 residential units including 18 live/work units, (446 one, two and three-bedroom flats and 259 three, four and five-bedroom houses - 3,088 habitable rooms overall), and non- residential/commercial as follows - 7,900 sq metres new offices; 7,520 sq metres refurbished offices, 680 sq metres light industrial/workshops retained for use as managed workspace, 100 sq metres wardens office/meeting rooms, 100 sq metres tele-working centre, 560 sq metres retail, 550 sq metres community facilities, 240 sq metres restaurant, 480 sq metres creche, 200 sq metres ancillary commercial floorspace to canal basin area, 1,500 sq metres separate health facility, 4,945 sq metres (gross floor area) sports complex, together with childrens' play/ adventure play areas, youth shelter, sports pitches, parkland landscaping and wildlife area, new canal basin, new bridge over canal and rebuilding of existing bridge, amenity open space, road infrastructure - with vehicular access from Ruislip Road and Broadmead Road, and associated servicing and car parking (outline application with environmental impact statement)

(This permission relates to that part of the development which falls within Hillingdon and comprises mixed residential development at a density which shall not exceed 40 dwellings per hectare, a sports complex, sports pavilion and youth shelter with associated landscaping and parking)'.

The S106 modification sought is to modify the current mortgagee exclusion clause contained in Schedule 2 (Affordable Housing), Part 1, Paragraph 9 for Nos. 31 - 37 (odd) Broadmead Road, 1 - 12 (inclusive) Avon House, 1 Ballinger Way and 1 - 6 (inclusive) Bridgewater House, 3 Ballinger Way.

Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.

Members supported the officer's recommendation which was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation and section 106.

157. **4 WATERSIDE HOUSE, COWLEY BUSINESS PARK - 53180/APP/2021/1325**
(Agenda Item 12)

Change of use from offices (Use Class B1a) to residential use (Use Class C3) to create 36 studio apartments (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, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval. Applications 63329/APP/2021/1326 and 53180/APP/2021/1325 were heard together however the Committee voted on the items separately.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to a presentation that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. The Committee was informed that two petitions had been submitted in objection of the applications, with one of petitions having over 1100 signatures. It was acknowledged that only certain factors could be taken into consideration when determining the applications, however petitioner concerns were reiterated to the Committee. A history of the site, land conditions and agreements were outlined, and it was emphasised that this once an idyllic meadow between two water ways. Concerns were raised regarding the protection of the diverse wildlife and the protection of residential privacy and amenities. Concerns were also raised regarding the deterioration of the corridor that could lead to fragmentation of the links in the green chain. It was questioned how the wildlife would be protected and also how the Council could maintain strategic pledges whilst risking the wildlife corridor.

It was noted that other office spaces in Hillingdon had been granted Article 4 Directions and questions were raised why it had not been done in this site given the impact of the pandemic. It was submitted that the impact of traffic was underestimated particularly in light of additional residents living in the area and additional online deliveries. Concerns were further raised regarding pollution, contamination, flood risk and the pressures on sewage and waste disposal with the additional residents living in the area, loss of amenity and character. It was questioned whether a friendly fence could be erected to protect the wildlife. It was noted that authorities had a duty to preserve nature for future generations, as once it had gone, it had gone. The Committee was encouraged to comply with pledges made and it was asked whether the change of use could be stopped in order to preserve the rich habitat to avoid the fragmentation of the wider green corridor, the safety and privacy and amenities of residents and the character of the area.

In response to Member questions to the petitioner, it was confirmed that the woodlands had pumps to avoid flooding however due to the level of water it was difficult to manage and pumps needed to be used continually to control the level of water. It was unclear who maintained the pumps.

The agent for both the applications addressed the Committee highlighting that the office was vacant and 39 apartments for Otter House and 29 apartments for Water House had been proposed. Housing shortage was a factor in the development purpose. Otter House included 76 parking space with cycle and refuse provisions, 36 onsite, 4 disabled and 4 visitor spaces. Waterside House had 106 car spaces, with cycle and refuse provision .51 on site, 4 one site and 4 visitor spaces. Given the onsite availability, there was no adverse impact on highways safety or surrounding roads. The wider site had no known contamination risks. Although the site was located in a flood

risk level one area, the change of use would not increase this. The current scheme had been reviewed and confirmed as acceptable subject to a maintenance plan. It was confirmed that there was not expected to be any impact on noise which had been confirmed by officers. The plans showed that each apartment would benefit from good levels of natural light. The significant local interest was noted, however the scheme remained compliant with relevant assessment criterias and was acceptable. Further, this was demonstrated by the Council's approval of previous applications at the site in 2020. The site had also remained vacant for several years and remained occupied by squatters and different communities. The development would contribute to housing and make good use of land that added positive contribution to the wider area. The Committee was urged to approve the applications in line with officer recommendations.

In response to Members questions, it was noted that the wider landscape area was under the management of the business park management. Although the additional carpark spaces did not meet the maximum criteria, it was clarified that one space per dwelling was adequate. It was also clarified that the agent was unaware of any covenants on the site and the windows were large and served every habitable room.

The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration informed the Committee that the planning system had changed significantly and only the five material planning considerations were permitted to be considered. It was highlighted that they were all studio flats and the parking allocation was sufficient. The proposal could be unpreventable, however conditions had been proposed to control the proposals. A condition preventing access was important and would address the issues relating to woodland, security and ecology. Other conditions had already been imposed, but this one was very important. The Committee was advised that the pumps could be conditioned to ensure that they would be maintained and an informative relating to wildlife and protective species could be imposed to address some of the petitioner concerns.

Members noted that this was a prior approval application and only material planning considerations could be taken into account. Following officer clarification, it was noted that the development would most likely see 20 cars during the am rush hour peak and this could be accommodated by the network. The Committee discussed the increase in deliveries and amending condition 3 to include a delivery bay on site.

It was confirmed that air quality was not a material planning consideration and the site was located in flood risk zone 1 which was in the lowest risk area. However, the Committee considered that a condition regarding pumps would alleviate flooding concerns.

Subject to reviewing the conditions to update the number of visitor car parking spaces at both Otter House and Waterside House, adding a delivery bay of both sites, adding a condition regarding the maintenance of the Frays River pumps and information regarding protective species, the officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with seven Members voting in favour and one abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to the additional information in the addendum and conditions.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.11 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the

resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 250636 or email (recommended):
ateji@hillington.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.