

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

13 October 2020

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman), Janet Duncan, John Morgan, John Morse (Opposition Lead), Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin, Mohinder Birah (In place of Raju Sansarpuri) and Alan Chapman (In place of Becky Haggar)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager) and Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services)</p>
66.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sansarpuri and Haggar. Councillors Birah and Haggar were present as their respective substitutes.</p>
67.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Tuckwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 8, Bourne Court, as he had previously held discussions with petitioners, as well as local residents regarding the site.</p> <p>Councillor Tuckwell advised he would turn off his camera and mute his microphone when the item was considered, and would therefore take no part in the discussion or vote for the item.</p>
68.	<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 15 September 2020 be approved as a correct record.</p>
69.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items 6 & 7 had been withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
70.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p>

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

71. **ST JOHN'S SCHOOL - 10795/APP/2020/1218** (*Agenda Item 6*)

The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

72. **ST JOHN'S SCHOOL - 10795/APP/2020/1520** (*Agenda Item 7*)

The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

73. **BOURNE COURT - 11891/APP/2020/20** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and addendum, highlighting that the application would provide 100% affordable housing. The addendum was confirmed to set out minor amendments to planning conditions. As the applications sought only 9 additional units over the previously approved scheme, with affordable housing, the application was deemed acceptable, and was therefore recommended for approval.

By way of written submission, petitioners objecting to the application made a number of points, including:

- The latest proposed planning application aimed to infill the Blocks A and B to form one block, increasing the number of units from 87 to 98, and reducing the number of parking spaces from 96 spaces to 64 spaces. By infilling the block, residents would face one solid wall of apartments, with no relief.
- The proposal would remove the open aspect of the previous plan, which was valued highly, but would also sacrifice 23 car parking spaces.
- Apart from the two blocks of flats adjoining Bourne Court, all surrounding streets on the application side of the railway comprised houses and bungalows. The proposed block of 98 units would change the nature of the area and street scene.
- Parking spaces in South Ruislip were severely restricted, necessitating a residents-only parking scheme operating in most streets surrounding the site from 9-5, weekdays. The previous application for 87 units, with 87 parking spaces, was originally deferred for further consideration, and it was considered that a 'parking allocation planning' condition was essential, and the officers report recommended a near 1:1 parking ratio to limit impact on existing residents.
- The latest application ignored these recommendations, offering just 64 parking spaces for 87 apartments. The addition of 2 car club spaces (only one on site) would do little to mitigate the envisaged prospective competition for parking spaces.
- It was understood that Clearview Homes wish to achieve the maximum density by increasing the number of units on-site. This was borne out by the progression of previous applications:
 - 49 units Jan 2014
 - 69 units Nov 2016
 - 107 units Sept 2018 (turned down)
 - 87 units June 2019
 - 98 units in 1 block 2020
- Residents felt that the increase was unreasonable and would result in an overcrowded site with insufficient parking spaces.
- Many local residents had expressed concern at the prospect of 100% social housing if this meant a large proportion would be rented properties. It was

hoped that the Council would support maintaining a good mix of home owners and a smaller number of rental properties to maintain the current nature of the area.

- The pedestrian footpath which ran from behind the substation, to the rear of Canfield Drive and out to Station Approach, no longer existed. This had been blocked and absorbed by the new Acol Crescent site. Consequently, there would be no pedestrian exit from this corner of the site.

By way of written submission, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant made a number of points, including:

- The principle of residential development on this site had already been established. The application site was a designated residential allocation in the adopted Local Plan and the site also had two extant and implementable permissions for residential development. This outline application for 96 units was effectively an amendment to the 87-unit scheme approved by the committee last year, with the primary amendment being the infill of a gap between the front and rear blocks to provide an additional 9 units.
- The extant permission was for an all-private tenure scheme, with an in-lieu affordable housing payment. This outline application was for 100% affordable tenure on the site, which was a significant enhanced position for the Council in delivering housing and affordable units in the Borough.
- The car and cycle parking spaces were compliant with the objectives and policies of the draft new London Plan, which aimed to reduce the reliance on car travel in London in accessible locations such as Bourne Court.
- The site was considered to be in a sustainable location with excellent access to a range of local shops and services. South Ruislip station was located 200m from the site, which provided services into central London and several bus stops. The vast majority of central London could be accessed from the application site within 30-60 minutes, being a normal commute. This demonstrated the site's high level of accessibility and support for reduced parking.
- The scheme now proposed two car club spaces. These would provide an additional benefit for wider usage of the car club by existing residents of Bourne Court and surrounding roads. The proposal for two car club spaces had been supported and fully endorsed by Enterprise Car Club, an operation already running successful schemes in the Borough.
- With the inclusion of the two car club spaces (equivalent to a minimum of 1:8 spaces per car club vehicle) this equated to 80 parking spaces on the site, and a parking ratio of 0.83. This level and type of parking provision was endorsed by Hillingdon Highways Officers and similarly supported in other recent Council and GLA decisions for reduced parking in such accessible locations.
- The Officer's report stated that the application was considered acceptable with regard to its design and relationship with the street scene, neighbour amenity, access, security, highways, landscaping, ecology, refuse, energy, flooding, noise and contaminated land, which in combination reinforced the sustainable credentials of this redevelopment scheme, in support of national housing and design objectives and policies.
- In response to the petitioners' objections, there would be no change to the design fronting Bourne Court or height of the block, as already approved in the 87 unit and implementable scheme. The reduced parking provision was appropriate, consistent with sustainable travel objectives and achieved overall betterment with the provision of two car club spaces, electric charging points, resident parking permit restriction and resident Travel Plan.

- The proposed development would deliver an additional nine units but moreover 100% affordable housing on-site. This enhanced proposal accorded with the objectives of sustainable development in the NPPF, the recently published Planning White Paper and policies in the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan and the draft London Plan.
- Substantial betterment would be delivered by this latest proposal, which would bring a long term vacant and previously developed accessible urban site back into affordable housing use.

Members discussed the application, and while some concerns were raised regarding the reduction in parking provision, Members were pleased with the scheme's commitment to affordable housing, and on balance it was felt that the proposal was acceptable. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

74. **TAVISTOCK WORKS - 35810/APP/2020/187** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that while officers had worked pro-actively with the applicant through negotiations to address issues wherever possible, both at preapplication and application stage, the scheme failed to comply with the Development Plan for the reasons identified in this report. On this basis, it was recommended that the application be refused.

By way of written submission, supported by a brief slide presentation and animated video, a petitioner objecting to the application made a number of points:

- The density of the planned building was not in accordance with Local Plan Policy DMHB17 and London Plan density guidelines. For flatted schemes, the acceptable density range was 150 to 250 u/ha. The current proposal, at 485 units/ha far exceeded the acceptable range detailed.
- The proposal had not considered any of the adjacent buildings and it proposed an 8 story wall that would be erected in front of Padcroft residents' windows.
- Policy 5.38 stated that a minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms was required. Hillingdon's 'Residential Layouts' Design Guidance advised a minimum distance of 15 metres between main windows of habitable rooms and a flank wall of a new development. The Tavistock Works proposal did not respect these guidelines in any measure. The wall of the proposed building was located only 1.1 m away from master bedroom windows in Fitzroy Court, which as 92% lower than Council guidelines. In addition, residents of Yardley Court would be impacted by direct overlooking from the proposed balcony and habitable room windows located only 13 m away from their living rooms. This was 40% below the Council guidelines.
- Should this planning application be approved, an unreasonable level of overlooking would exist between residents habitable rooms and the building erected, resulting in a complete loss of privacy, increased sense of enclosure, complete loss of outlook and adversely impacting residents ability to enjoy sunlight and daylight.
- Policy 5.41 explained that the Council aimed to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight and sunlight and unacceptable overshadowing caused by new development on habitable rooms. According to the Daylight & Sunlight Amenity Study, 40% of Fitzroy Court habitable room windows tested would not meet VSC targets if the proposed building was developed. In addition, 11 of Fitzroy Court

bedrooms would not meet BRE criteria for the daylight distribution. For example, bedrooms on the first floor of Fitzroy Court would suffer 93% loss of VSC, 100% loss of sunlight and 90.5% loss of daylight.

- The current proposal would have detrimental impact upon shared residential amenities as the building would severely overshadow residential gardens.
- Within Fitzroy Court, 14 bedrooms would suffer severe loss of outlook from their bedroom windows. All bedrooms facing Tavistock Road would now be viewing an 8 story blank wall within the distance of 1.2- 9m. This would severely impact residents and children of residents' mental health.
- There were concerns about the proximity of the proposed building in relation to resident balconies and windows, which would only 1.2m-4m away from the proposed building, given that Padcroft balconies are combustible.
- Overall, as identified, the proposal is overbearing and over-developed, due to its bulk, shape and height, it would have a detrimental and harmful impact on Padcroft residential amenities, outlook, complete loss of sunlight in some instances, and a disregard to proximity guidelines.

The Head of Planning advised Members that officers could not verify the accuracy of the fly-through component (animated video) of the petitioner's presentation.

Members discussed the application, and supported the officer's recommendation for refusal, for the reasons as set out in the report. However, it was suggested that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to amend reason for refusal no. 2, to include reasons of noise and disturbance, together with the addition of Noise Policy EM8. This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be refused; and**
- 2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to amend reason for refusal no. 2 to include reasons of noise and disturbance, together with the addition of Noise Policy EM8.**

75. LAND AT BULLS BRIDGE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, NORTH HYDE GARDENS - 75111/APP/2020/1955 (Agenda Item 10)

Officers introduced the application, and highlighted the extant permission on site, together with the positive impact the building would have on the economy of Hayes. The building was confirmed to be sited away from any residential properties thereby avoiding any potential adverse impact on residents. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Members were supportive of the application, and particularly the positive impact it would have on the regeneration of the area. The officer's recommendation was therefore moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

76. ALLPORT HOUSE - 46104/APP/2020/789 (Agenda Item 11)

Officers introduced the report, and highlighted that while the Committee would normally only consider developments of 10 units or more, the development had the ability to support more than the proposed 9 units, which were themselves oversized. The application was therefore presented for consideration by the Committee.

Officers confirmed that an in-lieu affordable housing contribution of £116,000 had been agreed with the applicant, alongside a review mechanism for potential future affordable housing.

The application was deemed acceptable, and was therefore recommended for approval.

Members were supportive of the application, but asked that a condition to prevent overheating be added. The officer's recommendation, together with this condition, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.*

*Nb. Councillor Birah did not take part in the vote on this item due to loss of connection.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be approved, and**
- 2. That a condition to prevent overheating be added.**

77. TRADE CITY - 3114/APP/2020/303 (Agenda Item 12)

Officers introduced the application, and reminded the Committee that the application had been presented to the Major Applications Planning Committee on 15 September 2020, where it was given a resolution to grant planning permission subject to the inclusion of a condition prohibiting vehicles over 7.5tonnes from entering or exiting the development between 9pm and 7am on any day. However, it was confirmed that the condition had not been agreed with the applicant, as the applicant felt that 24 hour operation of the site was crucial to their business.

The report detailed the results of independent CCTV surveys conducted at the site's access point, which showed a large number of vehicle movements overnight. It was therefore considered that the proposed development would not add additional harm over current operations at the site. The application was therefore recommended for approval, without a condition relating to use of vehicles overnight.

Members referenced a condition regarding idling vehicles that had been suggested at the September meeting, which appeared to be missing from the current report. Officers advised that this was an oversight, and the condition would be included, if the application was approved. It was also suggested that an informative be included relating to use of vehicles adhering to Euro 6 emissions standards, as part of the low emissions strategy.

Some Members opposed the application, citing concerns that the number of large vehicles frequenting the site would have a serious adverse impact on residents living within Cowley Mill Road and other nearby areas, due to issues of noise and disturbance. It was also suggested that the figures cited within the CCTV survey could significantly increased once the proposed development was in operation.

Other Members were supportive of the application, citing the precedent of the Royal Mail Depot, currently in operation. The officer's recommendation to approve, subject the condition on idling vehicles and informative on the Euro 6 emissions standards being added, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed by a vote of five to two, with one abstention.

RESOLVED:

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That the application be approved;2. That a condition on vehicle idling be added; and3. That an informative be added to seek the use of vehicles meeting the Euro 6 emissions standard as part of the low emission strategy. |
| The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.38 pm. |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on 01895 250636 or email (recommended): democratic@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.