

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

16 November 2021

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Henry Higgins (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Philip Corthorne, Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead), Jas Dhot and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration), Nicole Cameron (Principal Lawyer – Planning and Corporate), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Team Manager) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
53.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
54.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
55.	<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 on 14 October 2021 be approved as an accurate record subject to amending Councillor Alan Chapman's attendance.</p>
56.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
57.	<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> <p>It was confirmed that agenda items 6 – 8 were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>

58. **HIGHGROVE HOUSE LIDGOULD GROVE, RUISLIP - 10622/APP/2021/1490**
(Agenda Item 6)

Officers introduced the application, highlighted both addendum sheets 1 and 2, and made a recommendation for refusal. It was noted that both applications 10622/APP/2021/1490 and 10622/APP/2021/1491 had been referred to the Major Applications Planning Committee due to substantial public interest and this was permitted in accordance with the Council's scheme of delegations. It was also noted that both applications were subject to a non-determination planning appeals.

A petitioner in objection of the applications addressed the Committee and referred to photographs that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. There were 21 formal objections and 154 petition signatures against the applications. The petitioners agreed with the officer's recommendations and explained the significance of the photographs submitted. Concerns were raised regarding the proximity of buildings resulting in a loss of sunlight and daylight, overshadowing, and encroaching on neighbouring properties. It was noted that picture 3 on the DAS Planning Design Heritage and Access Statement had been mislabelled. Reference was made to the land registry title and clarification was provided on boundary plans. The proposed position of the electric parking bay was a concern as this was used by pedestrians and children causing safety and security risks to residents. Concerns were also raised about the ecology report as there were numerous protected species. It was submitted that the ecology on the site was vast and the Committee was asked to protect this area. Petitioners requested that the application be refused in accordance with officer's recommendation.

The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration confirmed that the Committee was not disadvantaged by any non-determination appeal proceedings.

Following Member request, clarifications were provided on the plans in relation to the site layout and car parking spaces. The Committee agreed that the refusal reasons were clear.

Had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged the application would have been refused. Subject to the additional information in the addendums, the officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation, subject to the additional information addendum sheets 1 and 2.

59. **HIGHGROVE HOUSE LIDGOULD GROVE, RUISLIP - 10622/APP/2021/1491**
(Agenda Item 7)

Erection of a detached three-bedroom house (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Agenda item 7 was heard and discussed in conjunction with agenda item 6. The minutes for both items have been recorded under agenda item 6.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation, subject to the additional information addendum sheets 1 and 2.

60.

NORTHWOOD & PINNER COTTAGE HOSPITAL & NORTHWOOD HEALTH CENTRE PINNER ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 23658/APP/2021/1296 (*Agenda Item 8*)

Partial demolition, refurbishment and extension of the existing Cottage Hospital to provide a state-of-the-art health centre and the comprehensive redevelopment of the remaining Site to provide residential (Use Class C3) accommodation and ancillary works including car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum that detailed amendments to the proposed conditions in the report. Three verbal updates were also provided on conditions relating to overheating, an automatic light switch off and public footpath. A recommendation for approval + section 106 was made.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and spoke on behalf of both Northwood and Northwood Hills Residents Association. It was stated that the petitioners were in support of the additional healthcare provision and the letters of support were only in relation to the healthcare aspect of the application. The issue was with the separate residential development and the petitioner highlighted the policies that had been breached. It was submitted that the hospital was being used as part of the financial study of the residential development and the Committee was urged not to accept this application as it could set a precedent.

The petitioner submitted that the proposed housing mix did not meet the policy requirements and did not meet the London plans in terms of responding to local housing needs. It was noted that affordable housing should be provided onsite, and the applicant had not demonstrated why this was not the case. There were strong objections to the officers' report in respect of affordable housing and the compatibility of the development with the street scene. The application was a clear overdevelopment of the site, would be taller than other buildings nearby and the loss of light was unacceptable. It was noted that the North Planning Committee had recently refused an application to raise roof heights and the proposed window layout would also be contrary to policies. Concerns were raised regarding the proposed layout of the childrens' space requirement, parking space and cycle access. It was submitted that the application was a clear overdevelopment, with the wrong housing mix and failed to meet many policy requirements. It was noted that there had also been early discussions to develop part of this site as a retirement development. The Committee was urged to refuse the application.

Prior to Member clarification questions, the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration advised the Committee that financial viability appraisals were required where developers had not met affordable housing requirements. Appraisals were then referred to external consultants for review and the findings of the review were shared with officers. In this application, the consultants were satisfied that appropriate input had been provided.

The applicant and architect for the application addressed the Committee and noted that the application was for a new healthcare facility supported by residential housing. It was submitted that residents needed modernised healthcare facilities and this application was a response to the NHS's long-term plan of replacing and refurbishing existing buildings. The application intended to address the needs of the growing local population and a background was provided on what the facilities would include. It was submitted that the development was appropriate for three main reasons; firstly that the existing building was no longer fit for purpose for the delivery of modern health care

due to its age. Secondly, the current clinical rooms were too small and did not offer sufficient circulation of space for service users, and thirdly, the cost of maintaining the building would be expensive due to its age. The building was now in a derelict state and the proposal provided the funding opportunity to rationalise the existing healthcare facilities. It was submitted that the proposal would provide screening to neighbouring properties as visual amenities had been considered and over a 100 new trees would be planted to increase the natural environment. Extensive consultations had been carried out with the public and there had been preapplication discussions where the designs had evolved. It was noted that there were several examples of buildings with similar heights in the neighbourhood, and the format and material of the proposal had been chosen taking into regard discussions with officers.

During Member questions to the applicant and architect, it was noted that the Committee was in favour of the new healthcare facility and supported the NHS. However, there were concerns in relation to capital costs and future revenue commitments. It was confirmed that the cost plan was around five million.

In response to Member questions regarding translucent glass in the windows and fire escapes, it was noted that the fire strategy for this proposal assumed that the exit was through the entrance door down the stairway and there would be sprinklers. In response to questions regarding engagement with different practitioners, it was noted that the local authority and social services were key partners and had been consulted as part of the process. The consultations commenced in March 2020 and the residential mix had changed as a result of discussions including the inclusion of seven three-bedroom units. There had also been amendments to the design work as a result of feedback. In relation to charging points, it was noted that there was a fast-charging point for the healthcare centre and a normal charging point for residents.

Councillor Duncan Flynn, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills addressed the Committee. Councillor Flynn noted that this was a complex application. There was no objection to the principle of the development as the building was in a poor state and had been unoccupied for at least eight years. The proposal would deliver a medical centre which was important for the local community and the conditions proposed were welcomed. Councillor Flynn was pleased to see the condition requiring the medical centre to be occupied before homes were occupied and the retention of the war memorial. However, there were concerns regarding the number of residential units being crammed into the small site and overdevelopment. There were also issues in relation to overlooking, parking provision, the impact of traffic on nearby roads and the height of the proposal. If the Committee was minded to approve this application, Councillor Flynn emphasised the need for robust conditions on landscaping and parking spaces.

Although it was not a material planning consideration, Members expressed concern regarding the cost of the proposal and any future development schemes of the site. The Committee welcomed the health centre element of the application but was mindful of the issues in relation to overlooking, size and parking.

The Chairman reiterated the need to only have regard to planning considerations and the information before the Committee at the meeting.

Officers advised the Committee that the application had been assessed by external viability consultants and further information on funding was received from the NHS. Assurances had been provided and a similar model had been used in other boroughs. In relation to the window and other concerns, delegated authority could be provided the

Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration, Chairman and Labour Lead to agree suitable wording for additional conditions. The external viability report could also be added as an approved document list and would be made available for public viewing to increase transparency.

During Member discussions regarding parking spaces, refuse lobbies and turning circle, officers confirmed that the parking was appropriate for the residential element of the site. It was also noted there was a condition requiring a car parking management and a service delivery plan to be submitted. The turning distance space was also within policy.

The Committee was informed that the report included an informative from Thames Water in relation to drain and waste management and there had been no objections from the applicant. In relation to overlooking, it was confirmed that the overlooking concerns were based on height and had been assessed on the basis of separation distances. These distances had had been assessed to be satisfactory and within policy. There was also a secure by design condition ensuring that there were assessments of both the new health facility and residential property.

The Committee was assured that there was a section 106 legal agreement that directed that the health centre needed to be open before the residential properties could be occupied. However, there were still concern around overheating and charging of the electric points.

The Chairman concluded that three addition conditions verbal had been proposed, there had been a change to the head of terms A1, amendments to the window configuration and additional documents providing assurance to safeguard the proposal in the future.

Members considered that it would be beneficial to explore the site and appreciate the impact on neighbouring streets prior to reaching a decision. Members agreed to defer the application for a site visit to investigate the area further. This would also provide an opportunity for officers to consolidate the various updates.

A motion to defer the application for a site visit was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed at a vote.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for a site visit.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.52 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655 or ateji@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.