

Minutes**MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 November 2013

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Hensley (Vice-Chairman) Janet Duncan (Labour Lead) David Allam Michael Markham John Morgan Brian Stead Carol Melvin</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture Matthew Duigan (Planning Service Manager) Syed Shah, Highways Engineer Rory Stracey, Legal Advisor Nadia Williams, Democratic Services Officer</p>
15.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Dominic Gilham. Councillor Carol Melvin attended in his place.</p>
16.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Dave Allam declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7, South of Ballinger Way and East of Broadmead Road, Yeading by virtue of having previously supported residents concerning this development. He withdrew from the meeting and did not take part in the decision of this item.</p>
17.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>
18.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be heard in public.</p>

19.	<p>THE COMFORT INN HOTEL, SHEPISTON LANE, HAYES 382/APP/2013/1163 (Agenda Item 5)</p> <p>Application for new planning permission to replace extant planning permission dated 14th September 2010, reference 382/APP/2010/1404 for Erection of a three storey bedroom wing extension to hotel to provide 54 bedrooms and 15 bathrooms, involving demolition of existing bedroom wing (Application to replace extant appeal decision ref: APP/R5510/A/07/2047304 dated 23/10/2007).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and directed Members to note the changes in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioners objecting to the application had indicated that they would not be addressing the Committee in respect of this application. Neither the agent nor the applicant was present at the meeting.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>
20.	<p>KITCHENER HOUSE, WARWICK ROAD WEST DRAYTON 18218/APP/2013/2183 (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>Erection of a part single, two, three and 4 storey building to provide 23 residential units, consisting of 14 x 2 bedroom, 9 x 1 together with 250sqm of retail/commercial space, with associated parking, cycle and bin storage and amenity space, involving demolition of existing buildings.</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers advised that this application had been deferred at the meeting on 30 October 2013 for a site visit and for further clarifications. The site visit had taken place and the queries and concerns previously raised had been addressed in the officer’s report. The Committee was directed to note the changes in the addendum circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>The Chairman asked whether the plans shown on the PowerPoint presentation were listed on the plans that Members were being asked to approve. Officers responded affirmatively.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution, a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The petitioners objecting to the proposed development made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objected to the commercial premises being located in a residential area, which by reason of its use was likely to result in noise, disturbance and nuisance which would be detrimental to the residents. • Suggested that the proposed A1 premises should be located in the High Street to improve and aid regeneration. • Suggested that the car wash that was currently in operation was operating without a licence and creating unnecessary problems. This area could be used to improve amenity for residents and pedestrian using the rear access of station. • The change of use from commercial premises to residential would have a detrimental impact on existing properties (2, 4, & 6) at Warwick Road.

- Suggested that a restrictive covenant should be put in place to prevent occupiers of the proposed development objecting to any future development proposed by the affected properties in Warwick Road.
- Objected to the proposed development due to its height, sitting, design, layout, size, mass and bulk, which would result in a cramped and overdeveloped site.
- The proposal would be visually incongruous and over dominant.
- The elevation of the proposed scheme would have a negative impact on the privacy and skyline.
- Advised that most council's applied the 21 metre rule for 2/3 storey-building, which was not the case with regard to this proposal.

The agent spoke raising the following points:

- Felt that the officer's report was thorough and satisfied that issues raised at the last meeting had been addressed.
- Emphasis had been placed on the sunlight and daylight assessment and had taken advice from consultant to ensure that it clearly passed guidelines.
- Had provided drawings to demonstrate how the front garden would work and to show that there was enough space for residents and this was also observed by Members during the site visit.
- The distance quoted were back to back distances which were not relevant to the front distance.
- Suggested that the document circulated by the petitioner included background information relating to a very different council to London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The scheme fully respected residential amenity.
- The new scheme had significantly less commercial space and felt that the proposed development would be returning residents to the area.
- Felt that many of the diagrams circulated by the petitioners were misleading and had there been time, would have provided further diagrams to show the difference to that put forward by the petitioners.

A Member expressed concerns about overlooking of amenity space at No.19, which appeared to have been addressed by setting back the balcony area. It was stressed that this would depend on the height of the balcony. The agent was asked whether it would be acceptable if the Committee was to add a condition that once built, overlooking could be re-evaluated and the balcony could be raised or set back a further few inches if required. The agent affirmed that this would be acceptable.

In answer to a query about preventing occupants from objecting to planning applications on neighbouring properties, the Legal Advisor advised that the Council did not have powers to impose such a condition and therefore, this would not be recommended.

A Member sought clarification on the interpretation of large vehicle (in respect of s106 (e)). Officers advised that this would be encapsulated with the details to be arranged through the details of the legal agreement.

A Member suggested that at least two of the cycle spaces should be allocated to retail. Officers advised that cycle spaces could be allocated for retail use and these could be specified under Condition 8 (2b), with 4 to retail and 28 to housing.

A query was raised about allocation of off site parking bays; officers explained that there was no specific control over parking bays, but if Members were minded to control,

this could form part of the legal agreement.

The Legal Advisor advised that this issue could be dealt with by the Highways Authority.

The Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture added that the Head of Terms could be adjusted, so as to cover the control of the on street parking bay.

Condition 11 was amended to require details of measures in order to prevent noise transmission from the proposed development to residential occupiers. Officers were asked to agree the detailed wording outside of the meeting.

In answer to concerns raised about the size of vehicles that were likely to be using the parking and loading bays, the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture advised the Committee that the point of S106 was to ensure that details such as, restricting the size of vehicles were set prescribed. Officers added that tracking diagrams had been produced to ensure that vehicles could be accommodated.

Members were satisfied following the site visit that there would not be any overlooking of residents, and officers confirmed that they were quite satisfied that evidence had been provided to show that overlooking concerns and outlook were acceptable.

The Committee added the plans that had been circulated at the meeting to the plans list.

The recommendation for approval with the Addendum and amendments to the Heads of Terms in recommendation 1. A) (i) (e) (f), additional condition was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved

1. That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission, subject to:

A) To the Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:

(i) Highways including but not exhaustively the following

(a) Provision of a service delivery bay for larger length vehicles (up to maximum 12 metre) and implementation of a traffic order limiting the hours of use of the bay between 10am and 2pm.

(b) Provision of a realigned pavement and kerb edge on the eastern edge of the site and the provision of a section of pavement where presently there is none.

(c) Provision of pavement on eastern edge of site where presently there is none.

(d) Provision of CCTV to manage compliance with the traffic order.

(e) A Service and Delivery Plan limiting the hours of delivery by vehicles, no longer than 12.5m in length, to the hours of 10am and 2pm Monday to Saturday and not at all on Sunday, Bank Holidays and Public Holidays and ensuring

vehicles will use the delivery bay.

(f) Provision of 1 additional metered car parking bay which can be used by shoppers or shop staff.

(g) All future occupants of the development removed the opportunity to gain Hillingdon residents' on street parking permits, for the life of the development.

(ii) Public Realm: A contribution of £5,000 in respect to public realm improvements arising from Cross Rail improvements to the West Drayton Station surroundings.

(iii) Education: a contribution in the sum of £62,652 should be secured.

(iv) Health: a contribution in the sum of £8,872.64 ($£216.67 \times 40.95$) should be secured.

(v) Libraries: a contribution in the sum of £941.85 ($£23 \times 40.95$) should be secured.

(vi) Construction Training: either a financial contribution or an in kind scheme delivered equivalent to the formula of £2,500 for every £1m build cost + number of units /160 x £71,675= total contribution, including the submission of an Employment Strategy for construction phase and end user phase (the latter in respect to the retail unit).

(vii) Air Quality: a financial contribution towards air quality should be secured in the sum of £12,500.

(viii) Affordable Housing: A time review mechanism is to be put in place.

B) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 and 278 Agreements and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

C) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement and conditions of approval.

D) If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to deliver necessary offsite highway and public realm works and to provide contributions towards the improvement of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of education, air quality, health facilities, library improvements, construction and employment training). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy BE19, AM2, AM7, OE16, R7 and R17 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Planning Obligations SPG.'

E) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.

F) That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives in the officers report, addendum, additional and amended conditions set out below be imposed subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture prior to issuing the decision.

Additional Condition

'Within 1 month of occupation of the building, an audit of the erected privacy screens shall be undertaken to establish effectiveness and compliance with the approved plans, the audit shall identify any remedial actions necessary to prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties.'

Any measures identified in the audit as being necessary to prevent overlooking shall be implemented within 3 months of occupation of the building and shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development.

Reason

To prevent overlooking and to accord with policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).'

Amended Conditions

8, 2b - Add the words '...including 28 bicycles for the residential occupiers and 4 bicycles for shoppers or shop staff.'

11 – Add section 4 – 'Details of measures to prevent noise transmission from the ground floor commercial use to the residential occupiers above.'

Plan 12034-02-045 was also added to the plans list.

21.

**SOUTH OF BALLINGER WAY AND EAST OF BROADMEAD ROAD
68819/APP/2013/1156 (Agenda Item 7)**

Erection of a Class A1 food store (1,476 sq.m. gross; 990 sq.m. net) with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Councillor Dave Allam withdrew from the room.

Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The petitioners objecting to the proposed development made the following points:

- Lived in the Grand Union Village and was speaking about the adjoining areas as a whole, as signatures to the petition had also been collected from people from the other side of Broadmead Road.
- Residents living on the three sides of the proposed development were against the scheme.
- Suggested that issues of concern had been thoroughly covered in the officer's report.
- The area was meant to be an urban sustainable village and did not see how the proposed scheme would make it more appealing.

- Acknowledge that if a supermarket was built in the area, it would be used by residents.
- Had found an alternative site where such a development would be more appropriate on the same bus route.
- Advised that the initial proposal was for a sports centre and suggested that the people living in the Grand Union Village could be consulted on more appropriate options for the site.
- Advised that a nature reserve was currently being populated.
- Did not see how building a supermarket would enhance the village.
- Welcomed officer's recommendation for refusal.

The agent made the following points:

- The application had been thoroughly prepared including relevant justification for the proposed scheme on green belt site.
- Transport assessment had been undertaken and provided.
- Had gone through a pre-application process with officers and the local community.
- Suggested that the site formed part of the proposal for the wider planned village.
- The principle development was supported by the Council as well as Members.
- The proposal was put forward in 2004 when a much larger building was refused.
- Suggested that there was no prospect for such a site and at present, it contributed nothing to residents or the green belt.
- The site was currently not opened to public access and this scheme instead offered a new proposal for a supermarket, which would create employment.
- There were no alternative sites to provide significant development.
- The proposed development exceeded policy requirement for renewable energy.
- Asked Members how they might like to see this site brought back into use and subject to client's agreement, may be able to bring back alternative development that was acceptable.

A Member added if the applicant wanted to bring the site back into use, they could consider providing a sports and leisure centre, which would be more appropriate for the site.

A Member stated that it was not acceptable to have a supermarket in green belt land.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons sent out in the officer's report and subject to the addendum.

22. **EC HOUSE, SWALLOWFIELD WAY, HAYES 38065/APP/2013/2245** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Change of use from Class B8 (storage and distribution) to a flexible Class use comprising B1(C) (light industrial) or B2 (general industry) or B8 (storage or distribution).

Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to changes in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.

23. **BISHOP RAMSEY C OF E SCHOOL, HUME WAY, RUISLIP 19731/APP/2013/1292**
(Agenda Item 9)

Variation of condition 4 (hours of use of gate to Warrender Way) of planning permission 19731/APP/2006/2811 (Amalgamation of upper and lower school sites to create one school campus. Redevelopment of upper school site including demolition and refurbishment of existing buildings, erection of new school buildings, new parking areas, access provision including a drop off point in Hume way and playground/sports facilities).

Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

In accordance with the Council’s constitution, a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The petitioners objecting to the proposed development made the following points:

- Suggested that officer’s presentation appeared to be based on the misunderstanding of the implications of the school’s request.
- A survey conducted had found that 120 sixth form students currently left the school during the day via the sports centre; 30 would turn right and 50 would turn left and go through Warrender Way into Ruislip, and the remaining 40 would continue on along Merton Avenue.
- To allow the students to go through Warrender Way would make no difference.
- Students accessed and exited by using swipe cards and if the gate was not supervised, there was a likelihood of the public going through the gate, as it took time to close.
- The proposal would allow the use of the gate in Warrender Way to make it safer.
- Residents living closest to the gate supported the school’s request.
- Advised that the current sports entrance was secluded and created safeguarding issues.
- The suggestion of installing CCTV would only assist in catching culprits and not solving the issue of crime.
- The school did not have the resources to man the gates and did not wish to wait until a serious incident occurred before taking action.

A Member expressed concerns about the detrimental effect lifting the restriction on the hours of use of the gate would have on the amenity of nearby residents. The Member stated that officers had indicated in the report, that security issues could be addressed through alternative measures.

The petitioner explained that the closest resident at No. 46 had indicated that they were happy with the proposal.

The Chairman advised that two ward Councillors who were unable to attend the meeting had sent in letters to be read at the meeting.

The letter from the Ward Councillor objecting to the proposal raised the following points:

- Planning permission was previously granted with the condition that pupils arriving by car should use the entrance off Hume Way and this was facilitated by the installation of a drop-off point within the Highgrove Pool car park.
- These measures were introduced specifically to reduce the congestion and obstruction caused by parents and visitors parking when they arrived at the Warrender Way entrance.
- The proposed application would result in increasing unnecessary obstruction and seriously be detrimental to the amenity of local residents who continued to suffer from the increasing number of vehicles already using the Warrender Way entrance.
- This increased use of Warrender Way was already in contradiction of the planning condition imposed in the previous application.

In their letter of support, the Ward Councillor raised the following points:

- Was also a governor of Bishop Ramsey school.
- The proposed application had been submitted as a result of security and safety concerns for students at the school.
- Four good reasons for the proposed changes had been clearly outlined in the officer's report.
- The majority of students would be in school during the day, therefore the question to bear in mind would be the number of students that were likely to use this exit during the extended times and whether there would be an increase in traffic in Warrender Way during these times.
- Urged the Committee to consider these comments when considering this application.

In response to clarification sought about access and security issues, officers advised that the Crime Prevention Adviser's view was that, given the option between what the school was proposing, the concern was not so much about it being unsafe; it was rather that it was more preferable in his view of the two options.

A Member expressed concerns that the sports hall gate could be seen as a quiet corner to seize people and therefore would support this application.

A Member added that they were satisfied that the fact the students entered and exited the school by using a swipe card and on the basis of that evidence, would support the application.

A Member commented that when the previous application was considered at Committee, the school had given assurances that pupils would be encouraged to gain access via Hume Way. Suggesting that there were other security measures that the school could consider, the Member did not see how opening the gate for students use from 8am to 6pm would make a huge difference. Other members expressed concern that once the gate was opened through out the day, wider use would be encouraged.

A Member added that the school had consulted with residents living in Warrender Way and was satisfied that the fears about greater use of Warrender Way could not be justified, as people could drive along the road at present regardless.

The Legal Advisor advised that because the application was one made pursuant to section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, it would result in the grant of a wholly new planning permission for the whole school. That being the case, any planning conditions/obligations that were imposed in the original planning application would need to be followed through in this application (to the extent that they were still relevant and necessary).

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused and on being put to the vote was lost.

It was moved and seconded that the application be approved and on being put to the vote, this was agreed.

Approval was given for legal authority to be delegated to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to finalise the wording for conditions and informatives in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the condition set out below:

Condition

'The Warrender Way entrance may be opened for student pedestrian use between 0800 and 1800 hours on school days only and for general pedestrian use between 0800 and 0900 hours and 1500 to 1800 hours on school days only.'

Reason

To safeguard the amenity of surrounding areas in accordance with Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP policies (November 2012).'

24.

FORMER CONTRACTORS COMPOUND, SOUTH OF SWINDON ROAD, HEATHROW AIRPORT 67622/APP/2013/2532 (Agenda Item 10)

Part outline, part full planning application for a proposed hotel development of up to 660 bedrooms (approximately 30,000sq.m) with ancillary café, bar and restaurant facilities, car parking, service access, courtyard space, landscaping and improved ground level pedestrian access including public realm improvements (all outline application) and a perimeter veil structure wrapping around the hotel buildings (in full application detail).

Officers introduced the report and directed Members to note the changes in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting. Officers verbally added an additional condition requiring that the building achieved a 'Secure by Design' accreditation.

Concerns were raised about the requirement for the plans to show clearly where the proposed entrance to the vale would be located and plans showing elevations of what it would look like. Officers clarified that the Vale did not go down to ground level and advised Members that Condition 4 required the applicant to provide further details of how the Vale would work, prior to the commencement of the development.

The Legal Advisor suggested that Members could require condition 4 to be discharged by Planning Committee. However, as this was a hybrid application, the design and layout of the main building was something that would come forward in detail at a future point.

A Member added that they were concerned, as it was not clear which part of the proposal was outline and what part related to reserved matters.

A Member noted that motor cycle parking bays would be displaced and asked whether there was any proposal to reposition the motor cycle parking bays. Officers advised that the Committee could add an additional condition requiring repositioning of motor cycle parking bays.

In response to the indication that the application should be deferred for greater clarification, officers advised that clear elevation was shown on all fronts with sections showing where cars would go and where the entrance would be.

The Legal Advisor clarified that the Vale would be attached to the proposed building and because that main building would be subject to a reserved matters application where features such as the access and means of attaching the Vale to the building would be the subject of a future reserved matters application.

The Committee amended Condition 15 to include cycle parking bays and Condition 20 to include barriers, directions and signage.

The recommendation for approval (with the requirement for Condition 4 to be discharge by Planning Committee) and amended conditions was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved

1. That subject to the Mayor not directing the Council under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 to refuse the application, or under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission, subject to any relevant amendments agreed by the Head of Planning Green Spaces and Culture and also those requested by the Greater London Authority and the following:

a) That the Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:

**i) T In their letter of support, the Ward Councillor raised the following points:
ransport:**

i.i) Highways as required by the Council's Highway Engineer to be implemented with the cost met by the applicant.

i.ii) Travel Plan to cover hotel staff and hotel guests and provision of a Travel Pack.

i.iii) Service and Delivery Plan.

i.iv) Off site coach waiting area and coach call forwarding.

ii). Construction Training: (£2,500 for every £1million build cost) +- (sq metre of

floor space proposed/7500sq.m x £71,675= total contribution and Coordinator Costs" based on size of development as a % of work placement coordinator threshold size x total cost of work place coordinator. One full time post, estimated at £71,675 per annum.

iii) Hospitality Training: An Employment Strategy including for end user stage.

iv). Employment Strategy for build phase and end user phase and details of measures taken to procure services from local businesses.

v. Air Quality: A contribution to sum of £25,000 for air quality monitoring.

vi). Project Management and Monitoring Fee: in line with the SPD a financial contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions is to be secured to enable the management and monitoring of the resulting agreement.

vii) Phasing: An agreement for Heathrow Airport Limited to bring forward, fund and complete a fully costed programme of works to improve the public realm/access arrangements, including all necessary highways alterations, between the hotel buildings and the Terminal 4 buildings prior to the occupation of the hotel development.

viii). Ecological enhancement scheme to provide off site wildlife opportunities to address the resulting loss/deficit on site and to address air quality issues.

B) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 and 278 Agreements and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

C) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement and conditions of approval.

D) If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to deliver necessary off site coach waiting area, public realm works, off-site ecological enhancements mitigation measures and provided contributions towards the improvement of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of construction and employment training and air quality). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy OE6 and AM7 and R17 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Planning Obligations SPG.'

E) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.

F) That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report (Condition 4 to be determined by Planning Committee) be imposed subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, prior to issuing the decision and the additional and

amended conditions set out below:

Additional Conditions

'The Development hereby approved shall achieve 'Secured by Design' accreditation awarded by the Hillingdon Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Adviser (CPDA) on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) . The development shall not be occupied until accreditation has been achieved.'

Reason

In pursuance of the Council's duty under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to consider crime and disorder implications in excising its planning functions; to promote the well being of the area in pursuance of the Council's powers under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000, to reflect the guidance contained in the Council's SPG on Community Safety By Design and to ensure the development provides a safe and secure environment in accordance with London Plan (July 2011) Policies 7.1 and 7.3.'

Condition

'Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the operation of the any vehicular access way gates proposed within the development by disabled persons, and manual operation of any gates in the event of power failure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the secure access arrangements shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and maintained so long as the development remains on site.'

Reason

In order to ensure the development achieves an appropriate level of accessibility in accordance with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (July 2011).'

Amended Conditions

8 – Add the words 'directional signage as well as' between the words 'including' and 'the alignment.'

15 – Add 2.f 'Details of the replacement provision of motor cycle parking spaces within the vicinity of Terminal 4 if as a result of the development any motorcycle spaces are displaced.'

25. **RYEFIELD HOUSE, RYEFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON 11838/APP/2013/2650**
(Agenda Item 11)

Section 73 Application for the Variation of Condition 2 and 3 of planning permission 11838/APP/2011/553 dated 1/12/2011 for the Erection of a three storey care home comprising 58 rooms with associated parking.

The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.
Resolved

1. That the application be determined by the Head of Planning, Sport and Culture under delegated powers, Subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the legal agreement associated with planning permission 11838/APP/2011/ for the

following obligations:

- i. **Health: A contribution towards local health care facilities in the sum of £216.67 per person. Given that there are 58 beds proposed in this scheme and basing the calculation on one person per bedroom the level of the contribution will be in the sum of £12,566.86.**
- ii. **Construction Training: A construction training contribution will be sought equal to £2,500 for every £1 million build cost.**
- iii. **Libraries: £1,334 as contribution towards the local library.**
- iv. **Project Management and Monitoring Fee: in line with the Planning Obligations SPD a contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions is required to enable the management and monitoring of the resulting agreement.**

B) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 and 278 Agreements and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

C) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement and conditions of approval.

D) If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to deliver necessary offsite highway works and to provide contributions towards the improvement of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of healthcare, construction training and libraries). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy AM2, AM7 and R17 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Planning Obligations SPG.'

E) That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives in the officer's report be imposed subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture prior to issuing the decision.

26. **HAYES GATE HOUSE, 27 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES 2385/APP/2013/2523**
(Agenda Item 12)

Change of Use of existing office (B1) building to create 170 bedroom hotel (C1) use with ancillary car parking and landscaping.

In introducing the report, officers directed the Committee to note the changes in the Addendum circulated at the meeting.

Condition 8 was amended to require 60 cycle spaces with 4 electric charging points.

The recommendation and amended condition 8 was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved

1. That subject to the Mayor not directing the Council under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 to refuse the application, or under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission, subject to any relevant amendments agreed by the Head of Planning Green Spaces and Culture and also those requested by the Greater London Authority and the following:

A) The Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:

- i. S278 and S38 Highways Works: to secure all necessary works, the provision of a Green Travel Plan.**
- ii. Air Quality Monitoring: A contribution in the sum of £12,500.**
- iii. Construction Training: A contribution in the sum of £119,266.96 or deliver an in-kind scheme to the value of the financial contribution.**
- iv. Hospitality Training. A contribution in the sum of £18,133.33 or deliver an in-kind scheme to the value of the financial contribution.**
- v. Green Travel Plan.**
- vi. Project Management and Monitoring: 5% of total cash contributions.**

B) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 and 278 Agreements and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

C) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement and conditions of approval.

D) If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 6 months, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to agree to undertake all necessary highway works and to provide contributions towards the improvement of air quality and construction and employment training. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy EM8 of the Local Plan Part 1 and Policy R17 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Planning Obligations SPD.'

E) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.

F) That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives in the officer's report be imposed subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture prior to issuing the decision and; subject to

the changes in the addendum and amended condition 8 as follows:

8 – 2.b Cycle storage for 60 bicycles
2.d – Car parking layouts for 70 cars
2.g – Other structures
Delete 3.b

27. **FORMER RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE 585/APP/2013/1955**
(Agenda Item 13)

Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 for Phase 2A of the 'Southern Area' (93 dwellings - 24 x 1-bed flats, 16 x 2-bed flats, 7 x 2-bed houses, 33 x 3-bed houses, and 13 x 4-bed houses), of planning permission ref: 585/APP/2009/2752 dated 18/01/2012, for the proposed mixed-use redevelopment of the former RAF Uxbridge site.

Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting. Members were asked to also note two revised plans circulated at the meeting, which showed that the proposed development had solar panels at the back and not at the front. Officers highlighted that not every house would have solar panels and the houses that would be having the solar panels removed were shown in the plans circulated.

The Committee added an additional condition regarding noise mitigation and an additional informative to advise the applicant to safeguard the reduced amenity space.

The recommendation and additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and the following additional condition and informative:

Additional Condition

'The scheme hereby approved shall not be occupied until the noise mitigation measures approved under Condition 13 of outline planning permission reference 585/APP/2009/2752 have been carried out and completed.'

Reason

To protect the amenity of occupiers in accordance with Policy OE5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).'

Additional Informative

'You are advised that the Local Planning Authority has permitted lower levels of external amenity spaces than required by the Hillingdon Design and Accessible Statement – Residential Layouts in this case. This decision was made having regard to the individual circumstances of the case which include but are not limited to, the increase in internal floorspace standards, since the grant of the outline consent and the large amount of public open space provided within the development. This decision does not set a precedent for other applications which will be considered on their individual merits.'

28.	<p>FORMER RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE 585/APP/2013/2474 <i>(Agenda Item 14)</i></p> <p>Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 for the construction of the northern access and works to the Chippendale Roundabout of planning permission ref: 585/APP/2009/2752 dated 18/01/2012, for the proposed mixed-use redevelopment of the RAF Uxbridge site.</p> <p>In response to a query raised about safety, officers advised that various road safety aspects would have to be met and these would be addressed in the detailed matters, which were being considered by the Council's Highways Department. The application currently before the Committee showed detailed layout of the proposed highway works.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.03 pm, closed at 9.15 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

This page is intentionally left blank