

Minutes**MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

10 December 2013

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW
HILLINGDON
LONDON

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Hensley (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Michael Markham John Morgan Brian Stead Mo Khursheed</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Dominic Gilham (Items 6 and 7)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager Manmohan Ranger, Highways Officer Sarah White, Principal Legal Advisor Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer</p> |
| 1. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Janet Duncan with Councillor Mo Khursheed substituting.</p> |
| 2. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 3. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30 OCTOBER 2013 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 30 October 2013 were agreed as a correct record.</p> |
| 4. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that agenda Item 18 and 19 in agenda B would be considered as urgent items.</p> |
| 5. | <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> |

It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1 public.

6.

26-36 HORTON ROAD, YIEWSLEY - 3507/APP/2013/2327 (*Agenda Item 6*)

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 50 residential units in 3 buildings with associated car parking and cycle parking spaces, communal amenity areas, landscaping, private gardens and balconies utilising existing access.

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposals was invited to address the meeting. The lead petitioner was unable to attend and requested that his objections were relayed to Members of the Committee as follows:

- The proposals would overshadow their property and affect their right to light.
- Loss of privacy due to the nature of the work undertaken at their property.
- The noise made by their printing facility had not been taken into consideration.
- Did not authorise the demolition of the boundary on the eastern side of their property.
- There was no indication that a fire assessment had been carried out.
- Concern there was no public notices informing local residents and businesses of the proposed development.

The agent addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- There was one parking space per unit.
- Improvements had been made to the amenity space.
- The proposals were a catalyst for further regeneration.
- The proposals would be an improvement to the canal frontage.
- Would meet local housing needs.
- Had achieved lifetime home standards.
- There would be no loss of sunlight.

A local Ward Councillor spoke regarding the proposals and made the following comments:

- Believed that the loss of privacy to the business in objection should not be a reason for refusal.
- Majority of residents support the proposals.
- The area was benefiting from Crossrail
- Regeneration, such as this, was welcomed in Yiewsley.

Members discussed the application and noted that there were a number of conditions attached in relation to landscaping had a number of conditions attached. Members agreed that the proposals would make good use of redundant Brownfield Land.

Members expressed concern about the noise impact from the adjoining business who had objected to the proposals. Officers explained that no habitable rooms would be affected.

Members requested that condition 11 be amended to read as follows:

'No floodlighting or other form of external lighting shall be installed unless it is in accordance with details which have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. ~~Any lighting that is so installed shall not thereafter be altered without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than for routine maintenance which does not change its details.~~

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

Resolved –

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) Transport: All on site and off site highways works as a result of this proposal, including improvements to the site access.

(ii) Education: The applicant provides a financial contribution of £176,170 towards school places in the area, commensurate with the estimated child yield of the development.

(iii) Health: The applicant provides a financial contribution of £23,068.85 towards health care in the area.

(iv) Libraries: The applicant provides a financial contribution of £2,448.81 towards library provision in the area.

(v) Construction Training: Either a construction training scheme delivered during the construction phase of the development or a financial contribution of £35,000.

(vi) Air Quality: The applicant provides a financial contribution in the sum of £12,500.

(vii) Community Facilities/Public Realm, including towpath improvements: The applicant provides a financial contribution of £50,000.

(vii) Affordable Housing review mechanism.

(viii) Project Management and Monitoring Fee: a contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contribution 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) That if any of the heads of terms set out above have not been agreed and the S106 legal agreement has not been finalised by 20th. December 2013, or any other period deemed appropriate by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, then the application may be referred back to the Committee for determination.

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 the conditions and changes in the addendum be imposed subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces prior to issuing the decision.

7. OLD COAL DEPOT, TAVISTOCK ROAD, YIEWSLEY - 18736/APP/2013/1784
(Agenda Item 7)

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a materials recovery and recycling facility and Civic Amenity Site, incorporating a recovery and recycling building, storage bays, administration office/training building, external processing and storage area, two weighbridges, reuse and extension of railway sidings, and Civic Amenity Centre, together with associated car parking, landscaping, fencing and infrastructure.

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

In accordance with the Council's constitution representatives of the petitions received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting. The lead petitioners raised the following points:

- Over 3,500 residents had signed the petitions.
- Many organisations such as local businesses, schools and places of worship had also signed petitions asking the Committee to reject the proposals.
- The site had already been considered unsuitable by the Council in 2011 when it decided that it would be excluded from the West London Waste Plan.
- If approved the application would bring misery and danger to the people of West Drayton and Yiewsley.
- Would harm the lives of local residents and destroy businesses.
- Who would want to live, work or do business near a waste plant?
- Residents had conducted a traffic survey in 2011.
- The site would generate 100,000 to 400,000 additional vehicle movements a year.
- If the plant was at a 600,000 tonne capacity it would equate to nearly 70 tonnes per hour in both directions all day and night.
- Latest data did not show how much material would be transported by rail.
- Statistics show that West Drayton does not meet EU air quality standards.
- Rats and vermin will increase, the MP for Ealing had suggested this was a continual problem effecting residents near Powerday's site in White City.
- Tavistock Road was a narrow road.
- Powerday would be processing the equivalent weight of 15 Titanics or 7 Costa

Concordias.

- The people of West Drayton and Yiewsley are asking Powerday to take their business elsewhere.
- Petitioners reminded the Committee of the Council's policy of 'putting our residents first'.

- Powerday assumed all their traffic would be routed via Horton Road.
- Traffic exiting Horton Road into the High Street would need to give way to southbound traffic.
- Horton Road was on an upward gradient slope.
- Traffic exiting Horton Road on the slope would have to join slow moving traffic in the High Street.
- The pedestrian crossing could be activated at any time causing traffic to back up.
- Once past the mini roundabout the HGVs would need to turn right into Tavistock Road.
- Next to the turning lane there was a yellow box junction and a few feet beyond that there was a zebra crossing.
- The station generated foot, bus, car and taxi traffic.
- West Drayton was benefiting from Crossrail.
- Tavistock Road was a local road with businesses located either side of its entrance and residential properties.
- Tavistock Road was often used as a short-cut through to Cowley over the next canal bridge.
- A residential development recently approved would add to Tavistock Road traffic.
- The access road to the Coal Yard was not wide enough for a HGV to enter the yard whilst another vehicle was exiting.
- Traffic into the site would back up at peak times.
- Network Rail had objected to the application because of the traffic levels that would generate at the level crossing.
- Approximately 1.2 million tonnes would travel by road.
- Approximately 138 tonnes would travel in and out of the site every hour.
- Cyclists and pedestrians would be subject to higher emissions when heavy vehicles start up in the traffic.

- Powerday claimed there would be 130 jobs created.
- The former tenant employed people on the site.
- There had been unauthorised activity taking place on the site.
- The Environment Agency had taken enforcement action at the site.
- Those who signed the business petition feared Powerday would have a negative impact on businesses trading along the High Street and Station Road.
- Businesses would lose trade if pedestrians were reluctant to cross roads.
- Horton Road was often congested.
- There was often traffic gridlocked up to the Stockley roundabout.
- Businesses had objected to the Council individually.
- The proposals would have a negative impact on residents and businesses.
- The proposed 130 jobs must be offset against the existing employment lost on the site and the negative impact on local employment.

- Important to set out the hours of operation proposed by Powerday.
- Import and export of material at any time on any day.

- Outdoor loading and unloading would happen on a 12 hour period on any day.
 - Noise, light, dust, litter, flies and vermin would be attracted to the site.
 - The timber shredder would create the most continuous noise.
 - The mitigating counter measures proposed would be ineffective.
 - The site was not part of an industrial site.
- The proposals would mean the loss of a large rare railhead.
 - There was positive regeneration taking place in West Drayton and Yiewsley.
 - Crossrail was attracting new businesses to the area.
 - Powerday have not indicated that discussions had taken place with Network Rail as requested by the Greater London Authority (GLA).
 - Powerday stated it was difficult commercially to commit to a minimum amount of importation by rail.
 - Powerday wanted to keep their options open.
 - Residents expected other developers to utilise the use of the railhead.
 - The site could be used for public services or housing.
 - 600,000 tonnes of waste a year or more would not add to the local amenity.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- Requested that the decision be deferred.
- Normally requested that applications be approved.
- Additional information was put forward and needed to be considered.
- Everyone needed to be clear of all the facts.
- There was a proposed reduction of capacity which should reduce traffic.
- Wanted officers to accept amendments to address their expressed concerns.
- What was the point in public consultation if the concerns raised could not be addressed?
- Conclusion was that there was a need to defer.

A local Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the proposals and raised the following points:

- Had taken drastic action by resigning from the Major Planning Committee so that he could speak in support of local residents and petitioners.
- Was a local ward Councillor and local resident and had listened to the views of the local people.
- Not one resident spoken to had been in favour of the development which was after all in a residential street.
- The West London Waste Plan just over 2 years ago sent a clear message that a waste and recycling centre with a concrete crushing plant was not right for this area.
- In the public consultation which reached over 2500 residents just 1 letter in favour was received with over 200 letters against.
- The strong feeling was evident by the 3000 plus people who had signed petitions objecting to the scheme.
- Had received 100's of emails from Yiewsley and West Drayton residents, retailers and other stakeholders all against the application.
- Welcomed the officers' report which clearly indicated that the applicant had no local support or could not demonstrate how they could overcome the planning concerns.
- Petitioners should be congratulated for their speeches, using clear planning

terms as to why the Committee must go with the officers' recommendations and refuse the application.

- Tavistock Road was a residential street with more residential properties recently approved by the planning Committee.
- A Town Centre environment was not a practical place to have a waste and recycling operation running 24/7.
- The applicant had failed to demonstrate that it would not be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety.
- Air, light and noise pollution at unacceptable levels could not be overcome.
- There were 2 primary schools in local proximity of the site.
- The Council had a history of putting residents first and asked the Committee to refuse the unwanted, unneeded and un-welcomed application.

Members of the Committee discussed the application. Members agreed that there was no reason for the application to be deferred and a decision would be determined at the meeting.

Officers informed the Committee that additional information had been received on 8 November 2013 which was advertised via a local newspaper. Officers also referred to the addendum sheet and informed the Committee that Powerday had proposed a reduced scheme of 450,000 tonnes of waste per annum on the 28th November 2013. It was explained that officers considered the proposed amendment was substantially different from the original application and therefore required a fresh application rather than an amendment to the current scheme.

Members agreed that London Plan Policy 2.15 should be added to reason for refusal no.1. Members expressed concern that there was no commitment from the applicant to use the railhead facilities on the site.

Members questioned the impact the proposals would have during the school runs in the morning and afternoon. There was also concern about an unmanned railway barrier.

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

Resolved – That should the Mayor not direct the Council under Article 6 to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the officers' report and any other material planning reasons which might be raised by H.M. Railway Inspectorate.

8. **272-276 BATH ROAD, HEATHROW - 464/APP/2013/2115 (Agenda Item 8)**

Change of use of existing building from office (Use Class B1 (a) to Hotel (Use Class C1), including 4-storey side extension (to rear of adjacent petrol station), and 4-storey rear extensions, and associated amendments to landscaping and car parking.

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

Members discussed the application and requested a condition be added to ensure that the development did not compromise the underground railway tunnels. Members also requested that amendments to condition 2a and 2f were made in respect of refuse storage (which should be covered and secure) and external lighting for the car park.

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

Resolved – That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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 other appropriate legislation to secure:

1. Highways: to secure all necessary works and the provision of a Travel Plan, including Sustainable Transport Measures (such as a hopper bus service).

2. Construction Training: either a financial contribution, or an in-kind scheme delivered during the construction phase of the development, should be secured (in either event the 'obligation' should be delivered equal to the formula of £2,500 for every £1 million build cost).

3. Air Quality: in line with the SPD and given the site is located in an air quality management area then a contribution in the sum of £25,000.

4. Project Management and Monitoring Fee: a financial contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions towards 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 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) That if any of the heads of terms set out above have not been agreed and the S106 legal agreement has not been finalised before 17/12/2013, or such other date as agreed by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to provide contributions towards the improvement of services and the environment as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of construction training and air quality). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Planning Obligations SPD and Air Quality SPG.'

E) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces 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.

| | |
|------------|--|
| | <p>F) That the conditions outlined in the officers' report and changes in the addendum be imposed.</p> |
| <p>9.</p> | <p>FORMER RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2013/2719 <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>Reserved matters (appearance, layout, scale and landscaping) in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 for Phase 3, First Application (Western Side of District Park) of planning permission ref: 585/APP/2009/2752 dated 18/01/2012 for the proposed mixed-use redevelopment of St Andrews Park (Former RAF Uxbridge site).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p> |
| <p>10.</p> | <p>UXBRIDGE TECHNICAL COLLEGE, PARK ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 1127/APP/2013/2739 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Amendment to appearance and layout of the south block previously approved under planning permission 1127/APP/2009/443 dated 14-05-10 (Section 73 application to vary condition 28 of the original planning permission).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>Members noted that a considerable amount of time had been spent on amending the conditions on the previous application that went before the Central and South Planning Committee on 13 April 2010.</p> <p>Officers informed the Committee that the traffic flow would not be impacted.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That delegated power be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission subject to the following:</p> <p>1. The Council enter 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 (as amended) and all appropriate legislation to ensure that:</p> <p>(a) Cycle and Pedestrian Network - The applicant is to upgrade the existing cycle network in the locality, including the upgrading of the existing pelican crossing to a toucan crossing at Park Road, to details to be approved by the Council. Upgrade works are to provide adequate lighting and surfacing and ensure that both pedestrians and cyclists can use the links.</p> <p>(b) Construction Management - Require the applicant/developer to provide and adhere to a responsible constructor scheme. This shall include</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>agreement that construction traffic shall avoid peak hours and the use of Gatting Way.</p> <p>(c) Green Travel Plan Sustainable transport measures in the form of a 10 year Green Travel Plan (which includes car park management plan to achieve a phased reduction in car parking provision on the campus down to 350 spaces.</p> <p>(d) A contribution of £3,000 towards Great Crested Newt habitat maintenance and translocation routes.</p> <p>(e) That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the Section 106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.</p> <p>(f) That the applicant meets the Council's project management and administration costs as set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>2. That Officers be authorised to negotiate and agree detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</p> <p>3. If a Section 106 agreement has not been signed by 26-12-13, or any other period deemed appropriate by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, then the application is to be referred back to Committee for further consideration.</p> <p>4. 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 Agreement under Section 106 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.</p> <p>5. That the conditions in the officers' report and addendum be attached.</p> |
| 11. | <p>FORMER NATS HEADQUARTERS, PORTERS WAY, WEST DRAYTON - 5107/APP/2013/2325 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Reserved matters (appearance and landscaping) in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 for Phase 3, Block D (76 residential units) of planning permission ref: 5107/APP/2009/2348 dated 01/10/2010.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p> |
| 12. | <p>FORMER NATS HEADQUARTERS, PORTERS WAY, WEST DRAYTON - 5107/APP/2013/2747 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Reserved matters (appearance and landscaping) in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 for Phase 3, second application ('Block G' comprising 107 residential units) of planning permission ref: 5107/APP/2009/2348, dated 01/10/2010: Proposed mixed-use redevelopment of the Former NATS Site.</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officers’ report.</p> |
| 13. | <p>21 HIGH STREET, YIEWSLEY - 26628/APP/2013/2604 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) in compliance with conditions 2 and 4 of planning permission ref: APP/R5510/A/10/2130048 dated 03/12/2010 for Redevelopment of site for mixed use development comprising a 44-unit apartment hotel, 1,320 m² of office space and 135 m² restaurant/bar, with associated access, car parking and landscaping (Outline application for approval of access).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>Officers explained that there had been minor changes to the approved scheme. Members noted that all the units were the appropriate size.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officers’ report.</p> |
| 14. | <p>CHARLES CURRAN HOUSE, BONIFACE ROAD, ICKENHAM - 1022/APP/2013/2347 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing care home and construction of 6 semi-detached 4-bed dwellings, together with associated car parking, landscaping and new pedestrian access.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>Members noted the amendment to condition 10 to add '<i>The scheme shall demonstrate the allocated of 2 spaces to each unit</i>' after 'the Local Planning Authority'.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>1. This authority is given by the issuing of this notice under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 and shall ensure only for the benefit of the land.</p> <p>2. That the Council enter into a Statement of Intent/Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure the following:</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>A. A contribution of £82,366 to be used towards capacity enhancements in near by educational facilities made necessary by the development.</p> <p>B. Project Management and Monitoring Fee: in line with the SPD if a s106 agreement is entered into then a contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions should be secured to ensure the management and monitoring of the resulting agreement.</p> <p>C. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</p> <p>D. If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Sport and Heritage to refuse planning permission for the following reason:</p> <p>'The applicant has failed to provide contributions towards the capacity enhancements in nearby educational facilities made necessary as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).'</p> <p>E. That the conditions outlined in the officers' report and changes in the addendum be attached.</p> |
| 15. | <p>CHARLES CURRAN HOUSE, BONIFACE ROAD, ICKENHAM - 1022/APP/2013/2345 <i>(Agenda Item 15)</i></p> <p>Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing care home.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p> |
| 16. | <p>FORMER MASTER BREWER SITE, FREEZELAND WAY AND LAND ADJACENT TO HILLINGDON STATION AND SWALLOW INN, LONG LANE, HILLINGDON <i>(Agenda Item 18)</i></p> <p>Mixed use redevelopment comprising the erection of a 3,543 sq.m foodstore (GIA) (Use Class A1), (inclusive of delivery areas) with 181 car parking spaces and 32 cycle spaces; 3 additional retail units, totalling 1,037 sq.m (GFA) (Use Class A1 to A5); a 100 sq.m safer neighbourhoods unit (Use Class D1); a 7 storey (plus plant level) 84 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1), with 18 car parking spaces and 16 cycle spaces; together with associated highways alterations and landscaping.</p> <p>On 2 December 2013, the Major Application Committee decided to refuse the applications for both the old Master Brewer site and the Land adjacent to Hillingdon Station.</p> <p>It was also decided that the reasons for refusal be brought back to Committee for</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>consideration by Members. It was noted that only Members present at the meeting on 2 December 2013 could agree the reasons for refusal.</p> <p>The recommendations outlining the reasons for refusal for each application were moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote were unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the reasons for refusal were agreed as per the officers’ report.</p> |
| 17. | <p>KITCHENER HOUSE, WARWICK ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 18218/APP/2013/2183 <i>(Agenda Item 19)</i></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>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application. Officers informed the Committee that there had been a minor change to the recommendation. Officers explained that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling preferred an alternative proposal which did not include a service bay.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officers’ report.</p> |
| 18. | <p>ADDENDUM <i>(Agenda Item 20)</i></p> |
| | <p>The meeting, which commenced at 8.00 pm, closed at 10.04 pm.</p> |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Danielle Watson on Democratic Services Officer - 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

This page is intentionally left blank