

Minutes

## MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 December 2013

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

HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Hensley (Vice-Chairman), Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), David Allam, Dominic Gilham, Michael Markham, John Morgan and Brian Stead</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Cllr Timothy Barker</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b></p> <p>James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture Matthew Duigan (Planning Service Manager) Manmohan Ranger, Highways Engineer Rory Stracey, Legal Advisor Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer</p>
29.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
30.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
31.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>
32.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be heard in public.</p>
33.	<p><b>FORMER MASTER BREWER SITE, FREEZELAND WAY, HILLINGDON - 4266/APP/2012/1544</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</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),</p>

**with 18 car parking spaces and 16 cycle spaces; together with associated highways alterations and landscaping.**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitions received in objection and support to the proposals were invited to address the meeting.

**Note – Concerns raised by petitioners relate to both items 5 and 6.**

The lead petitioner from the Ickenham Residents Association in objection to the application raised the following points:

- The proposals in 2004 were refused for various reasons.
- Traffic impact was a concern.
- The new design was improved and much smaller than the previous proposals.
- The 7 storey hotel was too high and would dwarf buildings opposite.
- The onus should be on the applicant to show that the traffic and air pollution impact was not severe.
- The surrounding roads could not cope with the traffic.
- There was an assumption that traffic would not join the road network.
- There would be longer journey times for longer periods in the day.
- Hillingdon Circus exceeded EU pollution limits, toxic levels increasing are unacceptable.
- The health of Hillingdon residents should be a priority.
- The phasing of the traffic lights could put pedestrians at risk.
- Council policy should encourage walking and not make it more dangerous.

The lead petitioner from the Oak Farm Residents Association in objection to the application raised the following points:

- There were over 7000 houses south of the A40 between the proposed site and the Uxbridge Road.
- Oak Farm was the closest housing area to the Tesco site.
- There were already issues with land drainage in the area and the proposals could make things worse, including flooding.
- The average house price in the area was £250,000, which the minimum wage could not afford.
- The area was already heavily polluted.
- A40 traffic had increased over the years from Hillingdon to Acton.
- Noise was measured at 80dBa at the entrance to Hillingdon station.
- There was no continuous bus route between the north and the south of the Borough.
- There were often queues to get on to Long Lane from residential side roads.
- Tesco have proposed a 4<sup>th</sup> traffic queue which would not help.
- The Oak Farm Residents Association requested a full assessment on conditions in the area.

The petitioners in support to the application raised the following points:

- Since the Master Brewer had been knocked down trade in the shopping parade was down by 40%.

- The general area was in need of repair, including the slip roads.
- There were more shops than people.
- Wanted life back to the area.
- Would love a supermarket within walking distance.
- It was about time the Master Brewer site was developed.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- Recognised that the scale of the previous application was too big.
- Thanked officers for introducing the report.
- There would be less impact on the local community and traffic with a smaller store.
- There had been recognition from residents that these proposals were improved since the 2004 application.
- Wanted a store that was right for customers.
- There had been a huge effort from the transport consultants.
- Had recently worked with Lambeth Council on a mixed use development in Streatham, which had not caused problems.
- Tesco offered exceptional employment opportunities and invested in their staff with degree courses.
- Tesco had a good pension scheme.
- The hotel was proposed to be a landmark building in a good location.
- There would be landscaping to compliment the Green Belt.
- Hoped the Committee would accept officers' recommendations.

A Hillingdon East Ward Councillor also spoke in objection to the proposals and made the following comments:

- Was speaking on behalf of his fellow Ward Councillors.
- Thanked Oak Farm Residents' Association.
- Objections must be based on planning guidelines.
- Supported more housing and employment opportunities in the area.
- Traffic was the overriding factor why the proposals were not practical.
- Long Lane, A437, was a major north to south route.
- Traffic was a daily problem not just at peak times.
- In 2004 a previous application was refused.
- Hillingdon had more cars per person than any other London Borough.
- A new development would increase traffic in the area.
- Correspondence from Tesco suggested there would be less traffic.
- Did not believe there would be less traffic than there currently is.
- The plans conflicted with policy AM7.

Members debated the current traffic in the local area. Members noted that traffic was an issue outside of peak times and worse at peak times. Members did not accept that traffic impacts would be acceptable.

Members discussed the effect the proposals would have on buildings opposite the proposed site, namely the hotel and health centre on Freezeland Way.

Approval was moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was lost.

Refusal was then moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. The

reasons for refusal were to be brought back to Committee to be agreed before 7 January 2014.

**Resolved – Refused.**

34. **FORMER MASTER BREWER SITE, FREEZELAND WAY, HILLINGDON - 4266/APP/2012/1545** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Erection of 5 part 4, part 5 storey blocks to provide 125 residential units (Use Class C3) with 99 car parking spaces and 150 cycle parking spaces and associated highways alterations, together with associated landscaping (outline application).**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.

The concerns and comments raised by petitioners in both objection and support are noted in Item 5 of the minutes, including comments from the applicant/agent.

Members discussed the size, scale and bulk of the proposals. Members were not satisfied with the height of the hotel and suggested it would appear too large and overshadowed buildings located opposite the proposed site, which included the hotel and health centre on Freezeland Way.

Members discussed the traffic impact the proposal would have on the local area. Members questioned the number of entry and exits on to the site and whether they met visibility requirements. Members also questioned the speed limits as they varied between the A40 and slip road. Officers informed the Committee that the visibility requirements had been met and vehicle activated speed signs could be used to lower the speed of vehicles.

Members questioned the pedestrian crossings and stated that there was a risk for pedestrians should they have to cross 4 lanes of traffic. Members were concerned that pedestrians would not use the crossing and could put their lives at risk.

Officers informed the Committee that there had been 3<sup>rd</sup> party highway consultants employed to carry out the transport assessments. Transport for London (TfL) used the same expert consultants. Officers stated that there was confidence in the external highway consultants, although additional traffic surveys would be carried out through the legal agreement. Officers informed Members that it was not common practice to include the whole detailed wording of the legal agreement in the officer's report.

Members stated that the cumulative reports clearly indicated that it would be wrong to approve both applications due to the impact on town centres, traffic and air quality in the local area. Members also stated that there were 2 local schools in local proximity and concern was raised about an additional minute being added to pedestrian waiting times on the crossing.

The Chairman stated that further detailed traffic surveys would need to be agreed by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling.

Members discussed the proposed park on the site and that there were no designated parking spaces for the park. Members discussed the planting of trees, including species that absorb pollution. Officers stated an informative could be added. Members questioned whether the landscaping condition could be altered so that the boundary

could act as a buffer zone.

Members raised concerns as to how residents living on the site would gain access. It was noted that residents would need to follow a one-way system and go back on themselves which Members thought was impractical.

Members had concerns in relation to the use of the other 3 retail units proposed for the site. In answer to a question raised officers informed the Committee that the store was to open 24 hours.

Members discussed the residential aspect of the application and agreed that the proposals could not be approved in isolation. Members also agreed to refuse permission due to the height of the residential blocks and highways concerns.

Approval was moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was lost.

Refusal was then moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. The reasons for refusal were to be brought back to Committee to be agreed before 7 January 2014.

**Resolved - Refused**

35. **LAND ADJACENT TO HILLINGDON STATION AND SWALLOW INN, LONG LANE, HILLINGDON - 3049/APP/2012/1352** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Demolition of the existing public house and timber yard, and the erection of a mixed use redevelopment comprising a foodstore (7829m<sup>2</sup> GEA) (Use Class A1); a 6 storey 82 bed hotel (Use Class C1); a 720m<sup>2</sup> restaurant/public house facility (Use Class A3/A4); and 107 residential units (Use Class C3), together with reconfiguration of the existing commuter car park, and associated landscaping, car/cycle parking and ancillary works.**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitions received in objection and support to the proposals were invited to address the meeting.

The lead petitioner from the Ickenham Residents Association in objection to the application raised the following points:

- Agreed with the officer recommendation for refusal.
- It was felt that the applicant was likely to appeal.
- Reasons for refusal were not strong or broad enough.
- The proposals were very similar to those rejected in the 2004 application by Tesco.
- The scale and size of the proposals were overbearing.
- There would be an affect on the Uxbridge Town Centre.
- Inclusion of a butcher in the proposed premises would threaten shops in Ickenham.
- The main concern was the impact on traffic and air pollution.
- Traffic models needed to validated against existing traffic conditions.
- There were often long traffic queues on Long Lane.
- The traffic flow from Hercies Road would be limited.

- Major concern for pedestrians, especially from local schools.
- Inadequate data relating to journey times and traffic pollution.
- There were already tailbacks on the A40 due to traffic; a store would exasperate the problem.

The lead petitioner supporting the application raised the following points:

- Had been a local resident since 1938.
- The site had been derelict for over 20 years.
- The applicant had been forthcoming and consulted with local residents.
- The proposal was in the right place.
- The proposals would enhance the local area.
- The proposed entrance would link with Hillingdon Station and be more accessible than the application on the old Master Brewer site.
- There would be separate entrances to the site.
- The proposals were larger than the Former Master Brewer site because food would be freshly prepared on the premises.
- Jobs would be offered to local and unemployed people.
- These proposals were better than those proposed on the Former Master Brewer site.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The Premier Inn hotel was committed to the development and had confidence in this application.
- Had included more parking at the site as requested by the local Chamber of Commerce.
- There was more support from local residents and businesses for this application.
- Was committed to local employment and would work with Uxbridge College and the local Job Centre Plus.
- 150 jobs would be offered to local unemployed people.
- Applicants for the Former Master Brewer site had used old traffic data from 2008 whilst this applicant had used data from 2011.
- Even with a smaller store the applicant for the Former Master Brewer site would have a larger impact on the local community.

Members discussed the traffic impact that the proposal could have on the local area. Officers informed the Committee that there was an issue with Hercies Road and the proposed traffic lights to allow traffic flow from Hercies Road. Members spoke about rat-running on Vine Lane and the impact it had on Long Lane.

Officers informed the Committee that information had been received at a very late stage on several occasions. The latest submission was so late that it could not be considered as it would have taken time to investigate.

Members suggested that traffic was the key issue and some residents felt that the new information submitted had not been validated.

The agent informed the Committee that the data was validated by Transport for London (TfL) and Hillingdon Council officers. There were currently trucks and diggers parked in the area where they were planning to make 2 lanes of traffic.

Members questioned whether the queuing on Hercies Road could be overcome by

	<p>altering the phasing of the traffic lights.</p> <p>Members requested that reason 6 for refusal be removed and transferred to item 5. The Chairman requested that the reasons for refusal were brought back to Committee before 7 January 2014.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - Refused</b></p>
36.	<p><b>CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor present reminded the Committee that the purpose of the report was to consider whether it would be appropriate to approve both schemes together.</p> <p>Members discussed the effects the proposals would have on the local area if both schemes were approved. Member concerns concurred with those already given during the discussions on the individual applications.</p> <p><b>Resolved – The Committee agreed that both schemes should not be approved together, and therefore cumulative reasons for refusal should be imposed on all applications.</b></p>
37.	<p><b>COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor present reminded the Committee that the purpose of this report was to consider which scheme was the preferable option of the two.</p> <p>Members discussed both the Spenhill scheme (Master Brewer site) and the Bridehall scheme (Land adjacent to Hillingdon Station). Members comparatively preferred the Bridehall application over the Spenhill applications.</p> <p><b>Resolved – The Committee agreed that the Bridehall application was the preferred scheme.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.49 pm.</p>

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

This page is intentionally left blank