

**Minutes****MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE****18 November 2014****Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**

**HILLINGDON**  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling, Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), Carol Melvin, John Morgan, Brian Stead and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillors Philip Corthorne and Brian Crowe</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Matt Duigan - Planning Services Manager, Meg Hirani - Planning Team Manager, Syed Shah - Principal Highways Engineer, Nicole Cameron - Legal Adviser and Gill Oswell - Democratic Services</p>
87.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies received.</p>
88.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Brian Stead declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 6 - Hillingdon and Uxbridge Cemetery, Hillingdon Hill, Hillingdon and left the room whilst the item was discussed.</p>
89.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7, 21 &amp; 29 OCTOBER 2014</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 7, 21 &amp; 29 October 2014 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
90.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>
91.	<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 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items marked Part 1 would be considered in public and items in Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>

<p>92.</p>	<p><b>HILLINGDON AND UXBRIDGE CEMETERY, HILLINGDON HILL, HILLINGDON 64409/APP/2014/3560</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b><i>Repair and refurbishment of Gatehouse and Chapel buildings to include: re-roofing, overhaul of rainwater goods, repairs and re-pointing to stonework, overhaul windows and external and internal doors, upgrading to fire doors, upgrade of timber floors and structural repairs in accordance with structural engineer's report (Listed Building Consent)</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
<p>93.</p>	<p><b>272 - 276 BATH ROAD, SIPSON 464/APP/2014/2886</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b><i>Change of use of existing building from office (Use Class B1(a)) to 135-room Hotel (Use Class C1), including 4-storey side extension (to rear of adjacent petrol station), and 4-storey rear extensions, and associated alterations to landscaping and car parking.</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application and details of the amendments on the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>In answer to a question raised in relation to the increase in the number of bedrooms and the parking requirement officers advised that it was expected that the location of the hotel would mean that a lot of visitors would arrive by the Hoppa bus and taxi.</p> <p>The recommendation in the report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission subject to the relevant conditions set out below:</b></p> <p><b>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:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Highways:</b> to secure all necessary works (including new access point on Eggerton Way) and the provision of a Travel Plan (including £20,000.00 Bond), including Sustainable Transport Measures (such as a hopper bus service).</li> <li><b>2. Construction Training:</b> 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 plus £9600 Coordinator Costs).</li> <li><b>3. Air Quality:</b> 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.</li> </ol>

**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 05/12/2014, or such other date as agreed by the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, 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 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, off site highways impacts as well as air quality). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies R17, AM7 and OE1 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, 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 should the application be approved following the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy coming into force, the applicant shall pay the required levy on the additional floorspace created.**

**G) That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives contained in the officer's report and on the addendum sheet be attached.**

94. **TEMPORARY FLIGHT CONNECTIONS CENTRE - STAND 323 TERMINAL 3  
HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW 27277/APP/2014/3202 (Agenda Item 8)**

***Temporary Flight Connections centre at Terminal 3, consultation under Schedule 2 Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.***

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the report and details of the amendments on the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

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

**RESOLVED - That no objection be raised.**

95. **FLIGHT CONNECTION CENTRE, TERMINAL 3, CENTRAL TERMINAL AREA,  
HEATHROW AIRPORT, HOUNSLOW 27277/APP/2014/3204 (Agenda Item 9)**

***Demolition of existing Flight Connection Centre and erection of new larger centre serving Terminal 3.***

	<p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report.</b></p>
96.	<p><b>UNIT 5, LOMBARDY RETAIL PARK, COLDHARBOUR LANE, HAYES 63098/APP/2014/3080</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b><i>Installation of mezzanine within existing retail unit with ancillary customer cafe.</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application and details of the amendments on the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>
97.	<p><b>FORMER NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES HEADQUARTERS SITE, PORTERS WAY, WEST DRAYTON 5107/APP/2014/2454</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b><i>Reserved matters (appearance and landscaping) in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 for Phase 4, second application (23 residential units) of planning permission ref: 5107/APP/2009/2348 dated 01/10/2010, for the proposed mixed used redevelopment of the Former NATS Site.</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application and details of the amendments on the addendum sheet. Officers advised that the standards in regard to amenity space had changed in the London Plan and some of the units did not meet this criterion. It was the view of officer's that the size of the dwellings was more important and approval was therefore recommended.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the amount of open space in the area, officers informed the Committee that there were 2 large areas of open space, one of which was 100 metres from the dwellings.</p> <p>A member raised concerns in relation to the parking that currently occurs in Holly Gardens.</p> <p>Officers advised the Committee that there was no vehicular access from this site to Holly Gardens, only a pedestrian access so this would need to be dealt with elsewhere.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers' report.</b></p>

98. **2 MIDCROFT, RUISLIP 4918/APP/2014/1274** (Agenda Item 12)

***Demolition of existing petrol station with tanks and erection of a four storey building comprising 14 residential, an office unit at ground floor level plus associated access, underground car parking and cycle storage.***

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the report and details of the amendments on the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting. This included the fact that a petition had been submitted, and additionally the applicant had submitted a detailed supporting statement. Members noted that they had read and taken account of the applicant's submission.

The site had a sensitive relationship with the adjoining residential property at 4 Midcroft. The officer highlighted that the site was in a conservation area and adjacent to an Area of Special Local Character.

The proposed building was marginally higher than the adjoining office building. The design of the building had included a step down where the site adjoins 4 Midcroft. The proposal meets the requirements of the Hillingdon Local Plan and the London Plan.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners and the applicant/agent addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposal made the following points:-

- All those who had signed the petition live in the locality of the site.
- The site lies within the Ruislip Conservation Area and adjacent to an Area of Special Character.
- Any development should enhance/preserve the Conservation Area.
- Residents were not against development but it needed to satisfy certain conditions and harmonise with the character, style, height and the street scene.
- The proposed 4 storey development does not provide the right transition as you enter Midcroft from the High Street.
- The building would be too bulky and the footprint was larger than that existing.
- The transition to No. 4 Midcroft was not felt to be acceptable.
- Suggested that there should be no commercial element to the proposal, which would reduce the height of the proposed development.
- The proposal does not conform to the character of the local area.
- Suggested that the proposed building should be of a more interesting style.
- Would prefer to see a smaller scale residential block and questioned whether the commercial element was needed.

The applicant/agent made the following points:-

- Was sympathetic to the views of neighbours.
- Had been in discussion with planning and the conservation officer.
- The scheme was sympathetic and compliant.
- Understood the issues and the specific points raised in relation to the Conservation Area.
- The current use as a car wash raised a number of road safety issues due to the number of vehicles using the site.
- The height of the proposed building would not be materially different to the adjoining office block.

- The height of the proposed development dropped down a storey on the residential side and had been set back so that the block did not appear too bulky.
- A daylight/sunlight survey had been undertaken and complied with the requirements.
- The roof terrace drops down and a higher barrier proposed to avoid overlooking.
- The design of the proposed flats had been as sympathetic as possible.
- The proposed building had been designed to blend in with the existing area and would be developed in a sensitive manner.

Points made by the Ward Councillors:-

- Endorsed the comments made by the petitioners.
- Eastcote and East Ruislip Ward Councillor are also opposed to the scheme as the site was close to the ward boundary.
- The character of the built environment was fairly balanced and could be argued either way.
- Initial thoughts when reading the report was that an error had been made and the report related to a different site.
- There were serious issues in terms of the impact the development would have on the Conservation Area.
- Concerns as to the impact the proposal would have on local businesses, as there were already vacant shops in the High Street.
- Sought clarification of the proposed traffic light system.
- The proposal failed to maintain the character of the area, was incongruous and there would be a loss of amenity.
- The neighbouring building would have reduced natural light.
- There were strong objections to the current proposal.
- Consideration should be given to what a Conservation Area was.
- There was a need for some development on this site.
- The removal of the commercial element would reduce the height of the building and overcome a majority of the objections.
- The proposed development would impact on the Halifax building a locally listed building, Midcroft and the street scene, which was not felt to be acceptable.
- Insufficient thought had been given to the impact the proposal would have on traffic as it would exacerbate an already congested junction with the High Street.
- If the Committee were minded to approve the application there needed to be great attention to the conditions imposed.
- Against the development in its current form.

The Committee felt that the proposal in its current form was overly large and detracted from the Conservation Area and had concerns about the distance between the site and 4 Midcroft in relation to overshadowing and over dominance. Further concerns were raised in relation to the undercroft and whether access/parking/servicing the units on the High Street would be possible (especially with HGVs) if the application went ahead. In relation to the office building facing the High Street there were concerns raised that the proposed development would block natural light increasing energy efficiency and reducing outlook for workers. The Committee noted that there had been an overshadowing survey carried out by the applicant but this had not been made available to the Committee who still had concerns around this issue.

In answer to the issues raised by the Committee officers advised that the undercroft would be unsuitable for access by HGVs. In relation to the issue with regard to natural

light the proximity of the building would reduce natural light to the office building but there was a secondary source of light. There were no policies that would support a reason for refusal in regards to the issue of natural light.

Officers advised that the overshadowing survey carried out by the applicant complied with the BRE guidelines, and therefore objection was not raised to overshadowing of 4 Midcroft.

A member raised concerns about the Council's sustainability policies as they had been written in general terms and felt that they needed to be more detailed as they did not address the impact on the loss of light to existing buildings.

The Committee had concerns in relation to the size, height and bulk of the proposed development due to the impact on the character of the area and its impact on 4 Midcroft. It was felt that the design of the building would be detrimental to the Conservation Area, Area of Special Local Character and the street scene and would not work in this location.

Officers advised the Committee that the proposal would project 10m beyond the rear building line of No.4 Midcroft and met the 45° rule.

In answer to concerns raised in regards to the parking for the commercial element of the proposed development officers advised that it would be possible to configure the parking to accommodate this.

In answer to the concerns raised in relation to the servicing of the units fronting the High Street from the rear access road, the Legal Adviser informed the Committee that if the access road was a private road an agreement between the land owner and the applicant could be drafted but this was not a consideration for the Committee as it was a private matter. Should the Committee believe that the development could not be physically serviced this could form a refusal reason.

The Committee still had concern about the application in relation to the size, scale, bulk height, design, the impact on the Conservation and the loss of servicing of the existing commercial units fronting High Street; and refusal was moved on these grounds. The recommendation for refusal was seconded and on being put to the vote the application was refused.

**RESOLVED - That the application be refused for the following reasons:-**

- 1. The proposal, by reason of its siting, size, height, bulk and proximity to the neighbouring buildings is considered to constitute an unduly intrusive, visually prominent and incongruous form of development, which would fail to preserve, enhance or respect the established character of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and the Midcroft, Ruislip, Area of Special Local Character, or compliment the visual amenities of the street scene and would mar the skyline, and result in a significant loss of residential amenity contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1, Policies BE4, BE5, BE13, BE19, BE21 and BE26 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policies 7.1 (D) and 7.6 of the London Plan (2011) and the provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.**

	<p><b>2. The proposal, fails to demonstrate that that sufficient manoeuvring and access arrangements for service delivery vehicles and car parking would be maintained for adjoining commercial premises which would result in driver confusion and unexpected vehicle movements for other highway users and deliveries and parking taking place from the road. The development is therefore considered to be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety and prejudicial to the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway, including access by service delivery vehicles the adjacent buildings at 53 - 61 High Street Ruislip, contrary to Policy AM7 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy 6.3 of the London Plan (2011).</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.30 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Gill Oswell on Democratic Services Officer: 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.