

Minutes

MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 January 2015

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



| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Committee Members Present:</p> <p>Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling, Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), Ray Graham, Carol Melvin, John Morgan and Brian Stead,.</p> <p>Cllr. Jazz Dhillon was delayed en-route to the meeting and consequently did not vote on agenda items 5 or 6.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present:</p> <p>James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager, Syeed Shah, Principal Highways Engineer, Sarah White, Legal Advisor, Charles Francis, Democratic Services Officer, Jon Pitt, Democratic Services Officer.</p> |
| 1. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr David Yarrow, with Cllr Ray Graham substituting.</p> |
| 2. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllrs. John Morgan and Peter Curling declared a pecuniary interest in item 5 as they were trustees of the Fassnidge Trust. Both left the room and did not vote on the item.</p> <p>Cllr Brian Stead declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 as he was a member of the 'Friends of the Bunker'. Cllr. Stead left the room and did not vote on the item.</p> |
| 3. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that there were no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p> |
| 4. | <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 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items marked Part 1 would be heard in public and those marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p> |
| 5. | <p>FASSNIDGE MEMORIAL HALL - R/O HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 12156/APP/2014/3099 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing Fassnidge Community Dining Hall and garage, and erection of part 4, part 7, part 8 storey building to provide a replacement</p> |

community dining facility and 48 self-contained residential units with associated undercroft car and cycle parking, new vehicle access point, communal and private amenity areas, and landscaping.

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

The application related to Fassnidge Memorial Hall to the R/O High Street, Uxbridge. Planning permission was sought for a residential mixed use development, comprising a total of 48 new residential apartments (twelve 1-bed, thirty three 2-bed and three 3-bed) within a part four, part seven, part eight storey building with three distinct but coherent elements arranged alongside Harefield Road and Oxford Road roundabout. Four of the dwellings would be affordable and all dwellings would comply with the unit size standards prescribed by the London Plan Housing Design Standard.

The scheme would also provide a replacement community dining hall with a combined 300m² of modern floorspace. This would be flexibly designed and capable of accommodating a full range of compatible community uses and activities.

Development proposals at the same site had been brought to Planning Committees twice previously and had been rejected. It was noted that the size of the scheme had been reduced considerably compared to the previous proposals.

Members noted that Officers had concluded that the proposed development was considered to be sensitive to the surrounding area, including the adjacent grade II listed building. The location was considered to be highly sustainable due to the public transport connections and it was noted that planning policies encouraged the development of such sites. In principal, Officers had no objection to the development of the site.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting the proposals addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:

- They would like know why the Fassnidge Trust had moved a large proportion of its funds into an asset management company and requested a deferral of the decision on this basis.
- The petitioners objected to the construction of an eight storey building at the location and consider that the site is not suitable for residential housing.
- Several of the background reports are based only on desk research.
- Air quality and noise levels at the site are of concern and considered to be a threat to the health of future residents and nearby neighbours.
- That the redevelopment of the Community Hall appears to be being used as an excuse for construction of the flats.
- The petitioners were of the opinion that the proposed development would add to the 'wall effect' created by existing high rise building, thereby amplifying traffic and other environmental noise.
- The petitioners were of the opinion that the developer has been granted a number of concessions. These included:
 - That only four of the 48 flats would be affordable.
 - That the development would have fewer three bedrooled dwellings than would normally be permitted in such a mixed development.
 - That there would be a shortfall of amenity space within the development.

- That repairs to an adjacent listed building would be at risk if the developer of Fassnidge Memorial Hall made no contribution.
- That parking for the flats would have an impact on the surrounding area and that although residents would not be able to obtain permits to park in nearby roads, these roads would be inundated with cars outside the restricted hours.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the applicant addressed the Committee.

The representative of the applicant made the following points:

- Although there had been two previous unsuccessful planning applications for the development of the site, there had been support for the principal of redevelopment.
- The development would be in keeping with the surrounding area and would respect the adjacent listed building.
- There had been a positive dialogue with Council Officers and this had led to a number of changes having been made to the plan.
- Distribution of leaflets about the development had indicated that there was local public support.
- The tallest elements of the development would be well away from the street. This would ensure minimum damage to the conservation area.
- The development would help the Fassnidge Trust to raise funding for the development of other housing projects in the Borough.
- The new dining hall would become an important local hub.
- The developer would pay to transport people to other facilities during construction of the Dining Hall.
- That the £100,000 developer contribution would secure a number of local public realm improvements.
- Proposed landscaping as part of the development would have a positive effect on the local area.
- That the development would support council policies and that Transport for London was supportive of the proposed parking arrangements.

Officers confirmed that the financial status of the Fassnidge Trust was not relevant to the planning application under consideration and that this would therefore have no impact on the decision to be made by the Committee.

The committee Members raised a number of concerns about the development. These included that two of the four units that had the potential to be adapted for disabled persons would not have car parking provision. There were also concerns that there would only be four affordable homes within a development of 48 dwellings and that there would be no financial contribution from the developer to the maintenance of the nearby listed building. Concerns were also raised regarding local air quality and that residents may need to keep their windows closed in order to breathe air that was of an acceptable quality. A question was also raised regarding associated landscaping that would be required with the development.

Officers responded that the parking provision was considered to be suitable for a site in a town centre location with good public transport links and pointed out that the units capable of being adapted for disabled persons would not necessarily be used for this purpose. With regard to the affordable homes requirement, it was stated that the original proposal had not included any affordable homes and that insisting on additional affordable units would have put the financial viability of the development at risk. This would have jeopardised the likelihood of it going ahead. Officers considered that the ventilation system to be installed as part of the development would mitigate air quality issues, although residents would still be able to open their windows if

they so wished. It was also confirmed that appropriate landscaping would be undertaken as part of the development.

The Committee agreed the following verbal changes to the Recommendation section of the Officer's report:

Addition of the words 'and Refuse' after 'servicing' in Head of Term iii)

Addition of '£20,000' between 'associated' and 'bond' in Head of Term iv)

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

Resolved - That the application be approved as per the Officer's report, changes to the report noted above and the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

6. **THE BATTLE OF BRITAIN BUNKER, RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2014/3910** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Erection of Battle of Britain Education and Visitor centre with exhibition space, auditorium, meeting rooms, library, cafe and shop and associated parking area and landscaping.

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

The application related to the Battle of Britain Bunker, RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge. Planning permission was sought for the erection of a Battle of Britain Education and Visitor Centre with exhibition space, auditorium, meeting rooms, library, cafe, shop and associated parking area and landscaping.

Prior approval had been granted for the demolition of the existing building and planning permission was granted in December 2014 for enabling works to allow construction of the building which is the subject of this application. Enabling works would include the creation of a temporary compound to facilitate demolition together with a temporary structure to house volunteers during demolition and construction thus enabling the facility to remain open.

The application site is located within land designated as Green Belt, while the adjacent underground Bunker is a Grade I listed structure. Development in the green belt is generally considered inappropriate except in special circumstances. It is considered that the new facility, which will enhance the visitor and educational offering on the site together with assisting in securing the future of the listed bunker, provides special circumstances which would justify development in the green belt.

The proposed building, while offering enhanced facilities to visitors is also considered to preserve the setting of the listed bunker. The proposal was therefore considered to be acceptable in heritage terms.

Members noted that Officers had no objection in principal to the proposed development. Officers were of the opinion that the nature of the proposed cultural and educational facility justified development in the Green Belt and that approval should therefore be granted, subject to referral to the Secretary of State.

The Committee Members welcomed the proposal. It was agreed that a requirement to provide a minimum of four parking spaces for motorcycles would be imposed on the applicant. There was a discussion about coach parking at the site and it was considered that it would not be necessary to require dedicated coach parking at the site. This was because coaches would arrive by prior appointment only and also that the access road to the site is not a through road. A question was also asked about the contaminated land status of the site. Officers confirmed that this had been addressed in the addendum to the application.

The Committee agreed that Condition 6 be amended to require the provision of four motorcycle spaces.

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

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 amendments to Condition 6.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7:10 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on Democratic Services Officer: 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.