

## Minutes

### MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 July 2015

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b> Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman) Peter Curling Jazz Dhillon Janet Duncan (Labour Lead) Carol Melvin Brian Stead David Yarrow</p>
	<p><b>OFFICERS PRESENT:</b> James Rodger, Residents Services, Adrien Waite, Residents Services, Syed Shah, Residents Services, Tim Brown, Legal Services, and Ainsley Gilbert, Democratic Services</p>
12.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor John Morgan. Councillor Raymond Graham was present as his substitute.</p>
13.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared an interest in Item 11, Padcroft Works, and explained that she would be leaving the room for the duration of that item.</p>
14.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2015 were agreed to be accurate.</p>
15.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were no such matters.</p>
16.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was agreed that all items would be considered in part one, as set out in the agenda.</p>

17. **FORMER TOMMY FLYNNS PH, SUTTON COURT ROAD, HILLINGDON  
8396/APP/2014/4118** (*Agenda Item 6*)

The Chairman explained that the officer recommendation relating to this report had been changed from refusal to approval, as a result of negotiations with the developer. The details were set out in the addendum paper.

Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was now recommended for approval as the applicant had agreed to provide 35% affordable housing. The application was for the redevelopment of the site to provide a part three, part four storey building containing 30 flats with 31 car parking spaces. Amenity space would be provided to the rear, through a roof garden, and on balconies. The surrounding area consisted mostly of two storey dwellings, but there was also a three storey parade on a corner nearby. The proposed ridge height was, at 11.89m, one metre taller than that of the existing public house, although it did not exceed the height of the existing chimneys. A tree protection plan had been developed to safeguard the mature oak located on the site. An extension at 76 Snowden Avenue had been approved, and whilst the 45° line would be breached for two of the windows on the ground floor, the third, principal, window would not be unacceptably impacted by the proposed development. Officers also noted that whilst planning permission had been granted, it had not yet been implemented. Officers reminded members of the addendum, and asked that two further changes to the recommendation be made, firstly, that the Heads of Terms of the S.106 agreement be amended to reduce the amount of affordable housing to be delivered before the first commercial unit was occupied from 100% to 50% in order to assist the developers financial position, and secondly that the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to amend conditions, should the proposal be granted.

Petitioners made the following points:

- The proposed development was insecure, and the car park had the potential to generate anti social behaviour;
- The transport assessments had not taken account of the significant amount of congestion already in the area;
- The roof garden was out of keeping with the area, was likely to generate noise pollution. Petitioners felt that its inclusion exposed the overdevelopment of the site;
- The location of the bin store was too close to neighbours and too far from disabled units;
- A three storey building would be out of keeping with the vast majority of houses in the area, and the resulting massing would be detrimental to the character of the area;
- The units lacked outside amenity space;
- The service road and car park was located on the boundary with both 60 Sutton Court Road and 5 Silver Way, which was detrimental to their amenity;
- The building line was not in keeping with the area;
- Neighbour's sunlight would be reduced;
- The density was too great, considering the suburban location and low public transport accessibility;
- The loss of the public house garden was detrimental to the area.

The applicant's agent made the following points:

- The proposal would bring a high quality sustainable development including 30 much needed homes to a prominent, underutilised brownfield site;
- Residents had been involved in the design process from an early stage, and the architecture had been improved as a result of this engagement;
- Amenity space to be provided at the site would exceed the minimum requirements significantly;
- The grounds would be landscaped, whilst the oak tree would be protected;
- The proposal was compliant with all relevant LB Hillingdon policies.

Councillor Chapman, attending as a ward Councillor, supported the arguments made by the petitioners and made the following points:

- The proposal would not harmonise with the street scene;
- The building would be very close to the front edge of the plot, which would make it over-dominant;
- The development would impinge upon neighbours amenity and privacy.

In response to questions officers explained that:

- There would be no significant loss of sunlight for neighbours;
- There would be no unacceptable overlooking as the proposal complied with relevant policies. The roof garden had also been designed to prevent overlooking;
- There were no policies protecting former public house gardens from development, as they were not covered by the 'backland development' policies;
- The bin store would be located inside the building, and so disabled access would be acceptable. There was not expected to be an odour impact on neighbouring properties relating to the bin store;
- Gates to the car park were not proposed as these led to unacceptable waiting on the carriageway. The proposal was however still 'Secured by Design' compliant;
- The level of parking and cycle parking was good, whilst traffic generation was likely to be so low as to be negligible;
- The proposal would not breach the 45° line, as only non principal windows in an unbuilt, but approved, extension would be within this angle;
- The closest point of the roof garden to the boundary was 24 metres from it, and so noise pollution was not considered likely;
- Residents living next to the proposed car park would be protected by acoustic fencing;
- Housing density figures were only a guide, and if a development could exceed these without causing harm in other ways, they could not be a reason for refusal;

After an extensive debate, a motion for refusal was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**It was therefore resolved:**

- a) That the application be refused because of the Size, Scale and Bulk of the proposed development which resulted in a site layout**

	<p>which was detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residential properties and had a significant impact on the character of the area;</p> <p><b>b) That the precise wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead.</b></p>
<p>18.</p>	<p><b>FORMER EMI SITE, DAWLEY ROAD, HAYES 8294/APP/2015/1406</b> <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that proposal was for the redevelopment of the site to provide 10,728sq metres of Class B1(c) and B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) floorspace with associated parking, servicing, access and landscaping. This would be split into 6 units across 5 buildings. The site was within a designated industrial area, and whilst there were a few residential properties in the area, these were not sufficiently close to be of any concern. The Environmental Protection Unit would manage noise generation at the site. Members attention was drawn to the addendum report.</p> <p>Councillors raised concerns about traffic generation, particularly from lorries, noting that this had caused complaints from residents. Officers explained that there would be improvements to the roundabout at the junction of Dawley Road and Swallowfield Way.</p> <p>Following debate, the recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed by a majority of members present.</p> <p><b>It was resolved that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a) The head of planning investigate whether a condition regarding traffic generation could be imposed;</b></li> <li><b>b) The application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report, and any additional condition arising from the first resolution, the negotiation of an appropriate S.106 agreement.</b></li> </ul>
<p>19.</p>	<p><b>THE OLD VINYL FACTORY, BLYTH ROAD, HAYES</b> <b>59872/APP/2015/1329</b> <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the approval of reserved matters relating to the appearance and landscaping of Phase 2 of The Old Vinyl Factory Masterplan: The Material Store as required by Conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission ref. 59872/APP/2013/3775. The design was considered to be of a very high quality, and met the requirements of the outline permission.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>It was resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>- That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report.</b></li> </ul>

20.	<p><b>HILLINGDON COURT, 108 VINE LANE, HILLINGDON</b>  <b>2393/APP/2015/1146</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the creation of science laboratories above the existing west wing, an extension to existing hall/west wing to create a multi-purpose hall, refurbishment of internal rooms, enclosure and refurbishment of the internal courtyard and alterations to manoeuvring yard and access road with associated landscape works. Officers drew members attention to the addendum report and explained that the next item was an application for listed building consent relating to the same proposal.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>It was resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report.</b></li> </ul>
21.	<p><b>HILLINGDON COURT, 108 VINE LANE, HILLINGDON</b>  <b>2393/APP/2015/1147</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers explained that this application was for listed building consent pursuant to the previous application, and drew members attention to the addendum.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>It was resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report.</b></li> </ul>
22.	<p><b>PADCROFT WORKS, TAVISTOCK ROAD, YIEWSLEY</b>  <b>45200/APP/2014/3638</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan left the room prior to the consideration of this application.</p> <p>Officers explained that planning permission had been granted for a large residential scheme on much of the site, but that the developer had now acquired additional land, and so sought to expand the scheme. The application was for the demolition of all existing buildings on the site enclosed by Bentinck Road and Tavistock Road including Globe House, Globe Court, Padcroft Works, the former Dairy Crest dairy and TiGi Warehouse and comprehensive redevelopment to provide three buildings rising from three to eight storeys comprising 308 residential units, 175 sqm of Class B1 floorspace, public and private amenity space, hard and soft landscaping and lower ground floor parking space for 293 vehicles. The car park location had been improved, which would create a better public realm, and wings had been introduced to the rear of the building, which stepped down towards the edge of the site. An additional floor had been introduced, but the height from ground level would not increase. Officers noted that the new scheme would deliver a greater percentage of affordable housing than</p>

	<p>the currently proposed scheme.</p> <p>In response to questions from members, officers explained that the path at the rear of the development would be accessible by residents only, as suggested by Secured by Design officers.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>It was resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report.</b></li></ul>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.55 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ainsley Gilbert on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.