

Minutes

MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 November 2015

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: 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>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Syed Shah (Transport Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>No apologies for absence had been received.</p>
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest made.</p>
3.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>No matters had been notified in advance of the meeting or were urgent.</p>
4.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all agenda items were Part I and would, therefore, be considered in public.</p>
5.	<p>FORMER ROYAL BRITISH LEGION CLUB, SIPSON ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 829/APP/2014/4252 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site to accommodate a 7 storey 91 room hotel, including a basement level and associated parking and landscaping.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. The proposed scheme was for the development of a vacant Royal British Legion site. This included the demolition of the existing club building, with the proposed hotel to include a basement car park with 23 parking spaces. It was noted that the principal of hotel use at the site had been previously established through a previously approved scheme for a four storey, 54 room hotel.</p>

The site was adjacent to, but not within, the green belt and it was therefore considered that the scheme would not have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the green belt.

Although the proposed hotel building would be seven storeys tall, it was noted that the two upper two floors would be stepped back from the front and side elevations of the lower floors. The height of the development would be consistent with the neighbouring Park Hotel development. The proposed street landscaping, car parking and highway arrangements were considered to be consistent with planning policy. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be approved.

A Member questioned why the proposed development was not exclusively four storey and asked whether it could be combined with the existing Park Hotel. The Member considered that the proposed structure was unacceptably high, although they had been satisfied with the previously submitted proposal for construction of a four storey hotel. Concerns were also raised by the Member in relation to what they considered was the excessively blue colour of the proposed building and the visual impact of the development on a public footpath that passed through the site. Officers advised that, as the application site was not within the green belt, any visual impact on users of the footpath was not relevant to the determination of the application.

Further Members expressed concerns about the height of the building, its appearance and effect on the adjacent green belt. Officers confirmed that existing buildings at the complex were between four and six storeys in height. The Legal Advisor stated that if the application was refused by the Committee and subsequently went to appeal, the Planning Inspector would consider the height of neighbouring buildings in comparison to the proposals. It was also noted that the colour of the buildings could be covered by a planning condition and that, therefore, this should not be included in any reasons for refusal, in the event that the Committee made such a decision.

In response to a Member question about disabled access to bedrooms and the apparent absence of a door within the submitted plans, officers advised that this appeared to be error in the plans.

Other Members stated that they did not object to the proposals as the development was not within the green belt and it also complied with relevant Council policies. In addition, the visual impact when viewed from a distance would be minimal.

A recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by six votes for to one against, with one abstention.

It was further agreed that authority would be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of the reasons for refusal with the Chairman and Labour Lead.

RESOLVED - That the application be refused, subject to the following:

- Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of the reasons for refusal with the Chairman and Labour Lead.

Demolition of the existing 2 x detached dwellings and erection of a two storey residential development with a lower ground floor and accommodation within the roof space. The development comprises of 6 x 1 bed flats and 6 x 2 bed flats.

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. It was noted that the two proposed dwellings had been designed to replicate the appearance of two buildings within the plot. Although the buildings would be joined by a glazed link, this would be set back from the front elevations. The proposals included 12 parking spaces, which was equivalent to one space per dwelling and amenity space.

The overall design, size and scale of the proposed building was considered to have an acceptable impact on occupants of surrounding buildings and would not have a detrimental impact on their amenity. The development would also be within acceptable limits for housing in the area. The scheme was considered to have an acceptable impact on the surrounding highway network. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be approved.

Members felt that the proposals provided much needed housing and that the designs were sympathetic to the surrounding area. A Member asked what percentage of houses within the area close to the proposed development had been converted to flats. Officers advised that this information was contained within the officer report. The Council had identified three properties (five including the application site) over a 1 km length for which consent had been granted or implemented for the conversion of buildings.

Members expressed concern about the number of side windows that appeared to be facing towards habitable rooms and that the separation appeared to only be 3 metres, while planning policies specified that the minimum separation should be 15 metres. Concerns were also raised about the amount of light that these rooms would receive. Some Members felt that the proposals were, therefore, unacceptable.

The Chairman reflected that the proposals appeared to be acceptable in broad terms but that there were concerns about the light that would be received by three habitable rooms.

Officers advised that conditions could be attached to some of the windows to increase the level of light. The Legal Advisor confirmed that the concerns raised were likely to be overturned at appeal in the event that the Committee cited them as reasons for refusal. It would be possible for the concerns to be addressed through additional conditions.

A Member asked whether there would be enough room for a bed to be placed in one of the rooms that was marked as a study. Officers advised that the room was smaller than the size for it to be considered to be a bedroom but that it was likely that the room would be physically large enough to accommodate a bed. However, it would not be practical to enforce a condition in relation to this.

Some Members felt that the Committee should base its decision on the planning guidance. This stated that the external windows of habitable rooms should not be separated by less than 15 metres from the windows of other habitable rooms. Officers advised that the minimum separation of 15 metres was guidance and therefore did not carry as much weight in the determination of a decision as a policy would.

It was agreed that authority would be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree, outside the meeting, the wording of conditions in relation to the siting of oriel windows.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by four votes in favour to three against, with one abstention.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report , the addendum sheet circulated and the following:

- Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree wording in relation to the siting of oriel windows with the Chairman and Labour Lead.

7. **IMPERIAL HOUSE, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 5039/APP/2014/3715** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Construction of an A1 discount food store with associated car parking and landscaping on the site of the former Imperial House. External refurbishment of Units 1 and 2.

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. The application proposed demolition of the vacant single storey Imperial House and replacement with a building that would house a Lidl food store.

It was noted that the application was the resubmission of a similar scheme that had been refused permission in April 2014. This refusal had been based upon the likely impact on other retailers, highways issues and the lack of a legal agreement and flood risk plan. Officers advised that Members should focus on these issues when considering the application. It was also noted that the site was within a designated IBA. There was no bulky goods restriction at the site following a previous appeal and the principal of industrial use had already been established.

Approval of the application would enable vacant land, which was currently not contributing to the local economy, to be brought back into use. There had been significant changes since the refusal of the previous application. An updated retail impact assessment had concluded that the proposals would not have an adverse impact on the viability other retail centres. Issues in relation to highways were complex, but the key conclusion was that the development would not cause an unacceptable impact in terms of either traffic or safety. Overall, officers considered that the issues that had resulted in refusal of the previous application had been overcome to the extent that the current application was recommended for approval.

A number of additional consultation responses had been received from the public in relation to application, the majority of which were in support. At the time of publication of the addendum, there had been 54 additional responses received in support of the application and 4 against. A petition in support of the application was also presented to the Committee. While the petition had been received too late for formal consideration, it was noted that the petition contained 52 signatures.

Members expressed concerns that the parking at the site would not be sufficient, which could cause congestion in nearby roads. Concerns were also raised that there was a possibility that pedestrian safety could be compromised by delivery vehicles, given the proposed site layout. Officers advised that the site currently contained 85 spaces. The proposals would add 19 spaces to give an on-site total of 104. This was only slightly less than the forecast peak requirement of 116 parking spaces. It was also noted that the proposed scheme complied with the maximum number of parking spaces permitted

for either retail or non-retail use, which would be 162. There was no minimum requirement. In relation to pedestrian safety, officers advised that the proposed Lidl store was of a standard format used in locations across the country and they were not aware of any serious incidents or safety concerns at these other locations. In response to a Member question about disabled access, officers confirmed that there would be not be an impact as access was separate. Some Members remained concerned that the footprint for the site was too small for the proposed development. The Chairman reflected that while the Committee appeared to be satisfied with the proposal in principle, there were concerns about highways issues, particularly in relation to parking and traffic volumes. Officers advised that these concerns did not amount to strong planning grounds for refusal and that parking related issues were particularly difficult to win at appeal. It was questioned whether conditions could be used to require the applicant to manage traffic at the site. In response, officers advised that this would not be practical in this case.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by six votes in favour to one against, with one abstention.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

8. **GRASSY MEADOW DAY CENTRE, GRANGE ROAD, HAYES - 48110/APP/2015/3436** (*Agenda Item 8*)

1. Demolition of existing Day Centre.
2. Erection of a single part 3 and part 4 storey building comprising: 88 number of 1 bed Extra-Care units (C2 Use Class) and 700 sqm dementia resource centre with communal lounge and associated service facilities (D1 Use Class).
3. Associated soft and hard landscaping (including ancillary structures such as bin stores & storage shed).
4. Provision of car parking.

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. The application proposed demolition of an existing Day Centre and complete redevelopment of the site to provide extra care housing units, a specialised Dementia Resource Centre and associated facilities. The proposed development was part three storey and part four storey.

It was noted that the proposals complied with current planning policy. This sought to encourage new residential schemes, including those which cater for people in need of additional care. The development, which would utilise a modern design, would be well screened by trees with all rooms receiving adequate light. There would be no significant impact on the local highway network. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be approved.

Some Members considered that the scale of the proposed development was excessive given that it was within Metropolitan Open Land, although they would not consider a smaller development at the site to be inappropriate. One Member considered that the suggestion that the proposals complied with the planning policy that sought to encourage new residential schemes was a weak argument. This was because the argument could be applied to the development of land anywhere in the Borough.

Officers advised that being within Metropolitan Open Land did not give the land the same status as would be afforded to it if it was within the Green Belt. It was also

considered that proposed tree planting would help to limit the impact of the development on the Metropolitan Open Land. The Chairman stated that the fact that there was already existing development at the site was an important factor in the determination of whether the development would be appropriate.

A Member sought assurances that there was suitable protection on the ground floor of the proposed development to prevent vulnerable dementia patients leaving the premises undetected. Officers considered that there had been much attention to detail with regard to the application and were confident that the relevant arrangements would be satisfactory to ensure the safety of residents.

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

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

9. **WEST LONDON INDUSTRIAL PARK, IVER LANE, COWLEY - 751/APP/2015/335**
(Agenda Item 9)

Continued use of the site for B8 purposes with new storage and ancillary workshop and office buildings, car parking, external storage area and new access to Wallingford Road.

Officers introduced the application, noting that the scheme proposed to create a new site access point so that all traffic associated with the operator would be able to gain access via Cowley Mill Road / Wallingford Road. This access had been opened previously but closure had been secured via condition. It was considered that the proposals were likely to result in a significant number of lorries using the local road network. Approval of the proposals would create a relatively large area of industrial land. Officers considered that this was likely to result in excessive noise and traffic and to prejudice general highway and pedestrian safety. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be refused.

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

RESOLVED: that the application be refused as per the officers recommendation.

10. **PARK VIEW DAY CENTRE, FARRIER CLOSE, HILLINGDON - 60469/APP/2015/3368**
(Agenda Item 10)

Erection of a 3 storey building (including a lower ground level) comprising 60 Extra-Case Units (C2 Use Class), associated facilities, parking and landscaping (involving demolition of existing building at the site).

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. It was noted that although the exiting day care facility at the site was currently vacant, it had provided day care facilities until recently.

It was considered that the scheme would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, nor to the amenities of the surrounding residential occupants or highway network. Accordingly, the officer recommendation was for the application to be approved.

Members asked for confirmation that the rooms that were closest to an earth bank would receive adequate light. With regard to the proximity of some rooms to the bank, it was confirmed that these room would receive adequate daylight. Appropriate wording would be included in the Landscape Maintenance Schedule to ensure that the bank would be maintained as a green area. Officers further advised that the proposals were compliant with planning policies with regard to the separation between rooms. In response to a Member question about amenity space, officers advised that all units had winter gardens.

It was agreed that authority would be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to further investigate the issue of contaminated land in relation to the development site.

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

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report , the addendum sheet circulated and the following:

- Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to further investigate the issue of contaminated land in relation to the development site.

The meeting, which commenced at 6:00 pm, closed 8:05 pm

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.