

## Minutes

### MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

8 December 2015

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 David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transportation Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer) and Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer)</p>	
11.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
12.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
13.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
14.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>All items were considered in Part 1.</p>	
15.	<p><b>ABBOTSFIELD &amp; SWAKELEYS SCHOOL - 3505/APP/2015/3030</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment of the Abbotsfield and Swakeleys School sites to provide two new three-storey secondary schools with detached sports halls and associated facilities including playgrounds, sports pitches, a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA), car parking and</b></p>	

**pupil drop-off/pick-up areas; erection of a new two-storey Vocational Training Centre (VTC); creation of a new vehicular access via Sutton Court Road; landscaping; and ancillary development (including retention of an existing sports hall and maths block and demolition of all other existing school buildings). (ADDITIONAL INFORMATION INCLUDING UPDATED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND REVISED PLANS)**

Officers introduced the report and spoke about each specific school application in detail, outlining what the main planning considerations were. Officers then set out the changes in the addendum.

In accordance with the constitution a representative of petition in objection was invited to address the meeting. As there were two petitions in objection, one petitioner spoke to both petitions for 10 minutes.

The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:

- The existing location of Abbotsfield School (as amended) - It was highlighted that although many residents had no objection in principle to a school, they wished its location to be moved even further south to where the existing Abbotsfield school was located.
- Sutton Court Road Traffic - It was noted that a permanent 20mph speed limit (as well as other traffic calming and safety measures) were recommended. This measure was to mitigate the increase in traffic. This is a conditional requirement for planning approval to be given. It was requested that this stipulation should be agreed as a condition of planning approval rather than as an informative.
- Sutton Court Road Security - To enhance security, residents requested cctv to be installed along the north side of the site, (where the proposed new school would border the back of Sutton Court properties).
- It was felt that the cctv should cover the whole line of sight of the new entrance to the bottom of Sutton Court (West to East). The petitioner reiterated that the request should be considered as a condition rather than as an informative.
- The Abbotsfield Bell - Instead of using a school bell (as was the case now), the request was made for this to be substituted for a buzzer which would be less intrusive to local residents.
- It was requested that the bell only be used in emergency situations and that the school bell or buzzer should be deactivated on Saturdays, Sundays, public holidays and school term breaks such that Sutton Court Residents do not suffer "noise pollution"
- The request was made that the same conditions should be applied to the public announcement system. The petitioner reiterated that the request should be considered as a condition rather than as an informative.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The applicant confirmed the siting of Abbotsfield school had not been its first choice and had been influenced by interaction with a number of organisations including Sport England.
- The current proposed site was located 53m away from the nearest residential property, so no properties would suffer from loss of light.
- The school was located in the lowest part of the site so would be as unobtrusive as possible to local residents.
- Most residents would have a more open aspect as a result of the proposed siting.
- The bell needed to be a certain volume for it to be effective over a given area. It was suggested that where possible an internal bell could be used to minimise its effect on local residents
- The transportation representative confirmed a robust approach had been taken to the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.
- It was acknowledged that the number of journeys at peak period would increase but the proposed new access route to Abbotsfield via Sutton Court Road would mitigate the traffic impacts.
- The applicant had worked with the Council and Transport for London to develop proposals to reduce traffic where possible, including increasing the frequency of buses, improved pedestrian walkways and improved cycle infrastructure.
- To improve safety and address rat running a number of steps were proposed which included a 20 mph zone, speed cushions, pedestrian refuges in roads and double yellow lines in Woodcroft Road.

A joint statement from all three ward Councillors was read out by the Chairman. This made the following points:

- Ward Councillors supported the basic approach taken in the Officer report.
- Ward Councillors acknowledged residents remained concerned about the close proximity of the school to some properties and the impact of the school bell.

During the course of discussions, the Committee sought a number of clarifications from Officers on several points. In relation to the proposed construction method of piling, Officers confirmed this was necessary due to the prevailing ground conditions. Officers were assured that the type of piling envisaged would not cause vibrations or cause nuisance to residential properties.

With regards to the siting of the school, the Committee noted that the proposal at Abbotsfield reduced its footprint and Officers had moved it as far away from residents as was possible. It was also noted that at 53 metres away at the closest point significant efforts had been made to mitigate its impact on local residents.

The Committee also discussed the transport impact assessment and questioned whether or not the proposed 20 mph zone could be

	<p>extended across a wider area. In response, Officers confirmed that planning obligations could only be added where they directly related to and necessary to make the development acceptable. The current proposals were considered the correct balance to meet this test. This would not prohibit the Council from considering other measures in the future should it feel these necessary in its capacity as the Highways Authority.</p> <p>Lengthy discussions took place about the merits and practicalities of using bells and buzzers at the schools and the likely impacts these would have on residents. Officers highlighted the necessary tests for conditions including that they must be reasonable in all respects alongside the practical requirement that existed to notify children who were outside of the school buildings of the start of lessons. While the Committee understood the points raised by the petitioners, the Committee agreed the use of bells and buzzers was a local management issue for both Schools.</p> <p>After deliberations, it was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved as set out in the officer report and addendum.</b></p>	
16.	<p><b>LAND SOUTH HOLLOWAY LANE/NORTH HARMONDSWORTH LANE HOLLOWAY LANE (SOLAR FARM) - 1354/APP/2015/2752 - WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Solar Energy Farm for the local generation of low carbon electricity to the Local Distribution Network, including the installation of solar photovoltaic panels and associated infrastructure.</b></p> <p>The item was withdrawn from the agenda by the applicant before the meeting.</p>	
17.	<p><b>HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL - 39708/APP/2015/4186</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Application For mineral extraction, processing and importation of sand and gravel and reclamation materials for Denham Park Farm with restoration to agriculture and a small wetland area at Pynesfield, off Tilehouse Lane, Maple Cross, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire (Consultation By Hertfordshire County Council)</b></p> <p>Officers explained that Hertfordshire County Council had sought comments from the London Borough of Hillingdon Council on an application for mineral extraction, processing and importation of sand and gravel and reclamation materials (from Denham Park Farm) for restoration to agriculture and a small wetland area and a new vehicular access on land at Pynesfield, off Tilehouse Lane, Maple Cross, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire</p>	

In response to a Committee question about the likely impact, Officers confirmed the applicant had failed to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the proposed development would not result in increased traffic generation on roads which were currently used to capacity within the London Borough of Hillingdon.

It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed unanimously that an objection be submitted.

**Resolved -**

**That the London Borough of Hillingdon object as per the officers report.**

18. **SIPSON VILLAGE GARDEN CENTRE SIPSON ROAD - 67666/APP/2015/2413** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Mixed use development comprising up to 53 residential units (Use Class C3/C2) and associated private and public open space, pedestrian and vehicular access and parking, including demolition of garden centre (Outline application).**

Officers explained that outline planning permission was sought for a residential development comprising 53 units, public open space, an ecology biodiversity area, a village green and 20 allotment pitches. The Committee learnt that the proposal included the demolition of existing buildings, structures and the glass house associated with the former Sipson Village Garden Centre.

The Committee were informed that a total of 121 surrounding occupiers were consulted and 65 representations were received in objection to the scheme. In the course of discussions, Officers explained the scheme was considered to be an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, 'very special circumstances' had not been demonstrated which would outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt. Additional reasons for refusal included the unacceptable ecological impacts and sustainability.

Discussing the application, the Committee agreed the proposal was an inappropriate form of development in the green belt and result in an unacceptable degree of urbanisation.

It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be refused.

**Resolved -**

**That the application be refused.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7:00pm, closed at 8:20pm

---

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