

Minutes

RESIDENTS' AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Thursday 12 November 2015

**Meeting held at Committee Room 3- Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Michael White (Chairman), Teji Barnes (Vice-Chairman), Mohinder Birah, Peter Davis, Patricia Jackson, Judy Kelly, Kuldeep Lakhmana, John Morse and Brian Stead.</p> <p>Apology for Absence: Councillor Jas Dhot (Councillor John Morse substituting).</p> <p>Officers: Chris Mansfield (Deputy Director, Planning and Transportation), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) and Khalid Ahmed (Democratic Services Manager).</p>	
33.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT ALL ITEMS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT ANY ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items on the agenda would be considered in public.</p>	
34.	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15 OCTOBER 2015</p> <p>Agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
35.	<p>RESIDENTS' & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - MAJOR REVIEW 2015/16 - MECHANISM FOR REVIEWING MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BOROUGH AND IDENTIFYING LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FOR THE PLANNING PROCESS</p> <p>The Head of Planning and Enforcement attended the meeting and gave Members a presentation on the purpose of the review.</p> <p>The Committee was informed that the aim of the review was to consider whether there were any simple post development processes which could be introduced to analyse the successes or failures of major developments in the Borough. Also to look at how decision makers could try to learn lessons from any post development review processes which had been introduced.</p> <p>Members were informed that Hillingdon processed between</p>	<p>Action By:</p>

	<p>around 4,000 planning application a year, of which there were around 100 major applications. The major applications approved had a huge impact on areas of the Borough. New housing developments affected lots of stakeholders.</p> <p>Reference was made to the current mechanisms which were used by the Council to monitor developments. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan - This provided an opportunity for officers and public to give feedback regarding future developments. However, much of the feedback on planning issues of importance stems from views on developments which had already taken place. In addition the Local Plan was also developed over many years and did not represent a targeted qualitative review of whether the Borough's planning decisions were resulting in high quality development. • The Planning Department also undertook occasional customer feedback exercises which were targeted at applicants and agents. However, this feedback tended to result in customers focussing on whether they liked the service provided by a particular officer or the merits or otherwise of phone calls going through a customer contact centre. Therefore, the feedback given did not tend to provide meaningful responses on the quality of developments arising from the planning process. • There was individual site specific feedback from residents or Resident Associations on developments which were being built, but this almost entirely focussed on potential breaches of planning control, rather than constructive feedback on schemes once they had been built. <p>The Head of Planning and Enforcement acknowledged that Hillingdon did not have any processes put in place which monitored planning applications post Committee decision. For instance it would be useful to receive feedback on landscaping at developments.</p> <p>The Committee was provided with examples of approaches taken by other local authorities in terms of post development review processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receiving development advice from a Design Review Panel. Reference was made to Guildford Borough Council who received development advice on proposals for large scale new developments from a Design Review Panel. This was a Panel which was made up of professionals with expertise in architecture, urban design, landscape planning, building conservation, 	<p>Action By:</p>
--	---	--------------------------

	<p>transport planning and sustainability. The advice offered was impartial and the intention was that a design review would improve the quality and functionality of development proposals, resolve potentially contentious design issues, anticipate problems and provide alternative solutions, ensure development proposals move smoothly through the planning process and provide a way of testing design ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staging of an awards scheme such as held at the London Borough of Bromley. This could aim to promote good design in the Borough and reward and promote excellent developments. • Reference was made to the previous Council tours which took place, which took Members of the Planning Committee around the Borough to observe recent developments. The tours presented an opportunity for Members to see how new developments had contributed positively to the strategic vision as set out in the Local Plan. It also gave Members an opportunity to consider the detail of some of the sites and to see what had worked well and what had worked not so well. • Building for Life Standard - This was a well known post development quality review process and was linked to the "Build for Life" website. This website allowed potential house purchasers to see how a new development rated against twelve quality standards. Reference was made to the nearest rated developments to Hillingdon which were in the London Borough of Barnet and which had a handful of large major developments which were subject to the "Building for Life" quality standards. • Post development questionnaires - The feedback received to these tended to concentrate on micro-issues; however, feedback could be requested of planning agents, builders and architects. <p>Discussion took place on possible witnesses for the next meeting of the Committee and it was agreed that the Council's Building Design Manager, a representative from a Planning Consultant's Office, and if possible, the Chairman of the Major Applications Planning Committee be invited to attend to help Members in their review.</p> <p>In addition, arrangements would be made for a site visit to take place with the Council's Building Design Manager to provide Members with practical evidence of good and development designs.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the two officers for their attendance and noted the information received and asked officers to invite the witnesses outlined above, to the next meeting of the Committee</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>Khalid Ahmed James Rodger</p> <p>James Rodger</p>
--	---	---

	<p>RESOLVED –</p> <p>1. That the information provided be noted and be taken into consideration as part of the review and officers be asked to carry out the actions outlined above.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>Khalid Ahmed / James Rodger</p>
<p>36.</p>	<p>RESIDENTS' & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - MAJOR REVIEW 2015/16 - CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT FINAL REPORT ON THE HOARDING REVIEW</p> <p>The Committee was presented with a draft final report of the review into Hoarding.</p> <p>Members were informed of suggested changes to the draft final report which included changing the recommendation on planning enforcement delegations so that it read:</p> <p>"That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation & Recycling and relevant officers consider what further measures can be undertaken by officers to tackle hoarding when the use of planning enforcement is a potential course of action."</p> <p>In addition a new recommendation be added to read:</p> <p>"That the Cabinet Member for Education & Children's Services and the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Health & Housing request officers to review whether the Vulnerable Persons Panel can be better integrated into established safeguarding arrangements, where children are potentially at risk by hoarding."</p> <p>RESOLVED –</p> <p>1. That approval be given to the suggested and updated recommendations of the review, and the finalisation of the report be delegated to the Chairman of the Committee, in consultation with Democratic Services.</p>	<p>Mark Braddock</p>
<p>37.</p>	<p>BRIEFING ON WEST LONDON CORONER SERVICE</p> <p>The Chairman informed the Committee that he had received correspondence for the London Association of Funeral Directors who had expressed some concerns regarding the West London Coroner Service.</p> <p>A briefing note was submitted which provided the Committee with the background to the issue and what the Council was doing to monitor and improve the situation.</p>	

	RESOLVED – 1. That the briefing note be noted.	
38.	FORWARD PLAN Noted.	
39.	FORWARD PLAN Noted.	
	Meeting commenced at 5.30pm and closed at 6.30pm Next meeting: 19 January 2016 2015 at 5.30pm	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Khalid Ahmed on 01895 250833. These minutes are circulated to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.