

Minutes

HILLINGDON  
LONDON

**MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

21 June 2016

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), Roy Chamdal, Henry Higgins, John Morgan, Brian Stead, David Yarrow, Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan and John Oswell.</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Charlotte Goff (Planning Officer) James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
14.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Eddie Lavery, with Councillor Roy Chamdal substituting.</p>
15.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item number 6, Old Coal Depot, as she was a member of the Garden City Estate Residents' Association that was opposing the application. Councillor Duncan left the room during consideration of the item.</p>
16.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 11 MAY AND 31 MAY 2016</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved: That the minutes of the meetings held on 11 May and 31 May 2016 be agreed as accurate.</b></p>
17.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>No matters had been notified in advance or were urgent.</p>
18.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were Part I and would, therefore, be heard in public.</p>

19. **OLD COAL DEPOT, TAVISTOCK ROAD, YIEWSLEY - 18736/APP/2015/4457**  
(Agenda Item 6)

**Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a materials recovery and recycling facility and Civic Amenity Site, incorporating a recovery and recycling building, storage bays, administration office/training building, external processing and storage area, two weighbridges, reuse and extension of railway sidings, and Civic Amenity Centre, together with associated car parking, landscaping, fencing and infrastructure.**

**Introduction of the application**

Officers introduced the report, which sought the redevelopment of the Old Coal Yard to provide a materials recovery and recycling facility and Civic Amenity Site. The proposals would provide a Materials Recovery and Recycling Building (MRF), which would provide 15,581 square metres of floor space. A number of storage bays would house materials associated with the construction industry. External Processing and Storage Areas would be provided to the western side of the site for concrete and wood processing and inert material storage. Offices and associated parking would be provided for the site. The offices would be contained within a two storey building. A 220 metre railway platform was also proposed to allow loading and unloading of trains transporting materials to and from the site. The existing rail sidings would be retained and extended. Two weigh bridges would facilitate the weighing of vehicles entering and leaving the site and a civic amenity site would be provided with 22 parking bays.

The only difference between the proposals and the previously refused (2013) application was the reduction in the proposed capacity of the development from 950,000 tonnes per annum to 450,000 tonnes per annum.

A total of 974 neighbouring properties had been consulted, with site notices having been displayed at 22 locations within the Yiewsley and West Drayton area. 239 representations had been received, 2 had been in support, 6 provided general comments and 231 were objections. In addition, 9 petitions in objection to the scheme had been received, containing a total of 3,137 signatures.

The London Plan had designated the site as a strategic industrial location and as an industrial and business area in the local plan. Policies LE1 and LE2 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan sought to retain land within these areas for B1, B2 and B8 uses.

The West London Waste Plan provided a policy framework for the assessment of applications for waste management facilities. The Old Coal Yard site had not been identified as a site for the provision of waste management during the period covered by the Plan. The Planning Inspector, upon examination of the West London Waste Plan, had concluded that the site would not be appropriate for such use. Appropriate sites had been identified and allocated to meet the need for waste management facilities.

The likely traffic impacts of the development were also a cause for concern, with the Council's Highway Officer having raised significant concerns about the quality and accuracy of the Transport Assessment. It was considered that the development would have significant adverse impacts on the free flow of the highway network in the Yiewsley and West Drayton Area and on highway and pedestrian safety.

The site had been almost entirely vacant since October 2015. Therefore, the

suggestion that traffic would not increase was considered to be incorrect as the baseline level of traffic was close to zero.

It had not been possible to make an informed assessment of the impact of the development on local area quality as the Air Quality Assessment was based upon assumptions from the Transport Assessment, which were considered to be flawed.

It was considered that the noise mitigation measures proposed would be likely to mitigate noise and vibrations resultant from HGV deliveries, internal loading/unloading and processing of recycling materials. The Council's Noise Officer had reviewed the application and had made no objections with regard to this and had recommended that conditions could be added in the event that the application was approved.

Members were referred to the addendum sheet circulated in advance of the meeting. This included that Network Rail had withdrawn their original comments and provided a holding objection to the scheme. There were concerns about public safety in relation to the proposed upgrade of the level crossing. It was recommended that a refusal reason be added in relation to this. An amendment to refusal reason 1 was recommended to add further reference to the West London Waste Plan. The addendum also included additional comments provided by objectors.

The application was recommended for refusal.

## **Petitions**

Multiple petitions had been received in objection to the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Chairman had determined that the petitioners would be allocated a total maximum of 25 minutes of speaking time. The petitioners had decided to allocate this time between four speakers.

Councillor Jan Sweeting spoke in relation to the main petition, making the following points:

- The petitions had been signed by a total 3,273 people. Several hundred other people representing, amongst others, local businesses and shops, had written letters of objection.
- The Committee was asked to reject the application on the basis that it would bring danger and misery to the residents of West Drayton and Yiewsley and result in increased traffic, as well as damaging existing businesses.
- Neighbouring business Tarmac had objected to the application on the basis that an additional railhead used by Powerday could have a severe impact on their operations as trains would be unable to leave their sites while trains were in the Powerday railhead.
- Petitioners considered the site to be completely unsuitable for use as an industrial waste plant as it would be in a town centre location where it would have a significant impact on the local community.
- The Council had previously determined on two occasions that the site was unsuitable for such a use.
- The Government inspector had considered that use of the site for waste recycling was "totally unacceptable" at its 2015 examination of the West London Waste Plan.
- Use of the site would also be unsuitable due to constant noise, increased pollution, additional traffic, the impact on the local economy and public health.
- 308 flats were being developed in nearby Tavistock Road. This would increase

traffic in the area, with traffic spilling out opposite the Coal Yard site.

- The site was within 50 metres of the nearest housing and would, therefore, affect thousands of local residents.
- Local residents would be overshadowed by the site, due to its elevated nature. The noise, odour and the view of the site would be detrimental to them. This would be made worse by the fact that the site would operate 24 hours a day. It was likely that the noise baffles proposed by the applicant would be inadequate.
- The submitted plans were for the processing of 950,000 tonnes per annum, but Councillor Sweeting felt that the applicant would have a strong incentive to increase the site's capacity in the event that planning permission was granted.
- Current operations of Powerday at the site had not been granted planning permission and had been the subject of an enforcement notice. This was already making the lives of local residents a misery.
- Access to the site was restricted, with the only access being via a narrow ramp. This would lead to the continuous queuing of traffic. Up to 400,000 additional vehicle movements per annum would be generated. Vehicle movements depended upon how much use of rail Powerday made, but the firm's suggestion that extensive use would be made of rail transport was not backed up by convincing evidence.
- The majority of vehicles accessing the site would be heavy goods vehicles, including bulk carriers, lorries and skips. The traffic forecasts made had not taken account of the size of the vehicles.
- The proposals would risk jeopardising the wider redevelopment of West Drayton and Yiewsley as no one would want to live, work or do business close to a waste plant.
- Concerns and objections raised by Transport for London were significant as they highlighted the traffic issues that the plant would cause.
- The application contained details of road traffic data from other sites, but it had not included any comparable data for rail freight movements. It was possible that Powerday may choose to use road transport instead of rail.
- The Council had already acknowledged the strategic importance of the site and had re-designated it from an industrial business area to an area for mixed use development, which would enable development to include small businesses, housing and community facilities.
- It was requested that the Committee reject the application. It was stated that the Council and the Committee was on the side of the people of West Drayton and Yiewsley, as were many local councillors, MP John McDonnell and the local Greater London Authority Member.

Keith Saunders spoke in relation to the traffic issues raised by the petitions, making the following points:

- Powerday had asserted that the level of traffic movement would not increase in comparison with their current operation.
- The firm's response to an enforcement notice against the current hours of operation was to seek planning permission. This evidenced that the current operation was taking place without permission.
- The Planning Inspector who had examined the West London Waste Plan had considered the access to the site to be "totally inadequate." He also concluded that local roads were unsuitable for the likely traffic volumes generated by the site and was concerned that the type of traffic would damage the local area.
- Powerday's current operation did not process anywhere near the amount of waste per annum that the application under consideration proposed. The

average loading would increase and the size of vehicles was likely to increase, along with traffic volumes.

- The firm had stated that it would not use Station Road in West Drayton for the movement of heavy goods vehicles. The only alternative to this would be to use Yiewsley High Street, where existing traffic levels and pollution were a cause for concern.
- Pollution levels in Tavistock Road were already close to maximum safe limits. The proposed scheme was likely to involve an increase in the movement of heavily laden HGVs.
- In a distance of one quarter of a mile after leaving the Old Coal Yard, a heavily laden HGV may have to stop at seven points. This would lead to increased congestion in the High Street, which was already slow moving at peak hours. An increase in stop-start traffic would also increase pollution levels.

Terry Morgan spoke in relation to the issues associated with Crossrail, regeneration and jobs raised by the petitions, making the following points:

- The development of Crossrail was having an impact on West Drayton and Yiewsley, with numerous housing developments being built in the area. This included developments either side of the canal bridge, south of the railway station and opposite the Old Coal Yard in Tavistock Road. House prices were increasing in the area.
- The character of the area had changed from predominantly industrial to commercial and residential use. The Council had reflected this change in the Local Development Plan, which was due to have its public examination later in 2016. It was proposed that the designation of the Coal Yard would be changed from an industrial and business area to mixed use, including public services and housing. This was consistent with a London Plan policy which stated that the redevelopment of surplus industrial land should "address local strategic objectives, particularly for housing and social infrastructure such as education, emergency services and community activities." Development should also focus around public transport links to enable higher density development.
- Powerday's proposals would create a large industrial unit within walking distance of the centres of West Drayton and Yiewsley, new housing developments and the Crossrail Station. Approval of the scheme would dissuade developers and potential residents, business owners and visitors from coming to the area.
- The Old Coal Yard site provided an opportunity for the provision of the public services required to support the new housing developments, such as schools, health facilities and open spaces.
- It had been stated by the applicant that the proposals would create 130 jobs. This was not challenged by the petitioners. However, the applicant had cleared the site of other tenants since making its previous application. This would have reduced employment, which should be set against any net gain in employment offered by the proposals.
- Some neighbouring businesses were concerned about the impact on their business as a result of increased traffic causing potential users to go elsewhere. This could lead to decreased profits and employment in the area.
- Congestion levels in Horton Road would increase, with businesses in Horton Road having told the campaign against the proposals that they were concerned about the impact of heavy goods vehicles.
- The proposals would be detrimental to the health of local businesses and to local employment levels.

David Andrews spoke in relation to the noise issues raised by the petitions, making the following points:

- Approval of the proposals would permit the Materials Recycling Facility to operate and vehicles to arrive / leave 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Outdoor loading and unloading would take place during a 12 hour period each day, while the outdoor crushing and shredding of materials would take place for up to 12 hours on weekdays and eight hours on Saturdays.
- Tavistock Road Residents had provided a log of noise nuisance caused by existing operations at the site to the Council. This demonstrated that noise nuisance was persistent through the night, on most days of the week.
- Powerday had not attempted to suggest that the noise had come from elsewhere. The firm had not shown a willingness to understand the impact of its operations or to engage with local residents. This did not give the petitioners confidence that Powerday would act as a responsible neighbour.
- It had been established that the majority of municipal and commercial waste processing in West London had been let on long term contracts to other firms, with the exception to this being the waste processed at Powerday's Old Oak Common facility.
- Powerday's website suggested that the majority of its business came from construction, excavation and demolition waste. This processing would involve timber shredding and concrete crushing.
- Noise produced by machinery operating at the site would not be comparable to the noise made by passing trains.
- It was questioned how robust and reliable the proposed methods of the shielding of noise emitted from the site would be. Noise would also be generated by HGVs travelling to and from the site on local roads.
- Overall, the best solution would be for the application to be refused.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Adrian James, representing the applicant's agent, Barton Willmore, addressed the Committee. The following points were made.

- A previous application had been made to the Council in 2013. A key Concern raised then, as now was the level of traffic that the proposals would generate.
- The 2013 application had been for a site with a capacity of 950,000 tonnes. The proposed capacity had been reduced in response to the refusal.
- The site had an established industrial storage use and had previously been used by railway companies for coal storage. There were currently a variety of uses at the site, with a wide range of vehicles already accessing it. The traffic generated by the Powerday proposals would be no worse than the traffic generated by previous uses and might be better as the site could currently be used 24 hours a day, 365 days a year with no restrictions on vehicle movements. The Committee had the opportunity to put in place a Traffic Management Plan as part of the application under consideration. This would specify the number of traffic movements, permitted hours of these movements and their routing. Such conditions would be enforceable by the Council.
- Concerns raised in relation to the application could be dealt with through planning conditions and it was requested that possible conditions be discussed by the Committee.
- Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning Development Order 2015 stated that when a refusal was made, there must be a reason within that refusal to set out what the planning authority had done to work with the applicant in a positive

and collective manner. The applicant had not had the opportunity to have such discussions with the Council. Additional information had been submitted in March 2016 in response to comments made on the proposals by Crossrail, the Environment Agency, the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, Natural England and Council departments. This information had dealt with a variety of issues raised. No response had been received, despite repeated attempts to make contact with officers.

- The agent had first heard that the application would be considered by Committee via a report in a local newspaper. He felt that the press must have been briefed in advance. The agent had only received official notification from the Council one week before the meeting. Powerday should have been notified in advance of the press having access to this information.
- Neither the GLA nor TFL had objected to the proposals in principal.
- Information had not been sought in relation to waste management. The applicant would be happy to provide such information.
- Network Rail would not be prepared to permit the use of a rail head if it posed any danger to the public.
- The West London Waste Plan was not concerned with the items that would be processed at the site and this was, therefore, not a relevant refusal reason.
- The development would help to meet the London Plan's target for self sufficiency by 2026. It would deal with waste that had been generated locally in West London and it was required that, where possible, waste should be dealt with close to the area in which it had been produced. The Planning Inspector had accepted that there may be sites, such as the application site, taken forward on sites that had not formally received permission. There were no alternative sites in West London to accommodate such a facility.
- The Inspector had noted that the site was well separated by from residential properties by the railway lines running close to the site. The Inspector was concerned about the impact of traffic generation and access to the site, rather than the specific use of the site.
- The officer report made clear that the proposals would be of acceptable appearance in the area. Given the proximity to the railway line, the scale of the development was justified and appropriate. The Head of Planning and Enforcement had been satisfied that there would be no harm to residential occupiers due to loss of privacy.
- The suggestion that the baseline traffic assessment was based upon current minimal use of the site was incorrect and the opportunity to review the document with Council officers would be welcome.
- There was an outstanding appeal in relation to an enforcement notice served by the Council in relation to the usage of a small section of the site, so this should not have an impact on the decision made.
- Comments made by Network Rail had not been addressed by the Highway Officer within the Committee report.
- In the event that the application was refused, the established long term use of the site would continue, with HGV usage continuing to be generated. It was therefore considered that the Transport Assessment was accurate.
- The application was a resubmission of a previously refused application. The current proposal was similar, with the main change being a reduction in the capacity of the site, which would lessen the traffic generated by the site.
- The proposals had always sought to provide no net impact in traffic terms and would give the Council the opportunity to monitor and restrict traffic movements.
- It was standard practice to consider the existing use of the site and the net impacts when compared to existing uses. The site had not been abandoned and

the existing use was a precursor to the use proposed by the application and its use was supported by Transport for London and Department for Transport guidance.

- The Council had identified the site as having an established industrial use and Network Rail had effectively confirmed that it did not have a strategic operational need for the site. The latter, in view of the Transport Assessment, had concluded that there would not be a significant increase in traffic in comparison to the baseline condition and also accepted that there would not be an increase in traffic at the level rail crossing. The site was nominated as a National Rail site and was protected for rail use.
- In comparison to the 2014 baseline, the proposals would result in hardly any increase in daytime vehicle movements and a reduction in evening vehicle movements.
- The size, specification and operating times of the civic amenity site could be agreed to comply with Council and any Network Rail requirements.
- A Council officer had contacted the agent on the day before the Committee meeting, enquiring about the proposed operating times of the civic amenity site. The agent advised that this would only be developed if the Council concluded that such a facility should be provided and that the provision could be subject to condition.
- Powerday was proposing that 300,000 tonnes of material would be transported by road. All material entering and leaving the site would be weighed on one of two weigh bridges. Therefore, the tonnage could be controlled by an enforceable condition. Delivery management could also be subject to condition and could be prepared in conjunction with Council officers and the local community in order to further minimise the impact on the area.
- In relation to the nearby residential development and the impact of traffic accessing both it and the Powerday site simultaneously, traffic surveys undertaken in relation to the residential development in 2012 and the applicant's survey undertaken in 2014 had predicted similar traffic flows. Permission had been granted to the residential development and co-use with nearby industrial development was considered to be acceptable.
- The residential development had been granted permission based upon the overall impact on the highway network. The first principle approach had been used for calculating existing site traffic and the impact of the traffic had been considered. This had been agreed by the Council and was the same as the methodology used by the applicant. The residential proposal had predicted a 40% increase in traffic turning in Tavistock Road in the evening peak. This had been deemed to be acceptable. The Council had been inconsistent and any capacity issues at the Tavistock Road / Station Road junction would not be exacerbated by the Powerday proposals.
- The traffic levels expected to be generated by the recycling facility had been calculated by Powerday using information in relation to similar sites operated by Powerday. Assumptions made had taken into account operational differences between sites. The Assessment had been understood and accepted by Transport for London. The trip generation estimated for the site had been shown to be robust.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, Councillor Peter Davis, Ward councillor for Yiewsley spoke in relation to the application. As a ward Councillor, Councillor Davis was entitled to up to three minutes of speaking time.

The following points were made:



- Councillor Davis welcomed the officer report, noting that he had received a significant amount of correspondence on the issue and that feelings were running high.
- The issue, which was of paramount importance to residents of Yiewsley and West Drayton, crossed the political divide. The presence of MP John McDonnell at the meeting, the MP for Hayes and Harlington, was noted, as was the letter in support of the petitioners that had been received from Boris Johnson, MP for Uxbridge and South Ruislip.
- The application had previously been considered and rejected twice by Hillingdon, in November 2011 and in December 2013. The site had been considered to be totally unacceptable for use as a waste and recycling site.
- The Councillor was puzzled by the resubmission of the application as nothing substantial had changed.
- Powerday had released a press statement on 20 January 2015. This had said that they would not be redeveloping the site for waste recycling purposes and would be consulting with local residents and groups concerning any future plans that the company had for the site.
- The objections to the proposals had been well stated by the petitioners and it was hoped that the Committee would consider these.
- Petitioners, local residents, businesses and other groups were firmly against the proposals. Hillingdon Council prided itself on putting residents first and had an opportunity to demonstrate this. On this basis, the application should be refused.

In response to a Member question to the applicant's agent, the following point was made:

- Part of the site that had been used by Powerday. This use had not been approved and the Council was taking enforcement action on the basis that the use was not established use. In Powerday's view, the current operation amounted to general industrial use and was therefore a permitted use. An appeal had been lodged with the Secretary of State on this basis, which would be heard later in 2016.

## **Discussion**

The Chairman advised that any issues relating to how the Council had informed the applicant that the application was due to be considered by Committee should be taken up separately outside the meeting. This did not have a bearing on the determination of the application.

The application was recommended for refusal on principal. Comment was requested from the Head of Planning on the impact of the proposals on the financial viability of Yiewsley and the extent to which the Committee could take into account the belief that there would be a negative impact on the vibrancy of the town centre, given the planned number of lorry movements. It was also asked whether the potential loss of development opportunity and the pending re-designation of the use of the site could be taken into account by the Committee.

The Head of Planning advised that a proposed refusal reason dealt with the adverse impacts upon the Highway network, but it would not be advisable to provide a separate refusal reason in relation to financial impact. It was considered that the applicant may appeal any refusal of the application. Therefore, it was important to have robust refusal reasons. The Council had, during development of policy documents, sought authority from Cabinet and full Council to use the Site Allocations document and the part 2 Local

Plan to use those documents for development control purposes. The Council had not yet adopted the Site Allocations document for development control purposes. Therefore, officers had not made reference to this in their planning reports. The focus was only on the part 1 Local Plan, which related to strategic policies. This did not refer to the fact that was proposed to designate the site as a residential, mixed use site, rather than as a waste transfer station.

Noise, pollution, odour and disturbance to the community had not been provided as a proposed refusal reason. The Chairman asked how these factors could be considered by the Committee and whether the proposed route to be taken by the HGVs had an impact on the decision. Officers advised that noise was one of the key material planning considerations, but it would be difficult to consider this as an extra refusal reason. The applicant had stated that they had reduced vehicle movements compared to the previous application, but the configuration of the site had not changed significantly. The Council's Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) had considered that, through planning conditions, it would be possible to mitigate noise issues. Government guidance specified that an issue that could be mitigated through conditions should not be cited as a reason for refusal. The EPU had not objected to the application currently under consideration as the site layout was the same. Approval of the previously refused application would have resulted in vehicles passing close to residential units and there had not been objections raised to this. Therefore, the Committee would need to explain why it had changed its view with regard to noise, in comparison to the previous application, if this was to be given as a refusal reason.

Officers advised that the reference made to West London Waste Plan in the officer's report referred to all types of waste. The applicant had suggested that construction and demolition waste had not been considered. The Head of Planning requested delegated authority to add a planning informative to the decision notice with regard to article 35 of the Town and Country Planning Order. This specified that the planning authority clearly and precisely state the full reasons for the refusal, specifying all policies and proposals in the development plan that were relevant to the decision. The informative would be used to specify how the Council had engaged with the applicant. It was noted that the Council had provided the applicant with consultation responses and that the applicant had not revised their proposals as a result of the concerns raised. The application was considered to be unacceptable in principle and therefore, there would not be as much engagement with the applicant as there would be for an application that was supported in principle.

The Committee noted that there were few changes in the application when compared to the previously refused application made in 2013. It was a concern that although the number of vehicle movements was proposed to decrease, that the tonnage per vehicle could increase. The new housing developments in the neighbouring area also made the application more unsuitable than it had been in 2013.

The size of the building proposed by the applicant was the same as in the original application and the applicant's suggestion that they would not use all the available capacity was felt to be unconvincing. It was suggested that an additional reason for refusal could be included to specify that the size of the building was considered to be excessive. It was also questioned whether it would be viable to add a planning condition in relation to access to the site. In relation to building capacity, officers advised that the original design of the building had been to enable HGVs to turn within the building itself and to accommodate plant for the proposed operations. Therefore, it was not necessarily practical for a reduction in the volume of waste coming to the site to result in a reduction in the size of the building. Officers considered that the impact of

vehicle movements associated with the building would be unacceptable in any case and it was therefore, unnecessary to make assumptions about an increased capacity that the building might theoretically be able to support. It could also be specified through a condition that the tonnage of waste being processed in the building be capped at a particular level.

Officers advised that the Council's access officer had not raised a particular issue in relation to the application. Therefore, it was suggested that accessibility should not be used as a possible refusal reason.

Concerns were raised that vehicle movements at the site could be more than predicted by Powerday.

Members considered that the officer report covered the key points in relation to the application well and that thanked the petitioners for their useful submission. It was reiterated that there had been little change to the proposals, compared to those that had previously been refused.

The Chairman advised that the Committee needed to consider whether the suitability of the site in relation to noise nuisance was a valid reason for refusal, given that there had been minimal changes since the previously refused application, which had not provided this as a reason.

The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report, subject to the addendum sheet circulated and that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to include an additional informative in relation to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning Development Order 2015 to specify the policies of the local development plan that were relevant to the decision.**

20.

**T5C, HEATHROW AIRPORT - 47853/APP/2016/1157** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Consultation under part 8 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted development) Order 2015 for the erection of a Baggage Recovery Facility (BRF) and Utility Storage Device (ULD) Store.**

Officers introduced the report in relation to the proposed consultation response regarding a proposal to build a Baggage Recovery Facility and storage facility for Utility Loading Devices to the north of Terminal 5 at Heathrow Airport. The proposals were located within the green belt. The principal of development at Terminal 5 had been considered by the Planning Inspector at the Terminal 5 enquiry. It was noted that the proposals related to an airside development. There were no associated highway issues and the development would be 1.5 kilometres from the nearest residential properties. Accordingly, officers recommended that no objection be made to the proposals.

The recommendation to make no objection to the proposal as part of the consultation was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

**Resolved: That no objection be made as part of the consultation.**

<p>21.</p>	<p><b>TEMPORARY CAR PARK SITE, SEALAND ROAD, HEATHROW AIRPORT - 65688/APP/2016/1929</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Reserved matters (details of landscaping) in compliance with condition 2 of outline planning permission ref: 65688/APP/2016/94 dated 7/3/2016 (erection of a multi deck car park for use by Gate Gourmet and British Airways staff).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was to provide details of landscaping in relation to a previous application for construction of a multi storey car park at Heathrow Airport. Construction of the car park had been approved by the Committee in March 2016. This included the provision of 1,022 parking spaces, motorcycle bays and electric vehicle parking. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon been put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for approval by the Head of Planning under Delegated powers. This approval would be subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
<p>22.</p>	<p><b>RMA OFFICES, ST ANDREWS PARK, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2015/1297</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Reserved Matters Application for the erection of 1 x 5 storey office building and 1 x 4 storey office building with associated plant, parking and landscaping.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, which related to Reserved Matters in relation to the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of a previously approved application for the construction of two office buildings at St Andrews Park. It was proposed that shared parking would be provided in a basement car park, to be used by both office users and local residents. Members were referred to the addendum sheet circulated, which proposed amendment to the wording of the proposed approval condition number 3. Approval of the application was recommended.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns with regards to a nearby barrier that had been put in place to prevent through traffic passing between Chippendale Waye and Vine Lane. Access was only due to be available to available to emergency services, but it appeared that 2,000 to 3,000 passes to the barrier had been issued to local residents. It was questioned whether passes would be issued to everyone who worked in the office, which would lead to increased traffic congestion. Officers advised that the issue raised was separate to the planning application under consideration and was an enforcement issue that officers were trying to resolve.</p> <p>It was questioned whether officers could be sure that the parking would be a shared facility, which would also be available for use by non users of the office. Officers advised that a link to the plaza area would be developed to ensure that the public could access the car park. There was also a planning condition associated with the outline application, which specified that the parking should be shared.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon been put to the vote, was approved unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions and</b></p>

	<b>informatives set out in the officer's report and subject to any changes negotiated by the Head of Planning and Enforcement prior to the issuance of the decision.</b>
	The meeting, which commenced at 6:00 PM, closed at 7:50 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.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**

This page is intentionally left blank