

Minutes

HILLINGDON
LONDON

MAJOR Applications Planning Committee**14 July 2016****Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Acting Chairman), Henry Higgins, Brian Stead, David Yarrow, Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, and (as substitutes) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana and June Nelson</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Alex Chrusciak (Planning Services Manager), Syed Shah (Highways Adviser), Jyoti Mehta (Legal Advisor) and Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
23.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Lavery, in whose absence Vice-Chairman Cllr Edwards chaired the meeting, and from Cllrs Morgan and Oswald, substituted by Cllrs Ahmad-Wallana and Nelson respectively.</p>
24.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
25.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
26.	<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>All items of the meeting were considered in public.</p>
27.	<p>FORMER TOMMY FLYNNS P.H. SUTTON COURT ROAD, HILLINGDON - 8396/APP/2016/777 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and, noting the addendum, provided an overview of the development. It was noted that, in the view of officers, the reasons for the previous refusal had been overcome. Officers additionally clarified that the development featured no basement.</p> <p>Petitioners, speaking in objection, raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though the omission of the roof garden was welcome, the proposal remained a

massive overdevelopment which would not harmonise with the area. It would instead dominate the area, and therefore previous reasons for refusal remained.

- The scale of the development, with 120 units per hectare, contravened the Hillingdon Local Plan.
- The number of parking spaces was insufficient to accommodate visitors, and access to the car park at the rear would be unpleasant for neighbours. The proposed light, wooden fencing was insufficient. As the car park was not secure, this would lead to problems for neighbouring houses.
- Officers had given insufficient attention to traffic, especially given the new school development, and Members should note the cumulative effect of new development and not consider this application in isolation.
- The crossing into the car park would be dangerous.
- The building would lead to loss of light for neighbours.
- In a leafy, suburban area the development was not appropriate.

In response to a Member question, petitioners claimed that the loss of light was not minimal, as officers had stated, as the building height was only being reduced by 1 metre.

In response, the agent for the applicant raised the following points:

- Regarding height, scale and bulk, the proposed 4th floor had been removed, which was actually a 3.4 metre reduction. The roof was pitched to match neighbouring properties, and was not overbearing.
- The proposed development had been reduced by 4 units, and the roof terrace removed.
- The car park had been redesigned to permit a 3 metre planting area between cars and Sutton Court properties.
- The scheme met tests for preserving daylight and not overshadowing. It preserved the residential amenity for neighbours.
- The development had 60% more amenity space than guidelines.
- The Highways Officer had raised no concerns regarding parking or impact on the highway.
- In conclusion, the application fully overcame the previous reasons for refusal.

A Member of the Committee asked for clarification of any reduction in sunlight to nearby properties, to which the agent drew attention to a slide showing that the proposed development was within the 25 degree angle for properties to the north, and explained that the ridge height was lower than the current pub.

A Ward Councillor, speaking in objection, addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- Though the designs represented an improvement on previous plans, it was in essence the same scheme, still excessive in scale, bulk, massing, and detrimental to the surrounding area.
- Local properties were mostly Victorian terraces, and the development would not harmonise with the local area.
- The proposed parking was within guidelines, but the notion that the overspill would be acceptable was questionable.
- Even with minor greening, the parking was still concentrated near to Sutton Court.

A Member of the Committee asked whether the area was affected by flooding, to which the Ward Councillor responded that recent flooding had submerged gardens in the vicinity. Though this was currently not a regular occurrence, it was suspected that tarmacing a currently green area would worsen this.

Moving into the deliberations, the Chairman summarised the issues raised as density, shadowing, flooding concerns and parking. In response, the Head of Planning informed the Committee that the density was higher than average for a suburban area, but the application could not be refused on density alone.

The Flood Management Officer had stated in their report that the drainage scheme proposed was likely to lead in a reduction in flooding risk, but planning officers could only provide the executive summary and did not have the detail in the meeting, so could only inform the Committee that officers were satisfied regarding flood prevention. Members commented that they required more information on the mechanisms in order to make their decision.

Following discussion, Members of the Committee agreed that height, scale and bulk were not problematic, but the proposed parking design remained a concern. Officers drew Member attention to the solid timber fence, designed to be imperforate, and the need for the placement of the car park as designed to avoid overshadowing.

Members remained concerned about flooding, but agreed that information could subsequently separately be provided to the Chairman and Labour Lead to assess.

A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, upon being out to a vote, was agreed by a majority of 7 to 1.

RESOLVED:

- **That the application was approved subject to satisfactory information on drainage being provided to Chairman and Labour Lead.**

28. **GAELIC ATHLETIC ACCOS. SPORTS GROUND, WEST END ROAD, RUISLIP - 24373/APP/2016/1511** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Officers introduced the report, noting that this was a reduction on a previously approved scheme.

A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- **That the application was approved.**

29. **UNIT 2, TRINITY TRADING ESTATE, SILVERDALE ROAD - 70738/APP/2015/4688** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report, and noted the addendum. It was noted that the facility was only for the transfer of waste, not processing, and an odour management scheme was conditioned.

A Member of the Committee noted that the facility was already operation, and as Ward Councillor they had not received any complaints from residents.

A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>- That the application was approved.</p>
30.	<p>1-3 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 1911/APP/2016/1472 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and noted the addendum as well as the fact that several Members had visited the site.</p> <p>Petitioners speaking in support of the application raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They were disappointed with the officer recommendation for refusal, and believed that all previous refusal reasons had been met. In addition, they had only found the officer response to the application through the report, and noted that the Air Quality Officer and Environmental Health had not rejected the scheme, but rather had asked for further information. • The odour management system proposed would cost £750,000, and should not be refused on the basis of what might happen. A potential impact was not reason to assume a direct impact on residents. • No objections had been received from other authorities, just the officers of the Council. <p>Members noted that this was the first facility of its kind in the UK, and that the industry did address a societal problem.</p> <p>A member of the Committee stated that the scheme did have merit, but a test facility in close proximity to a school in a built-up area was problematic. Several Members agreed that the location was inappropriate, and even a small margin of error would lead to an impact on residents. The Chairman noted that a 2% assumed failure rate, as per Defra guidance, was equivalent to 1 week, during which time the nearby school could be shut.</p> <p>A motion for refusal was moved, seconded and, upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>- That the application was refused.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 18:00, closed at 19:25.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Alex Quayle on 01895 250692. 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.