

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

20 June 2017

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan, Henry Higgins, John Morgan, Brian Stead, David Yarrow and Tony Eginton</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), Alan Tilly (Transportation, Policy and Projects and DC - Transport and Aviation Manager), Ed Laughton (Planning Officer) and James McClean Smith (Major Planning Applications Officer)</p>
8.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies received from Councillor Oswell with Councillor Eginton substituting.</p>
9.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Higgins declared a non pecuniary interest in relation to item 9 and did not vote on the item.</p>
10.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
11.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were Part 1 and would be heard in public.</p>
12.	<p>22 NEW ROAD - 4519/APP/2016/3619 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Planning permission was sought for the redevelopment of the existing light industrial use site to provide eight new residential units consisting of a mix of dwelling houses and flats. Officers made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members asked for clarification on the calculation and location of parking spaces. Officers explained that there was one available parking space each for the flats which resulted in four car parking spaces, and there were eight remaining spaces on site which could be worked out as one and half per house. In total, the scheme provided 12</p>

parking spaces which was fully compliant with policies. Officers also confirmed that the location of the parking could be reversed as there were no onsite planning constraints.

Members noted that the recreation ground was fenced off from the flats and in order to access the area residents would have to walk some distance. Officers commented that although residents would have to walk to the recreation ground, no roads would need to be crossed and the distance of walking was not lengthy. Members discussed the possibility of allowing residents to access the recreation ground directly from their gardens through the use of gates. This raised security concerns for some Members. Officers advised that generally this proposal would not be supported and although there were some shortfalls with this site in relation to amenity space, on balance, it would be better to approve.

Members raised concerns that the distance between buildings did not meet standards which meant that there would be some overlooking. Members also raised concerns in relation to the excessive height of the building. Officers advised that these factors could be limited by the imposition of conditions. Officers advised that there was a precedent of this new arrangement style and it was generally accepted as there were no windows overlooking neighbours.

To summarise, Members agreed the changes in the addendum, notwithstanding the agreed plans an amendment to the amenity spaces for properties five and six, and notwithstanding the agreed plans an amendment to the positioning of the four parking spaces within the hard surfaced area adjacent to units 7 and 8 and accessed from Connaught Close.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote, there were six votes in favour and two against.

RESOLVED - The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation subject to no representations raising material planning issues not previously considered being received during 21 day re-consultation period following receipt of revised plans relating to the agreed amendments.

13. **FORMER ROYAL BRITISH LEGION CLUB, SIPSON ROAD - 829/APP/2016/3167**
(Agenda Item 6)

Officers introduced the application which sought planning permission for the redevelopment of the site to accommodate a seven storey 108 room hotel incorporating breakfast area and working/living zone at ground floor level; a basement level with associated parking and external landscaping works including provision of parking, servicing area and planting. Officers also highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members queried the number of available motorcycle spaces and officers confirmed that condition five required motor cycle spaces for the scheme to be approved. Officers advised that the ratio usually applied was one for every 20 car parking spaces. Members clarified the ceiling heights and officers advised that the ceiling height for the rooms was compressed which resulted in an additional floor. Officers advised that if Members were concerned about height restrictions then they could impose a condition capping the height of rooms in the building.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the additional condition specifying the maximum height of the building.

14. **ST ANDREWS PARK , PHASE 3C - 585/APP/2016/3776** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced and provided an overview of the application. The application sought to discharge the reserved matters relating to Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping for phase 3C St Andrew's Park development.

Members confirmed electric car spaces and officers advised that this matter had been covered in the conditions outlining consent.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.

15. **ST ANDREWS PARK, PHASE 6 - 585/APP/2016/3733** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced and provided an overview of the application. The application sought to discharge the reserved matters relating to Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping for phase 6 of the St Andrew's Park development.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations.

16. **WOODBIDGE HOUSE - 20590/APP/2016/1383** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of an existing Almshouse complex and erection of 30 residential units, with office/meeting room, residents' cafe/social room, ancillary buildings and associated parking and landscaping. Officers made a recommendation for refusal. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner spoke in objection of the proposed development and made the following points:

- Woodbridge House was a locally listed building. The property now acted as offices for the local community serving local businesses and was used by the community to hold meetings when there were issues in the area.
- The architecture of the new design was not iconic or sympathetic to the design of the local area which was surrounded by Victorian properties.
- The height of the proposed development would also be over oppressive and dominating.
- The applicant failed to meet the conditions set in the previous meeting such as providing disabled accommodation and affordable units.
- Local residents were upset by the proposed development and the impact on the availability of parking. The surveys from the proposed development showed that light levels would decrease impacting local neighbouring properties.
- Security was also a concern as the current plans did not have any security gates. Noise levels would increase affecting people who worked from home.
- To summarise, residents were not happy with the demolition, the design, the height, the design and the parking.

The applicant's agent addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- A technical proposal was received from officers. The first attempt was found to be unworkable. The latest attempt seeking to impose an (M4 (3)) standard to the bathroom areas within (M4 (2)) units had been presented far too late to be assessed properly.
- The 100 percent (M4 (3)) expanded the foot print beyond the site boundary.
- The 100 percent affordable housing requirement compromised the funding.
- The applicant had commissioned considerable time and resources and had also arranged a viability assessment. Officers had accepted that the scheme was unable to bear the imposition of further affordable housing at the loss of the open market bench. Subsidised houses were already being offered.
- Making kitchens (M4(2)) and the remaining areas of the unit (M4(3)) and bathrooms (M4(3)) and the remaining areas of the unit (M4(2)) would reduce the unit size and would compromise the overall use and appeal of the units.
- (M4(3)) was the highest level of accessibility for people who were permanently in wheel chairs, and was considered that this would never be the case for occupants in the proposed development. (M4 (2)) was a highly accessible standard. Outside London (M4 (1)) was acceptable.

Members considered that the loss of heritage must deliver significant public benefit. This was a specific accommodation for a specific cohort of people, namely people in their later life where needs would be different. As a result, Members were of the view that standards of wheelchair accessibility needed to be higher. Bathrooms had to be sufficient to meet the needs of people at later life. Members accepted that there could be some flexibility in the kitchen area but not in the bathroom area.

Members were not in favour of deferring the item to allow the applicant to have additional time.

The proposed development as suggested by the Council's access officer would enhance the bathroom design.

To summarise, Members noted that the applicant had done a viability assessment which showed that it was not viable to have affordable housing. The officer's view of the scheme was that there were 20 replacement arms houses, two staff flats and the remaining eight were to be sheltered units for elderly people at market rent. Officers accepted that to provide fully disabled units would increase the footprint and cost of the scheme. The Council's access officer had suggested to have (M4(2)) units with (M4(3)) bathrooms making it more flexible for people with limited mobility to use the bathrooms.

Members considered two options in the circumstances, namely to refuse the application at this time or approve the application subject to further conditions.

The officers' recommendation for refusal was moved and seconded, and upon being put to a vote, there were four votes in favour and three against.

RESOLVED - That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.

The meeting, which commenced at 18:00, closed at 19:34.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji 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.