

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

23 August 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, John Oswell, Brian Stead and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Edward Oteng (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer),</p>
39.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
40.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
41.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 2 August 2017 were agreed.</p>
42.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
43.	<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 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were Part 1 and would be heard in public.</p>
44.	<p>SIPSON QUARRY - 45408/APP/2017/2075 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum. The application was requesting an extension to the deadline for completion of permitted operations at Sipson Farm from 5 August 2017 to 30 September 2019. The addendum sought to revise condition 33 to allow additional vehicular movements of no more than 2,200 two-way heavy goods vehicles per week to enable the site to be restored within the extended time limit. Officers also drew attention to condition 32 which referred to a</p>

construction management plan previously submitted and approved in 2010. Said plan detailed traffic management arrangements and outlined the fact that there would be no additional impact at peak hours.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that she lived on the boundary of the site and had been living with disruption, including both noise and air pollution, since the works commenced in 2009. The petitioner pointed out that it had originally been stated that the works would be completed in 5 years but an extension was requested in 2014. On visiting the site it appeared that very little was happening on the site at present. The petitioner was concerned that increased truck movement was being requested and stated that HGVs cut across Sipson Lane which was a main route for local people to use. There were no traffic lights in place so a man was employed to check this traffic flow. The petitioner also pointed out that people living in Raywood Close paid an enhanced Council tax as they had a field behind their houses and felt this was unfair since works were continually underway in the field which was now a quarry. The petitioner felt that residents would feel happier if it could be guaranteed that the works would be completed within the revised deadline and believed that they should be compensated if this did not prove to be the case.

The agent spoke in support of the application and explained that the company undertaking the works was Harleyford Aggregates who had taken over the operation of the quarry from Streeters. This in part accounted for the delay in completing the works. The agent stated that they had applied for the maximum amount of time required to complete the works with two months flexibility at the end of September if required. Pre-application advice had been sought from officers throughout the application process and, other than the extension of time, no other changes were proposed. The agent advised that inert waste only would be put into the site and, with regards to the highways issue, confirmed that both the original permission and subsequent extension had no limits at all on HGV movements whereas, under the new submission, a limit would be in place. The agent also confirmed that all other controls remained in place regarding noise, air quality and monitoring and environmental officers who had visited the site were satisfied and had no issues with it.

Members queried why such a dramatic increase in the maximum numbers of HGVs was proposed; from 1,500 to 2,200 per week and pointed out that this was an increase of nearly 50%. Members sought confirmation as to whether this increase was being requested because the original assessments were incorrect and expressed concerns about pollution and air quality. The agent explained that there were no limits at present and this was a new condition proposed. The figures had been suggested by the Highways Officer and this number of HGVs would be required to enable the site to be restored within the two year timeframe. The agent further explained that this figure would be the absolute peak and numbers of HGVs would be much lower during quieter periods, for example during the summer months. Members also requested clarification regarding the raising in height of the ground to form a mound which was intended to improve drainage and asked what effect this would have on residential areas. The agent confirmed that this had been agreed at the time of the original application and no changes to the approved scheme were proposed. The Committee questioned why traffic movements were being controlled by an individual and the agent explained that this was an addition that the operator had put in place for safety reasons. Councillors then asked for confirmation that the work would definitely lead to a conclusion by 2019 and the agent confirmed that this was the case.

The Head of Planning and Enforcement referred to a previous application on Green Belt Land whereby an extension was requested to complete works and explained that an informative had been added delegated to the Head of Planning and the legal

department explaining why the Council would not support further extensions of time. It was suggested that a similar informative could be put in place for the application in question. Members agreed that this would be a good idea and very helpful.

Members further sought clarification regarding the issue of HGVs using Sipson Lane as mentioned by the petitioner. It was understood that this should not be happening. Officers explained that there were conditions in place covering this so, if these conditions were not being observed by the operator, this would be an enforcement matter and should be reported to the Council.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the addition of the agreed informative was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed at a vote.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved subject to the conditions outlined and the additional informative.

45. **HILLINGDON CYCLE CIRCUIT, MINET COUNTRY PARK - 49962/APP/2017/1802**
(Agenda Item 7)

Officers introduced the application which sought to construct a velodrome-style cycle circuit on an existing playing field. It was explained that there was sufficient parking as users could park either in the car park at the nearby Goals centre or at Minet Country Park. The track would predominantly be in use on Saturday mornings whereas Goals was used mainly in the evenings.

Members sought clarification regarding access for emergency vehicles and it was agreed that condition 4 should be amended to include reference to this. Councillors also questioned whether the protection of flora and fauna in condition 9 would cover everything. Officers agreed to amend the wording of the condition to refer to land under the applicant's ownership rather than to the development site only.

The Committee moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation subject to the agreed amendments.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addition of an element to the landscaping condition 4 covering 'other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas' to include reference to access for emergency vehicles and subject to agreed revised wording of condition 9.

46. **ONSLOW MILLS - 1724/APP/2016/3513** (Agenda Item 8)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The application sought to erect a four storey building with semi basement parking comprising 24 residential flats, involving the demolition of the existing industrial buildings. Officers explained that the site was immediately adjacent to West Drayton town centre boundary and adequate parking would be provided for the flats on a 1:1 basis.

Members made reference to the issue of pedestrian safety due to the width of the site access as mentioned by the Highways Officer in the report and queried how this had been addressed in the scheme. The Transport Consultant confirmed that a central island had been considered and rejected as this would necessitate an even wider site entrance. The Committee asked whether the alternative option of a path for pedestrians flush to the footway had been considered. The Transport Consultant confirmed that this had been considered and corrected the Highway Officer comments. It was confirmed that treatment of this access was within the Highways work schedule.

Councillors sought clarification regarding other possible approved developments surrounding the proposed one and asked if they were indicated on the plans. Officers confirmed that proposed developments were already clearly indicated on the plans. Members also queried whether the distances between buildings were adequate. The Head of Planning and Enforcement confirmed that the 21m distance requirement and window to window distances required had been met to the south. Regarding the front of the development, officers advised that a 15m distance to Claxton House had been previously approved. There was also a 15m distance between the new development and the properties on Trout Road but this was deemed to be acceptable in this case as nobody had objected, it looked onto a public highway and, if it were further back, it would be out of sync with the building line. Members enquired about the blocks to the north which were currently industrial but could be re-developed. Officers confirmed that these were light industrial and, if they were to be re-developed, the 21m rule would have to be adhered to.

The Committee also enquired regarding the possibility of parking being 'priced out' or charged for by the developer. It was agreed that officers could not control what a developer chose to charge for a parking space and the Legal Advisor confirmed that the condition stated that spaces were allocated solely for the use of the units therefore 'pricing out' would be unlikely. Members asked whether the wording of the condition could be amended to state that parking was allocated for the use of **each** unit. Members felt the condition should be strengthened to indicate that parking was for the use of each of the units so that one individual would not be able to buy multiple parking spaces. It was agreed that the Head of Planning would agree the wording of the condition with the assistance of the Legal Services department for the approval of the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application subject to the re-wording of the condition regarding parking allocation.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the re-wording of the condition regarding parking allocation.

47. **236 SWAKELEYS ROAD - 72634/APP/2017/769** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. It was explained that the proposal was to convert a group home to five one-bed self-contained flats. There would be three additional designated car parking spaces on the road but these would not be allocated specifically for the proposed flats.

Members moved, seconded and voted to approve the application with 7 members voting in favour and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved.

48. **BRIDGE HOUSE, RIVERVIEW HOUSE & WATERSIDE HOUSE, OXFORD ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 40050/APP/2017/2438** (*Agenda Item 10*)

It was highlighted that this was a prior approval application therefore the Committee's powers were considerably restricted and only limited matters could be considered namely transport and highway impacts; contamination risks on site; flooding risks; impact of noise. The Head of Planning introduced the report and highlighted the addendum stating that it applied to three office buildings - Bridge House which Members had dealt with previously; together with Riverview House and Waterside

House to the rear. The proposal was to convert the 3 buildings to 239 units and to provide 359 parking spaces. The Head of Planning and Enforcement explained that there were no risks regarding flooding, noise or contamination therefore transport and highway issues were the key matters for consideration. It was explained that a comprehensive Section 106 agreement was proposed which included a contribution of up to £500,000 which related to works identified through a transport appraisal and modelling together with a public realm contribution of £825,000 which would sweep up pedestrian and cycle issues. The Highways Officer had explained that he believed these contributions would address all highways matters. It was also explained that the Council were looking to bring in an Article 4 direction and until that came into play the Committee could not bring into account any matters related to the Council's position in terms of wishing to protect employment land. Attention was also drawn to the addendum and an additional head of term A 3 was highlighted regarding parking spaces.

Members queried the wording which stated that prior approval was ***not required***. Councillors also requested clarification regarding the issues of transport and noise as there were concerns about both so controls were in place and yet prior approval was not required. Members wished to understand why they were being asked to approve something for which prior approval was not required. The Head of Planning and Enforcement explained that, with prior approval, conditions and legal agreements could be added in some cases if required. The Legal Advisor confirmed that the wording of the recommendation should be amended to reflect the fact that prior approval would be granted subject to the conditions and the section 106 agreement. The Legal Advisor highlighted that whether prior approval is required is dependent on the Class of the General Permitted Development Order 2015. Class O of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 requires a two stage process. It was therefore agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and the Legal Advisor to agree the wording.

Members requested confirmation of the existence of charging points for electric vehicles but officers advised that we cannot request this. Councillors also asked for clarification regarding the 200 additional parking spaces and whether this land could be built on in the future. Officers confirmed that any work on this land would have to go through the normal planning application procedure and be dealt with accordingly.

Members moved, seconded and approved the application subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and the Legal Advisor to revise the wording. Seven Members voted in favour with one absention.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved subject to delegated authority being passed to the Head of Planning and the Legal Advisor to agree the final recommendation wording.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.10 pm.

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

