

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

1 August 2018

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, John Morse, John Oswell, Devi Radia, David Yarrow and Roy Chamdal (Reserve) (In place of Steve Tuckwell)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Kerrie Munro, Richard Michalski, Richard Phillips (Principal Planning Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) and Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
35.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Tuckwell, with Councillor Chamdal substituting.</p>
36.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
37.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
38.	<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 agreed that all items would be considered in public.</p>
39.	<p>HAREFIELD HOSPITAL, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 9011/APP/2018/1854 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Retention of hospital waste store (Retrospective Application) with new boundary hedge planting.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in objection to the application and noted that 51 residents had signed a petition requesting the removal of the waste store. The Committee heard that there was no consultation regarding the building, which was built in front of the building line, without planning permission in the Green Belt and Harefield Village Conservation Area, and it was 1.65m from the boundary of the hospital, which put clinical waste very close to the public. In addition, the</p>

doors of the waste store were often not locked and there was no security, which meant that there was nothing stopping members of the public and vermin from accessing the waste store.

The applicant addressed the Committee and accepted that all the points raised by the petitioner were justified, but the hospital had action plans in place to deal with the concerns, including new security measures and locks on the waste store's doors. The applicant apologised for the mistakes that were made, and stated that the hospital had wrongly assumed that the waste store could be built with the previous planning permission, but the error was not intentional.

Responding to Councillors' questions, the applicant confirmed that the waste store was placed at the front of the site to avoid taking waste through the hospital building past vulnerable patients, as well as members of the public and staff, and by positioning it closer to the ITU, it would save resources that would be used taking the waste around the site.

Councillor Higgins, Ward Councillor for Harefield, noted that the waste store security was lacking, and as such, it risked contamination and vermin, and would have an adverse impact on local residents who would also be put at risk. The Committee heard that the retrospective application meant that there was not a chance for residents or Councillors to object in the correct manner, and the building does not fit in the area. Councillor Higgins commented that, should the Committee be minded to approve the application, much stronger conditions were required to prevent any future issues.

Councillor Palmer, Ward Councillor for Harefield, had also submitted a written objection to the Chairman which cited concerns regarding the waste store's positioning, impact on street scene, impact on residents and public health, lighting, and its building in the Green Belt without planning permission.

The Committee commented that the petitioner made some very persuasive arguments regarding health concerns at the site, and also noted that the planning impact on the listed building nearby and Green Belt were concerns.

Councillors expressed their sympathy with the hospital, but noted that the waste store was in front of the building line, affected the street scene and view of the listed building, and there were a number of concerns expressed regarding the siting of the waste store and its impact on local residents. Members stated their apprehension about the lack of security at the site, and that the waste store would attract vermin. The Committee noted that a more secure location that did not interfere with a locally listed building would be preferable to the current arrangement.

Responding to questioning regarding whether the application could be considered as infill, officers confirmed that policy PR20 allows infilling at the hospital, but it would be able to enforce security within one month through conditioning, should the Committee be minded to approve.

Members agreed that if the waste store remained in its current position, it would require a tree planting all around it which would obscure the view of the listed building. As such, the Committee confirmed that they would like waste store relocated, but noted that a refusal would not help the hospital. A motion to defer the application was moved, to allow time to negotiate with the applicant to try and agree a better site for the waste store. This motion to defer was seconded, and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.

40. **FORMER TOMMY FLYNN'S P.H., SUTTON COURT ROAD, HILLINGDON - 8396/APP/2018/2110 (Agenda Item 6)**

Variation of S106 Agreement associated with planning permission ref: 8396/APP/2016/777 dated 4/11/16 (Redevelopment of the site to provide a new three

storey building containing 26 flats (Class C3) with associated parking, balconies, landscaping and rear communal amenity space) in order to remove Schedule 4 – Requirement for a Travel Plan.

The report stated that a Travel Plan, in this instance, was not justified as the scheme did not require referral to the GLA/TfL and did not meet the London Plan/TfL guidance thresholds or satisfy specific circumstances for when developments below the thresholds may require travel plans.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to a S106 agreement.

41. **UXBRIDGE SPORTS CLUB, PARK ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 73873/APP/2018/2092**
(Agenda Item 7)

Erection of a new extension incorporating a new platform lift, DDA WC and small reception desk with all associated external works, additional internal alteration to include new rap, new openings to allow access for the lift on two floors and access to allow access to female changing rooms.

Officers introduced the application, and noted the addendum.

Members moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, which was unanimously agreed upon being put to a vote.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

42. **LAND EAST OF MONS BARRACK BLOCK, ST ANDREWS PARK, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2017/2819** *(Agenda Item 8)*

Outline planning application with means of site access from the central access road (internal access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reversed for subsequent approval) for the erection of up to 90 dwellings (Use Class C3), sustainable urban drainage features and all other necessary ancillary and enabling works.

Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum.

Responding to Committee questioning, officers confirmed that there would not be a huge uplift in traffic generated by the potential development, and predictions were for around 20-30 cars during peak times. Councillors were also informed that a low emission strategy would be put in place, but required further details from the Council's air quality expert before this happened.

Members commented that they were happy that 70% of the development would be made available at affordable rents, and moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to a S106 agreement.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.05 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Luke Taylor on 01895 250 693. 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.