

## Minutes



### MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

12 July 2018

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, John Morse, John Oswell, Steve Tuckwell, David Yarrow, Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana and Nicola Brightman</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Richard Michalski, James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager) and Kerrie Munro</p>
26.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Edwards with Councillor Ahmad-Wallana substituting and from Councillor Radia with Councillor Brightman substituting.</p>
27.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
28.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 19 June 2018 were approved as an accurate record.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED - That the minutes from the meeting on 19 June be approved as an accurate record.</b></p>
29.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 23 MAY 2018</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3a</i>)</p> <p>Members were asked to agree the revised version of the minutes of the meeting on 23 May 2018 which had been slightly amended to better reflect the discussion which took place at the meeting.</p> <p>Councillor Oswell stated that some of his comments regarding the 'red line' boundary had not been accurately recorded in the minutes. Councillor Morse also expressed his dissatisfaction as he felt the meeting had been truncated, as a result of which he had been unable to read out his five reasons for refusal. He also felt that his concerns regarding the safety of the crossing as raised at the meeting had not been minuted. The Chairman indicated that this issue had been referred to at the bottom of page 4 of the minutes and any concerns regarding the conduct of the meeting would need to be addressed in a separate forum. Councillor Morse further advised the Committee that, in</p>

his opinion, the minutes were the most important part of any planning committee and Members could not vote on minutes for legal reasons; however, the Chairman stated that he had sought the advice of the legal officer and had been advised to the contrary. Councillor Morse suggested that it would be useful if opposition Councillors could be briefed by officers prior to planning meetings. Members were reminded that the revised minutes provided at the meeting had only been modified very slightly and the changes were in bold type to enable Councillors to see them clearly. All other information in the minutes was exactly as included in Agenda B which had been circulated to Members several days previously. Advice was sought from the Legal Advisor who confirmed that the purpose of the minutes was to have an accurate record of the meeting; it was not a verbatim record of everything that was said as this would not be feasible. The Legal Advisor went on to explain that Court did not consider the minutiae of a debate and would only take account of the broader debate and whether a fair decision was reached on the basis of the information before Councillors. It was confirmed that officers had accurately recorded all the main points raised at the meeting; if any Members were dissatisfied with the minutes, they could opt to move an amendment to that effect which would be put to the vote.

Members moved an amendment to the minutes so their additional reasons for objection could be incorporated therein. This was seconded. When put to the vote, five Members voted against the proposed amendment. The revised minutes before the Committee were therefore approved as an accurate record of the meeting on 23 May 2018

**RESOLVED: That the revised minutes of the meeting on 23 May 2018 were approved as an accurate record.**

30. **IMATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT** (*Agenda Item 4*)

Item 6 - Wallingford Bus Depot (50677/APP/2017/4537) had been withdrawn prior to the meeting.

31. **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** (*Agenda Item 5*)

It was confirmed that all items would be heard in Part I.

32. **WALLINGFORD BUS DEPOT - 50677/APP/2017/4537** (*Agenda Item 6*)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

33. **FLC CAR SALES - 692/APP/2017/749** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The application sought to erect a 2-4 storey building comprising 30 studios, 1, 2 and 3-bedroom apartments. This case had been deferred at the Majors Committee meeting on 19 June 2018 for further investigation into alternative options to access the site as some concern was raised by Members with regard to the traffic generated by the proposal and the use of the Falling Lane access. At the previous meeting, it was cited that emerging vehicles could potentially 'stack' across Falling Lane thereby causing blockage and impacting on the nearby signalised junction with the High Street. The Council's Highways Officer had investigated two other possible options - alternative vehicular routing and a left turn only option; neither of these options was considered viable for the reasons detailed in the report. Members' attention was drawn to the addendum which highlighted the

'realignment of street furniture'; this sought to address an issue which had been noted by the Highways Officer at the previous meeting.

Members were of the opinion that the use of the service road would be preferable since it was such a busy junction; this option would also offer the possibility of turning both left and right. Officers explained that this option would not be ideal for a number of reasons; the residential amenity would be affected and potential emergency access would be thwarted. Members were advised that it was a very narrow road and the use of the service road would put all the pressure onto that particular location and displace movements further down into Falling Lane. With regards to intensity of use, Members were informed that only 30 units were involved therefore the output would be low. It was confirmed that the accident record was very good with no personal injury accidents over the past five years; there was no alert in safety terms.

Members commented that this was a very busy junction; almost directly opposite the site in question, there was the entrance to the car park behind the library and across the road there was a cross-hatching to allow for vehicles coming down Falling Lane turning right or left. This resulted in traffic queues. The High Street junction had two lanes turning left and, as a result, fast moving traffic could speed around the corner almost immediately into the queuing traffic which could potentially be very dangerous. An additional area of concern had regard to the entrance / exit to the site which was in close proximity to two lanes of left-turning traffic and was opposite a keep clear sign. Councillors also highlighted the fact that cars would be coming from both directions and turning left / right into the site which could cause gridlock both at the junction and in the High Street. Members expressed further concerns regarding the presence of a school behind the site; it was felt this would add to the traffic difficulties and could present a danger to children and other pedestrians.

The Highways Officer reiterated that the volume of traffic coming from the site would be low and not all traffic would be turning onto the junction. It was difficult to predict volume precisely but was felt that the spread of traffic in both directions would lessen the impact on the junction. Members were advised that, in the professional opinion of Highways officers, the junction was safe. The Head of Planning also confirmed that the applicant's highway engineers did not support the use of the sliproad and wanted a determination based on the existing plans. The Head of Planning considered that the deferral had been useful as it had enabled officers to consider alternatives. The matter of a planter which had some limited impact on visibility had also been discussed by officers and a decision had been taken to reposition it.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, there were four votes in favour, three votes against and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application was approved as per officer's recommendation and subject to addendum changes.**

34. **EALING COUNCIL - 39704/APP/2018/1817** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The application was an out-of-borough consultation from the London Borough of Ealing on the Shree Kutch Leva Patel Community site. Members were informed that the site was located within the Green Belt and it was considered that the proposal for a large community / sports building on the site represented inappropriate development. It was suggested that the increased intensity of the use of the site, traffic generation and potential for noise pollution and light pollution would be excessive. Councillors were advised that the Highways Engineer had formally objected due to the impact on parking. Further

objections had been raised by Ward Councillors and residents. For these reasons, the Local Planning and Highway Authorities formally objected to the proposals. It was recommended that the Council formally object to the proposal for the reasons stated within the officer's report and all consultation responses be forwarded to Ealing Council.

Members deemed the planned re-development to be excessively large and inappropriate with inadequate parking arrangements.

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

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the Council formally object to the proposal for the reasons stated within the officer's report;**
- 2) That all consultation responses be forwarded to Ealing Council.**

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.35 pm.

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