

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

22 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 Oswell, Devi Radia, Steve Tuckwell and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Kerrie Munro (Legal Advisor), Richard Michalski (Highways Engineer) and Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
43.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Morse.</p>
44.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
45.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED That: the minutes of the meetings on 12 July 2018 and 1 August 2018 were approved as an accurate record.</p>
46.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
47.	<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 the item on the agenda was marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
48.	<p>WILLOW TREE DEPOT, DITCHFIELD ROAD - 31572/APP/2017/4624 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 6 x 3-bed/5-person houses and 4 x 4-bedroom/6-person houses, involving demolition of vacant depot building</p>

It was confirmed that the petitioners' letter dated 9 February 2018 had been circulated to Committee Members prior to the meeting. Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were advised that the application proposed to construct 10 dwelling houses in two separate terraced blocks; each property would have two allocated parking spaces and associated landscaping. Officers had negotiated this revised design as the original proposal had been for 11 units in a single terraced block. Councillors were informed that the site had been identified as surplus to requirements and there were no national or local planning objections in principle to the loss of the previous depot use on the site. Additionally, the Committee was advised that there was no adverse impact on visual amenity and there would be no material loss of residential amenity. There was also a Section 106 proposed for the site which was detailed in the report. The application was recommended for approval.

With reference to the landscaping condition on page 12 of the report, the Head of Planning commented that, as this was a major application, there was a requirement for 4 active and 4 passive electrical charging points. However, as this was a Council application, it was suggested that a more sensible approach might be to provide electrical charging at a publicly accessible location which would serve a wider number of people. If Members were to agree, the recommendation could be to provide 5 active charging points at a publicly accessible site in the local area.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application. The main points raised included:-

- The ground in question was an old dump containing hospital waste, old batteries, asbestos, aluminium casings and WWII munitions. Petitioners believed that the Council had not consulted the Environment Agency about this application. Residents were concerned that, once the work commenced, the fumes and dust would affect them adversely; especially those with breathing problems. Soil tests had been conducted by the Council but no results had been seen to date. A Council land inspection in 2001 had confirmed that the land was toxic and residents wanted to know how many truckloads of toxic waste would be removed from the site and how this would impact on traffic congestion and safety in the area. Residents were also concerned that the development would result in an additional 68 residents plus visitors with only 2 parking spaces allocated per house;
- With regard to amenities, there was concern that there were insufficient GPs and primary school places in the area;
- Residents to the south side of Strone Way would lose privacy to gardens to the rear of their houses and light and sun would be excluded especially during the winter months; number 12 would be particularly affected as the proposed work extended past the building line;
- Residents requested that the existing building be re-instated as a Council depot. Since it had been closed, Willow Tree open space had badly deteriorated and was now untidy and dilapidated. It was suggested that the building could perhaps be used as an OAP centre, health centre or youth centre;
- If the development were to go ahead, residents requested assurances in writing regarding working times, no weekend or Bank Holiday working, no deliveries outside working hours, the numbers of trucks to be used, no trucks to be allowed to wait with engines running, how long the work would take with penalties for over-running, how vermin, dust and fumes would be controlled and assurances that residents' own fences would not to be used as part of the development.

Jenny Evans, Senior Programme Manager, spoke on behalf of the applicant

expressing agreement with the officer's report and recommendations and stating that the development was 100% affordable.

Councillor Bliss, Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the application and regretted that the petitioners had not been given more notice prior to the hearing date. Moreover, she expressed concern that the proposed road and pavement would be too narrow and commented that the increase in traffic along the busy street would force people to park in adjoining roads which were also very busy and narrow. Councillor Bliss referred to the impact on number 12 Strone Way; the development was very close to this property and the resident was particularly concerned about potential loss of light. With regards to fencing, Councillor Bliss stated that residents had been told their back fences would be used as a boundary for the new development; they were concerned that they would be responsible for fixing said fences and would be expected to pay for future repairs. Residents were also worried about the impact on schools, GPs and water provision. Finally, there was some confusion as to whether the new development would be for social or private housing; clarification on this was required.

Members were referred to page 10 of the officer's report which clearly stated that all the new units would be for affordable housing and specified social rented tenure. The report also confirmed that matters such as education provision etc were covered. Members were advised that the boundary fence issue could potentially be resolved via the addition of a condition. The Chairman commented that the provision of a walkway between the boundary fence of the new development and residents' fences would be inadvisable as such alleyways often created other problems e.g. anti-social behaviour.

With regards to the potential impact on number 12 Strone Way, Members were informed that there was a 4m separation distance between 12 Strone Way and the proposed development which was acceptable and it was considered that there would be no loss of light. The unit in question (B2) had already been moved away from the boundary in an attempt to improve the relationship with no. 12.

With regard to the fencing issue, it was suggested that the landscaping condition be tweaked to ensure that strong additional fencing was constructed on the development site thereby ensuring that residents' fences were not utilised.

Members requested clarification regarding the length of tenure and whether this would be in line with current Council terms and conditions. Members also enquired as to the level of rent and how this would be defined. It was confirmed that the level of social rent would be fixed and was set locally. The rent would be equivalent to that for all other social housing across the Borough.

Members expressed concern regarding contamination and health and safety on the site and requested clarification as to how this issue would be addressed. Attention was drawn to the existence of a local nursery at the Community Centre near to the development site. It was confirmed that condition 12 in the report directly referred to this matter and was a tried and tested standard planning condition which would address all contaminated land issues if fully complied with. Members made reference to Southall Gas Works which was another contaminated site and enquired whether the matter of contamination could be resolved by capping the site in a similar way. Members were made aware of a demolition and construction management plan through which developers were able to communicate with local residents; the Head of Planning indicated that the wording could be amended slightly to ensure that there were regular communications with residents throughout the demolition and construction process.

With regard to the charging points on the site, Members suggested that these could be placed in the car park of the community centre as this was deemed to be a convenient location in a public area; however, this solution would not be advisable if parking was already problematic at the Community Centre. Another option was to install passive charging points at each of the new builds although this was not current Council policy. The Head of Planning confirmed that the charging points could be situated anywhere in the local area. In relation to the matter of pollution, Councillors suggested that trees should be planted to absorb this (for example Silver Birch trees); this approach had been found to be effective in the past. An informative could be added to this effect.

Councillors empathised with residents and understood their concerns but felt that, with the tightening of the conditions regarding the boundary treatment, the charging points and the communications particularly around the construction plan and the plan to deal with the contamination and the informative regarding trees, the proposal was acceptable.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to

- 1) a S106 agreement;**
- 2) the changes in the addendum;**
- 3) authority being delegated to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Councillor (in the absence of the Labour Lead), to agree the wording of an informative regarding trees and to draft, review and finalise conditions relating to boundary fencing, charging points and communications about contamination and the construction plan.**

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.44 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250185. 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.