

## Minutes



**MAJOR** Applications Planning Committee

**30 January 2019**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, John Morse, John Oswell, Devi Radia, Steve Tuckwell and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Richard Michalski, James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) and Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
109.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
110.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 11 as a Governor of St Matthews' School, remained in the room for the consideration of the application, but did not participate in the discussion or vote.</p>
111.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes from the meeting held on 9 January 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
112.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
113.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
114.	<p><b>WONDER CAFE &amp; GRILL, UXBRIDGE ROAD, HILLINGDON - 18635/APP/2018/2174</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing Class A3 café and erection of building to comprise 13 residential units (Use Class C3) and two retail units (Use Class A1), with</b></p>

**associated car parking.**

Officers introduced the application, noted the addendum, and made the Committee aware that comments in the report that noted flooding as a reason for refusal would be removed.

A petitioner spoke on behalf of the Ivy Cottages Residents' Association, and noted that there were over 100 signatures supporting the petition. The Committee heard that the application was sited in a historic hamlet, and was not in keeping with the street scene and an overdevelopment. The petitioner also stated that the proposal would result in a loss of sunlight, privacy and views and would have an impact on material standard of living. The proposal would exacerbate access and traffic issues, and affect pedestrian access in an area with many young and old residents. The petitioner confirmed that residents were not opposed to a development, but this application was detrimental to the local area.

Responding to questioning from Members, the petitioner noted that the site was accessed via the private road owned by Ivy Cottages, and developers had not asked the residents for permission to use their road, while the proposal sought two-way access to the road, while the current arrangement was a one-way system with the owners granted an easement onto their land.

Councillor Richard Mills, Ward Councillor for Brunel, addressed the Committee and stated that the proposal was an overdevelopment, overbearing, not in keeping with the street scene and intrusive and visually prominent. Members heard that the building was currently set back in the site, but the proposal was right to the site boundary, and constituted an inappropriate development. Responding to Committee questioning, Councillor Mills noted that the current one-way access was not a problem and was not intrusive for the residents of Ivy Cottages, but the proposed arrangement would lead to an increase in traffic.

The Chairman noted that the Planning Committee were not involved in matters of road ownership. The Highways Officer also stated that the proposed access was deemed acceptable, as although it was not ideal for cars to reverse out of the private road, this already took place.

Councillors stated that the proposed boundary wall would conflict with vehicles and leave them unsighted when leaving the site, which would cause a danger to pedestrians. The Committee was concerned that the access point was onto Uxbridge Road, which is a classified highway and that the access point was also very close to the busy junction with Long lane.

The Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration advised Committee that the NPPF required them to consider whether the access issue caused a severe impact on highway safety, and that the highway engineer had been mindful of this when stating that the access was acceptable. The Committee confirmed it did consider the impact to be severe. It was suggested by the Chairman that the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration noted the concerns of the Committee and reviewed the access arrangements.

The Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration advised the Committee that they needed to make a decision on the access due to the non-determination appeal. Members then agreed that the access was not safe and that this should form an additional refusal reason.

Members agreed that the application disregarded local policies and adversely affected local residents, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to agree final wording of the access issue as a further reason for refusal. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously approved.

**RESOLVED: That the application be rejected, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to add an additional reason for refusal regarding the access being detrimental to highway safety.**

115. **HAREFIELD HOSPITAL, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 9011/APP/2018/1854**  
(Agenda Item 7)

**Retention of hospital waste store (Retrospective Application) with new boundary hedge planting.**

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum. It was confirmed that this item was previously deferred by Committee, and since this deferral, security at the site has been improved and low-level planting has taken place which would take two to three years to mature and cover the store. Members were also informed that a suitable alternative location for the store was sought, but no other site was considered viable for the waste store.

A petitioner spoke in objection the application, and noted that over 200 people had signed petitions to oppose the proposal. Local residents were concerned that clinical waste was being stored so close to housing, and that the waste store was situated in Green Belt land within the Harefield Village Conservation Area. Members heard that dense planting detracted from the locally listed hospital buildings, and was too close to the boundary. The petitioner also expressed concerns about odour, and noted that any smell was too much for local residents. Councillors heard that nothing had changed since the previous deferral except for increased security, and another location was suggested, but nothing had happened. To conclude, the petitioner stated that the application was a health risk, nuisance and eyesore for local residents and should be refused.

A representative of the application addressed the Committee and noted that alternative sites had been considered but there was no other suitable site for the waste store, as it was a 24-hour facility with a huge volume of waste from a ward that was treating seriously ill patients. The waste store was proposed at this location as the previous site took too long to reach for nurses and this was a detriment to the patients. Councillors heard that waste store could now only be accessed by a swipe card and the doors were on a timer to prevent vermin or ingress to the facility. Furthermore, if there was any risk to critically ill patients from the waste store, it would not be situated there, and collections were now timed for minimum disturbance.

Responding to questioning from the Committee, the applicant's representative confirmed the original plan for a four-bed ward extension and waste store was changed to accommodate six-beds, and as such, the waste store had to be moved from the facility. Open land opposite the current site was considered but this would lead to waste being moved an extra 30 yards over an access road for ambulances and a bus route, and it was important to ensure nurses were away from the unit for the minimum time possible. Members asked whether there was access to water at the storage facility, and the applicant's representative stated that he did not think this was the case.

The Ward Councillors for Harefield were in attendance at the meeting, and addressed

the Committee.

Councillor Jane Palmer stated that although the hospital was a big part of the community, this application directly affected residents. The houses opposite the site were affected by odour, particularly in the summer months, and the store was too close to the edge of the residential area. Members heard that there was huge opposition from local residents to the application in the conservation area, and the application should be refused and the waste store moved to a more appropriate site.

Councillor Henry Higgins noted that the building was inadequate, and not suitable for the Green Belt or a Conservation Area. Members heard that a large shed was not the best way to deal with this waste, and the Committee was urged to reject the application.

Councillors agreed that the decision was very difficult, as the Committee was asked to support the operational efficiency of the hospital at the detriment of local residents. Members noted that the waste store was a large building that conflicted with the Locally Listed building and is detrimental to the area in planning terms, and hedging and planting would not make the problem disappear.

The Committee sympathised with the hospital, but noted that the location of the waste store was too close to the residential area and there was no way to minimise its impact due to its size. Members expressed concerns over the lack of washdown water at the site and odour, and agreed that an alternative site for the waste store was preferable

Members confirmed that, ideally, they would have been able to support the hospital and noted another location may be acceptable, but this application was unacceptable in planning terms due to its size, bulk and location, and the adverse impact it had on the Conservation Area and Locally Listed building.

The Committee then moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to confirm the reasons for refusal.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration, in conjunction with the Chairman and Lead Labour Member, to confirm the wording regarding the reasons for refusal.**

116. **20-30 BLYTH ROAD, HAYES - 1425/APP/2018/2145** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Variation to Conditions 2, 7, 32 and 33 of planning application reference 1425/APP/2011/3040 (Comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide a part 11, part-nine, part-five and part-four storey building comprising 120 residential units, office floorspace, 97 car parking spaces and hard and soft landscaping) to amend Car Stacker A, remove Car Stacker B and increase number of electrical vehicle charging points (reduction of car parking space to 92 spaces).**

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum which included amendments to the Heads of Term.

Members sought clarification over the removal of Car Stacker B and the reduction of car parking spaces, and were informed that if a Car Stacker was removed, five spaces would be lost.

The Committee moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to amend Head of Term 3. Upon being put to a vote, the proposal was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to amend Head of Term 3 regarding permit free parking.**

117. **FORMER GARAGES SITE B, REAR OF 2-28 WORDSWORTH WAY, WEST DRAYTON - 74344/APP/2018/4085** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Demolition of existing garages and construction of six dwellings, comprising four bungalows and two houses with associated parking and landscaping.**

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum, which included amendments to Conditions 2 and 4, the addition of two further conditions, changes to Condition 11 and the deletion of Condition 12. Furthermore, Condition 4 would also be amended to include 40% Electric Vehicle Charging Points.

Responding to questioning from Members, the Strategic and Major Applications Manager confirmed that residents must take waste to the street side for collection roughly 50 yards away, and all windows on the flank upper floor elevation could be obscure glazed. Officers also noted that there was no air quality assessment and it was not possible to say whether air quality was below the legal safe limit.

Regarding the access road, the Committee commented that vehicles should be prohibited as the pedestrian access is the width of a car. Furthermore, motorcycle and moped access should also be limited, and it was suggested that this access be controlled by a gate. Members agreed that conditions could be strengthened to ensure disabled access was not affected but anti-social behaviour and vehicle access could be prevented, while existing rights of access were not extinguished.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the condition changes, was then moved and seconded, and upon being put to a vote was agreed by seven votes to one.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to:**

- 1. Amendment of condition 4 (landscaping) to include the wording "2.f Lighting Bollards to be installed on the internal gated passageways", details of footpath arrangements to prevent parking / access for cars and motorcycles and 40% passive Electric Vehicle Charging Points;**
- 2. The addition of a condition to state "This authority is given by the issuing of this notice under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 and shall ensure only for the benefit of the Council";**
- 3. The addition of a further condition regarding Obscured Glazing and Non-Opening Windows;**
- 4. The amendment of Condition 2 to include revised site plan;**
- 5. The amendment of Condition 8 to include a secure by design condition to account for motorcycle / rat-running; and,**
- 6. Changes to Conditions 11 and 12 (to include Condition 11 and the reason for Condition 12), with the deletion of the duplicate condition.**

118. **COLNE PARK, CARAVAN SITE, CRICKETFIELD ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 8706/APP/2019/16** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Construction of a bund to the south eastern boundary of the site.**

Officers introduced the application, noted it would help to prevent fly-tipping and tidy the site, and clarified that the site application was not within a flooding site.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

119. **MORRISON SUPERMARKET, 41-67 HIGH STREET, YIEWSLEY - 2370/APP/2018/2793** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Demolition of the existing building and the redevelopment of the site to provide a part-four to part-eight storey building, comprising a replacement Class A1 1,643sq.m (GIA) foodstore, 144 residential units, basement car park and associated works.**

Councillor Duncan declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item, remained in the room for the consideration of the item, but did not participate in the discussion or vote on the application.

Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum, which included amendments to Condition 7, 13 and 23. It was also noted that a site visit had taken place prior to the meeting.

Members expressed concern regarding the overlooking of the garden area in The Vicarage, which was used for meetings in the garden. Officers confirmed that discussions had taken place between developers and the vicar in June 2018 to address concerns regarding balconies and landscaping proposals, and it was agreed there was no reason why existing trees could not be retained and landscaping could not be sought to address remaining concerns.

The Committee sought clarifications regarding waste collection to the front of the development, and were informed that there were six communal bins, including recycling, for 35 flats, with a staggered collection times. Members heard that refuse collections would take roughly five or six minutes, and stated that this was too long to block the highway, and if investment was required to redesign the roads, this should take place. The Head of Planning, Regeneration and Transportation noted that a large redesign of the High Street was considered, but it was not a straightforward solution and could not result in a perfect solution.

Members agreed to ask for the refuse collection plan to be reconsidered, with an informative included to ensure that traffic on the High Street would not be held up.

Councillors commented that the application was welcome, as were the discussions with developers to reach a solution that would enhance the High Street and local area.

The Committee moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, subject to amended conditions, and this was unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to:**

1. Additions to Condition 7 regarding landscaping details;
2. Amendments to Condition 13 and relevant Informative;
3. Amendments to Condition 23; and,
4. Amendment to Condition 30 to “above damp proof course level” and look to prevent blocking the highway regarding refuse collection on the High Street.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.39 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.**