

## Minutes



### MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

12 March 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, Martin Goddard, John Morse, John Oswell, Steve Tuckwell and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Alan Tilly (Transport and Aviation Manager) and Kerrie Munro (Planning Lawyer) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
131.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
132.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Goddard declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 11 – Uxbridge College, due to prior involvement. Councillor Goddard left the room when the item was considered.</p>
133.	<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 of the meeting held on 19 February 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
134.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
135.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked as Part I, and would therefore be considered in public.</p>
136.	<p><b>BOURNE COURT - 11891/APP/2018/3414</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment to provide 87 residential units in two blocks, together with</b></p>

**associated access, car and cycle parking; communal and private amenity space; and landscaping**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. It was confirmed that the plans circulated as part of the meeting pack were incorrect, and a set of updated plans had been forwarded to all Committee Members prior to the meeting. Officers advised that the plans consulted on, and present on the website, were correct.

Planning history of the site was outlined, and the Committee was reminded that consent had been granted on 14/11/2017 for the redevelopment of the site to provide 69 residential units with associated car parking and amenity space.

The application to be considered was seeking permission to redevelop the site to provide 87 residential flats with associated works included landscaping, amenity space and car parking. This was an increase in the number of proposed units and respective car parking spaces, through a simplified and improved design when compared to the extant scheme. The revised scheme would comprise 3 storey units at a maximum overall height of 9m, in line with comments made by officers and the Ministry of Defence. The new scheme provided better communal amenity space, including larger amenity space for family units.

Although local objections and a petition opposing the scheme had been received, there were no objections to the principle of development, living conditions for future occupiers, or impact on the street scene, landscaping, or amenity of nearby occupiers, and the application was recommended for approval.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application, and highlighted the following points:

- Residents had concerns over the size of the development and its impact on local services such as schools, GP surgeries and dentists, which were already overstretched.
- The development would result in further congestion on what was a very busy road and junction.
- Although the development made provision for cycle sheds, there were no cycle lanes and pedestrians were in danger from cyclists on pavements, as cyclists were fearful that cycling on the road was too dangerous due to the heavy traffic.
- The report incorrectly listed screened windows as being on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of Unit A, but were instead on the ground floor of Unit B. Concerns remained over privacy and overlooking from balconies.

Members asked the petitioner a number of questions, including a request for further information regarding the damage to residential property referred to within the report, and whether there were any properties in Canfield Drive that had extensions. The petitioner was unable to advise on the nature of the damage, but confirmed that most properties within Canfield Drive had single-storey rear extensions.

The Chairman read a statement on behalf of Councillor Allan Kauffman, Ward Councillor for South Ruislip:

- Councillor Kauffman expressed his concerns that the development would exacerbate existing problems with traffic entering or exiting the development site.
- Station Approach was a single carriageway and one of the busiest roads in

South Ruislip, and at peak times was often at a standstill due to traffic congestion.

- Councillor Kauffman made two suggestions to help resolve these issues:
  1. A box junction with CCTV to catch offenders; and
  2. A traffic light system that stopped traffic both ways and allowed residents to enter or exit the site in safety. (Similar to the system in operation on the West End Road at the White House Gates entrance to RAF Northolt).

Officers suggested that, if the application was approved, that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and enforcement to strengthen the wording of Condition 15 regarding windows facing Canfield Drive.

The Committee discussed the application, and expressed concerns over the redesign of the amenity space, which was felt to underprovide for the flats without private gardens, privacy issues due to the proximity of corner units and overlooking from balconies, and the gating of the site and resultant antisocial behaviour. Members also expressed concerns regarding the siting of waste and collection of refuse from the site. The lack of tracking details for refuse collection vehicles within the report was highlighted. In addition, the report referenced access to a playing field, but it was unclear how far this was from the development site.

In response, officers advised that the new amenity space was designed to provide quality space, for use by occupiers of 1 bed flats, as the proposed family units were provided with gardens. Regarding the playing field, the report detailed a straight-line distance. When considering a walking route, this was 526m away, in excess of the recommended 400m walking distance for a child.

Regarding privacy, the new scheme was situated further from nearby residents than the extant scheme, and there were no habitable rooms on the second and third floors with windows that could result in issues of privacy for neighbours.

Refuse collection vehicles would be required to drive into the site in first gear, manoeuvre in reverse gear, then exit the site once again in first gear.

Members suggested that the application be deferred to a future meeting, to allow officers to prepare an updated report that addressed the following:

- Concerns over the gating of the site
- Antisocial behaviour in car parks
- Amendments to the proposed amenity space
- Clarity on waste siting and collection arrangements
- Distance between corner units and concerns over privacy.

This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

137. **LEGION HOUSE, UXBRIDGE ROAD - 1927/APP/2018/1232** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Proposed conversion of the first floor from a former Church and Nursery (Class D1) to 11 residential units (Class C3)**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The Committee was reminded that the application had been deferred from the meeting held on 9 January

2019 following a request for additional clarity on the Financial Viability Appraisal. This requested detail was addressed within the report, and the scheme was considered to be acceptable. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

In addition, officers recommended that the wording on parking permits be amended in line with the wording set out within the application for Bourne Court, ref. 1927/APP/2018/1232, namely that the permits exclude blue badge holders and that the developers were ensuring that prospective occupiers were notified of the restricted parking.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, inclusive of amended wording relating to residents parking.**

138. **6 ROUNDWOOD AVENUE - 37403/APP/2018/4475** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Refurbishment and extension of B1 office building including two-storey extension (net increase of 1,120sqm GEA floorspace), recladding of the retained structure and rooftop plant enclosures, and reconfiguration of hard and soft landscaping and vehicular and cycle parking**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The proposal was considered acceptable, and was therefore recommended for approval.

Members requested that officers ensure that all planting was designed to absorb pollution.

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

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

139. **RENAISSANCE LONDON HEATHROW HOTEL - 12004/APP/2018/2720** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Extension to provide an additional floor (5th floor level) comprising hotel facilities, guest bedrooms and new and extended lift shafts together with amendments to car park**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The application sought permission for an additional 5<sup>th</sup> floor to the Renaissance Hotel, which would include a new restaurant/bar, meeting rooms, lounge, gym, crew room, bedrooms and back of house facilities. The principle of development was acceptable, and there were no concerns over amenity or environment, scale, design, height, or parking. 5 parking bays were proposed to be replaced to provide additional disability standard bays, together with new cycle parking and electric charging points. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

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

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

140.	<p><b>ST HELENS SCHOOL - 7402/APP/2018/3445</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of the Fitzwalter building and construction of a new STEM building on same site</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The application sought to provide a new contemporary, two-story Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths building. The applicant had worked positively with the Council's officers to develop a scheme that was considered the correct scale, orientation and high quality to meet the educational needs of pupils, with limited impact on nearby residential amenity.</p> <p>The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the deletion of Condition 11 and the noting that there was one active and one passive electric vehicle charging point on site.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the application be approved; and</b></li> <li><b>2. That Condition 11 be deleted.</b></li> </ol>
141.	<p><b>UXBRIDGE COLLEGE - 1127/APP/2018/4375</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a 3-storey building within the existing car park to create a new Institute of Technology along with the erection of a single storey link block, the erection of a single-storey car parking deck, the reconfiguration of existing car parking spaces and associated landscaping</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and addendum. The application was deemed acceptable, as officers considered that there was no visual impact on the character of the area, or objections to the proposed reconfiguration of the car park. The application was therefore recommended for approval.</p> <p>In addition, officers advised that a new red line boundary plan had been received, which the Council was now consulting on. It was therefore further recommended that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to review any complaints resulting from that consultation.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the application be approved; and</b></li> <li><b>2. That the Head of Planning and Enforcement be granted delegated authority to review any objections resulting from the Council's consultation on the new red line boundary plan.</b></li> </ol>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.18 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the

---

resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.**