

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

15 May 2019

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Janet Duncan, Martin Goddard, John Morse, Steve Tuckwell, Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin and Mohinder Birah</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Richard Michalski (Highways Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
4.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies received from Councillor John Oswell with Councillor Mohinder Birah substituting.</p>
5.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8: Northwood College Educational Foundation (2082/APP/2018/3819) as she had prior involvement with the application. She did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Ian Edwards declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 10: Ventura House, 72 – 74 Station Road (63102/APP/2019/1107) as he was a shareholder in Vodafone. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Martin Goddard declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 10: Ventura House, 72 – 74 Station Road (63102/APP/2019/1107) as he was a shareholder in Vodafone. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
6.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting held on 4 April 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
7.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Agenda item 7: Paddington Packet Boat Public House (1058/APP/2018/4486) had been withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.</p>

	<p>Agenda item 10: Ventura House, 72 – 74 Station Road (63102/APP/2019/1107) had been added as a late item and published as agenda B.</p>
8.	<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 all items were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
9.	<p>MALT HOUSE 281 FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP - 23156/APP/2019/339 <i>(Agenda Item 6)</i></p> <p>Change of use of offices (B1) to 47 (31 x 1 beds and 16 x 2 beds) residential apartments (C3). (Prior Approval Application).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum which removed conditions 1 and 6 and made amendments to condition 5. Officers made a recommendation for approval and sec 106.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application and section 106 be approved, subject to the amendments in the addendum.</p>
10.	<p>PADDINGTON PACKET BOAT PUBLIC HOUSE, COWLEY - 1058/APP/2018/4486 <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i></p> <p>This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
11.	<p>NORTHWOOD COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, NORTHWOOD - 2082/APP/2018/3819 <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p>The erection of a 4-storey block to accommodate a new science and sixth form centre, and the re-surfacing of the play space fronting Vincent House to facilitate car parking with associated works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in support of the application and informed the Committee that the school had been established for 126 years. In summary, the petitioner cited that 89 % of 850 pupils lived in Hillingdon and were residents. Full consultation with neighbours and parents was undertaken prior to submitting the application, in addition to engagement with the Council's planning department. The pre application process started in October 2017, and the school had responded to numerous comments and feedback received. The final design of the building was not what the school had originally hoped for and all non-essential elements had been cut back. The new building would have a high quality design which would be sympathetic to existing buildings, and in keeping with its surroundings. The design would complement the campus feeling and landscape improvements had been proposed. It was submitted that the school strived to create sustainable transport initiatives, and the school would not be trying to increase pupil numbers with the new science buildings. The main purpose of the development was to provide the best education for pupils, enabling a wider syllabus. It was further submitted that the school had deep roots in the community and the school had partnerships with other local schools. The development</p>

was needed to thrive and to also survive as without the development the school would be unable to provide the best curriculum. For the reasons stated, the petitioner commended the planning application.

Councillor Scott Seaman - Digby, Ward Councillor for Northwood, addressed the Committee and told Members that there was always some form of engagement with the school ranging from fairs to other community events. Cllr Seaman- Digby submitted that there were thin grounds for refusal as the reasons were ambiguous based on the belief that it would cause harm. Cllr Seaman – Digby further submitted that the development would not over dominate the scene and the typography meant that it would be set back. Northwood was a diverse community and the school took pressure away from local schools. He urged the Committee to approve the application given the provision of transport, landscaping and highlighted that the concerns raised could be overcome by conditions. Cllr Seaman-Digby had received statements form 300 people in support of the application along with the Residents Association. Overall, Councillor Seaman – Digby asked the Committee to approve the application.

The Chairman read an email on behalf of Cllr Richard Lewis, Ward Councillor which stated:

The development is very sympathetic to the area in Maxwell Road, and is badly needed to improve the further development in the facilities, Educational and Science studies needed at the College since the merging with Heathfield School.

The College has been improving its buildings and facilities over the last years and has always been very aware of the conservation of its environment.

They have made a number of changes to try and address the Officers concerns and I don't feel that it is now totally out of context with the surrounding area. It is certainly nicer than the flats on the other side of Maxwell Road.

I am aware of this being a Conservation area, but Conservation does not mean no changes but attempting to make the best efforts to ensure that the area is not spoilt, there have been many changes in Northwood over the years, but it still has a reasonably village feel.

Having read the comprehensive report from HM Heritage I feel very comfortable with this development and would ask the Committee to approve the plans.

Members questioned how much taller the building would be in comparison to locally listed buildings. It was confirmed that it would be taller by at least a storey and a half higher.

Members acknowledged the community work undertaken by the school and noted the significance the development would have on the long term future of the school. Members also recognised that it was difficult to complement 50's buildings with modern day building designs.

Members appreciated officer concerns that the development jarred with the conservation area. However, it was noted that officers had made a conclusion that there was a less than substantial harm on the conservation area.

Members discussed the location and nature of the buildings in the surrounding areas and some Members considered that the design of the development made no attempt to accommodate surrounding buildings. Concerns were raised about over dominance and

chasing the whole nature of the local area.

The Head of Planning informed the Committee that the scheme could be improved and further work could be done with the applicant's architect. There were concerns with the scale and massing and this was not helped by the design of the building.

Members considered that a site visit would provide further clarity about the application and help provide a better understanding of the site. It may also provide an opportunity to address specific concerns.

The Committee moved a motion to defer the application to allow a Member site visit. The motion was seconded, and upon being put to a vote, there were six votes in favour and one abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for a Members' site visit.

12. **GARIB NAWAJ SPRINGFIELD ROAD, HAYES - 1033/APP/2019/52** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Replacement of the existing site boundary fence.

Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.

Some concerns were expressed about the quality and type of fence and its impact on the green belt. Members questioned whether a condition could be included to ensure that the colour of the fence was green.

The Committee moved a motion to approve the application subject to an amended condition in relation to the fence. The motion was seconded, and upon being put to a vote, there were five votes in favour, two votes against and one abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to amend the condition regarding the colour of the fence.

13. **VENTURA HOUSE, 74-72 STATION ROAD, HAYES - 63102/APP/2019/1107** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Proposed installation of a rooftop base station consisting of 12 x antenna, 4 x dishes, associated equipment, cabinets and ancillary development. (Application under Part 16 of schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance).

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

The Chairman read a written submission on behalf of a petitioner submitted in objection of the application. The statement read:

"We the residents of Ventura house have signed a petition against the installation of cell tower equipment and a base station to be placed on the roof of the building we reside in. There are very conflicting reports on the health and safety of these masts and the fact that a young people's hostel has been chosen out of all the other buildings in

the area we feel is not acceptable, furthermore we (the residents) were not properly notified of the proposed planning permission, the documents were seen by chance and then removed after questions were raised, we feel this hasn't even been conducted in the right manner. This building is full of young vulnerable people and its not right that this is being conducted for possible financial gain. We also feel very strongly that if neighbouring buildings with home owners knew about the planned installations there would be more against the proposal as it would be extremely unsightly for them to be looking out on to.

I hope we have managed to get our concerns on this matter across and that they are taken into consideration.”

Members bore in mind the officer's comments about the health issues and requested that an additional condition be included requiring the removal of equipment once no longer necessary.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to:

- 1. adding a condition requiring removal of equipment once no longer necessary;**
- 2. delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration to tidy the conditions; and**
- 3. the changes in the addendum.**

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.56 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655. 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.