

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

19 February 2020

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman), Janet Duncan, Martin Goddard, John Morgan, John Morse, Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin, Mohinder Birah and Becky Haggar</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p>
105.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Eddie Lavery, with Councillor Steve Tuckwell substituting and Councillor John Oswell, with Councillor Mohinder Birah substituting.</p>
106.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Tuckwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 Bourne Court Site, Ruislip (11891/APP/2019/3855) as he had prior involvement with residents regarding the site. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
107.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meetings held on 16 January 2020 and 22 January 2020 be approved as correct records.</p>
108.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
109.	<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 would be considered in Part I.</p>
110.	<p>LITTLE BRITAIN LAKE, PACKET BOAT LANE, COWLEY - 52368/APP/2017/1844 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

Proposed footbridge over the River Colne at the north end of Little Britain Lake.

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A representative on behalf of the petitioners, Baron Randall of Uxbridge, spoke in objection of the application. It was noted that intention of the bridge was to give access to environmental agencies monitoring the far side of the island. However, it was submitted that there was already access granted to the Environment Agency for them to access the island via a padlocked gate and this had been used by them previously. The Local Authority had done an excellent job around maintaining Little Britain and it was highlighted that there may be a red listed bird that would come back as that was the last place it had been seen. It was acknowledged that the bridge would be unsuitable for housing and it was unlikely that the Local Authority would develop on the land. Although the bridge would be padlocked, concerns were raised regarding the safety as there was a risk of people being able to jump across and gain access. It was questioned why this site was being looked at when there were already a number of other issues affecting residents including fly tipping, litter and it was suggested that CCTV would enhance this area further. The Local Authority was urged to withdraw their application.

Responding to questions from the Committee, it was explained that the petitioners were unsure why the bridge was being built and the Environment Agency already had access to the area. It was noted that when the application came before Committee in 2017, officers had indicated that the reason the bridge was being opened was to allow public access. The impact on the biodiversity were explored at that point. There was a concern that once the bridge was there it would open the risk to other issues in an area of good habitat such as dogs and predators that might cause harm to species already there.

Members were mindful of the recent motion that took place at a Council meeting where all parties were in agreement regarding climate change and a programme and strategy for conservation was being drawn up. The information regarding flood risks needed to be reassessed in light of the new climate change decision. There was a concern that there had been no human contact with species habitating in Little Britain which might cause harm. The application would cause ecological damage and counter the climate change motion, given that there was clear evidence of litter and abuse.

The Head of Planning reminded the Committee that the key consideration in this application was not whether there was a need but rather if the application complied with planning policies. The recommendation for approval was supported by conditions that would prevent unfettered public access and conditions 10, 11, and 13 mitigated ecological harm. This was a result of concerns regarding ecological harm that were previously raised by the Committee. Although it was not essential to demonstrate need, it was explained that there was still a need to be able to access the bridge by the Environment Agency to undertake their work. It was also emphasised that there would be no loss of trees.

It was noted that there was already a bridge there that was fit for purpose and it was questioned why this extra bridge was required. It was reiterated that access was required by the Environment Agency however they did already have access via another bridge that was on private land. The Committee questioned how often access would be required by the Environment Agency to enable them to do what they needed to do.

Members discussed deferring the item, however were advised that deferring the application would need to be on ecological grounds and the conditions recommended regulated this.

Concerns were raised regarding environmental impacts of the proposed development on the unique location. Members considered whether they could grant the application and then review it in a year to consider what the impact was. Although the conditions proposed were good, questions were raised regarding the enforceability of them. Officers explained that the Council's enforcement team would enforce the conditions, the presence of wardens would protect the area and it was in the Council's interest to enforce the conditions.

The Legal Advisor cautioned the Committee in relation to property issues and explained that as the proposed the bridge was on land owned by the Council, access and control had to be agreed by the Council. In the past the Environmental Agency had to serve statutory notices to gain access to the land via the bridge already in place as the access had been restricted. Further, the Committee was advised that there was public interest in the Council and Environmental Agency being able to carry out works to improve the area without delay. The Committee was reminded to judge the case on material planning considerations and if Members were minded to refuse the application then clear refusal reasons needed to be provided.

It was noted that the weir had been maintained for a period of time and access in the past had been made possible. The Committee discussed Hillingdon planning policies HE1 heritage, policy EM3 and the Natural and Environmental Rural Communities Act 2006 s41 and some Members were of the view that this did not conform to Hillingdon's planning policies.

Officers and the Legal Advisor clarified the impact of the proposed planning policies and appropriateness of them in considering the application. It was emphasised that the application could only be rejected on planning considerations.

A motion to refuse the application was made on the basis that the application did not meet Hillingdon Planning Policies HE1 and EM3 was moved and seconded. When put to a vote there were four votes in favour, one vote in against and three abstentions.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused on the grounds that they did not meet Hillingdon Planning Policies HE1 and EM3. Delegated authority was given to the Head of Planning to issue to the Chairman and Labour Lead the exact wording of the reason for refusal.

111. **FORMER MASTER BREWER SITE, FREEZELAND WAY , HILLINGDON - 4266/APP/2019/3088** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Construction of a residential-led, mixed-use development comprising buildings of between 2 and 11 storeys containing 514 units (Use Class C3); flexible commercial units (Use Class B1/A1/A3/D1); associated car (165 spaces) and cycle parking spaces; refuse and bicycle stores; hard and soft landscaping including a new central space, green spaces, new pedestrian links; biodiversity enhancement; associated highways infrastructure; plant; and other associated ancillary development.

Officers introduced the report, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.

Representatives from the Ickenham Residents Association and Oak Farm Residents Association spoke in objection of the application and submitted that the proposed plans amounted to an overdevelopment of the site. The residential density level were double the acceptable levels set out in the Hillingdon development plans. The design of the development was discordant with the setting of the current location, far too tall and bulky, and would do substantial harm to the settings of the heritage assets. The development would cause insufficient parking and additional traffic. It was noted that the applicants had not shown how the development would be protected from noise and air pollution and it did not meet amenity space and sunlight standards. The proposal failed to recognise local needs and it was submitted that the GLA's opinion of the development was "at odds" with the local plan guidance. The officer's report was endorsed and the Committee was asked to refuse the application.

Representatives of the application addressed the Committee and submitted that the residential led mixed use scheme intended to positively regenerate the long term vacant site to deliver substantial benefits to the public. It was explained that the planning application was the outcome of over 12 months work in collaboration with officers and other stakeholders in the community. There had been consultations events, face to face meetings and leaflet drops in the surrounding areas. The scheme would include a number of benefits including sustainable regeneration of the vacant site, the creation of new residential neighbourhood providing much needed new homes, 182 affordable new homes, provision of mixed commercial uses that would promote enhanced vitality of the local centre leading to long term employment opportunities, landscaping improvements, a net gain in biodiversity, improvement in public services and an urban greening factor. The proposal would be pedestrian and cycle led. It was noted that the site in question was a challenging site however the proposed development could accommodate the more ambitious proposals as detailed in the application.

Responding to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the air quality impact assessment supported the site and was based upon associated traffic assessment data alongside additional monitoring as discussed with the Local Authority. The applicant had also identified mitigation in terms of damages contribution to support the scheme. The approach on how to manage air quality was explained to the Committee.

The Chairman read an email from Councillor Alan Chapman, Ward Councillor for Hillingdon East. Concerns were raised regarding the scale, height, size and density of the proposals as they were not in character with the local area. Further, the proposals had a negative impact on the local Green Belt, the parking provisions were inadequate and the added vehicle movement would increase traffic flows. There was also concerns in relation to the increase in both air and noise pollution in the surrounding area. The Committee was asked to support the officer's recommendation and refuse the application.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation and welcomed refusal reason five on air quality. It was emphasised that air quality could not be compromised. Concerns were raised regarding the size of the development, air pollution and, overall, Members considered that the application was out of character with the local area.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation, subject to the changes in the addendum.

112.	<p>BOURNE COURT SITE, RUISLIP - 11891/APP/2019/3855 <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p>Deed of Variation to Section 106 Schedule 1 (Affordable Housing) associated with planning permission ref: 11891/APP/2018/3414, dated 17/06/19 (Redevelopment to provide 87 residential units in two blocks, together with associated access, car and cycle parking; communal and private amenity space; and landscaping) to remove the requirement for a commuted sum and replace it with an affordable housing obligation for an on-site provision with 54 shared ownership units in Block A and 33 affordable rented units in Block B.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval and section 106.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation and section 106.</p>
113.	<p>CRANFORD PARK, HAYES - 14009/APP/2019/4088 <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>The erection of a detached cafe building, outdoor seating area with access, and minor alterations to the listed cellars beneath, minor alterations to the listed stable block with change of use to B1, extension to the existing car park, alterations to the existing information centre building and construction of bin store including all associated external works.</p> <p>The Head of Planning declared a non- pecuniary interest in this item and left the room during vote and discussion of the item. Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that this was a valuable site. Members welcomed the proposals and considered that it would be an asset to Hillingdon.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</p>
114.	<p>CRANFORD PARK, HAYES - 14009/APP/2019/4090 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>The erection of a detached cafe building, outdoor seating area with access, and minor alterations to the listed cellars beneath, minor alterations to the listed stable block with change of use to B1, extension to the existing car park, alterations to the existing information centre building and construction of bin store including all associated external works (application for listed building consent).</p> <p>The Head of Planning declared a non- pecuniary interest in this item and left the room during vote and discussion of the item. Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that this was a valuable site. Members welcomed the proposals and considered that it would be an asset to Hillingdon.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p>

	RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.
115.	<p>BRIDGE HOUSE, UXBRIDGE - 40050/APP/2019/1865 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Section 73 application to vary the approved plans list condition of application reference 40050/APP/2017/2438 dated 01/09/2017 for (Prior Approval Application for the change of use of Bridge House, Riverview House and Waterside House from office accommodation (Class B1) to residential units (Class C3) together with ancillary car parking, cycle storage and waste and recycling storage (as amended by application reference 40050/APP/2019/3869 dated 21/01/20).</p> <p>The amendments to the approved plans propose: No longer including the 6th floor of Bridge House (7 x 1 bedroom units) and allow the change in the mix of units at Bridge House from 9 x Studios and 114 x 1 bedroom units to 16 x studios, 43 x 1 bedroom units and 56 x 2 bedroom units.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval and section 106.</p> <p>It was noted that this application was a prior approval.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application and section 106 be approved as per officer's recommendation and changes in the addendum.</p>
116.	<p>19-22 CHIPPENDALE WAY, UXBRIDGE - 67544/APP/2019/1978 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a block of 12 No. flats comprising of 7x1 bed, 4x2 bed and 1x3 bed apartments with associated parking, landscaping, access and amenity.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on the storage of bicycles and this was demonstrated by officers on the plans. It was confirmed that the development was required to provide 1 percent disabled unit and as there were only 4 car parking spaces, 2 bays should be allocated to the disabled unit with the remaining parking being allocated to the family unit. The Committee considered that it would be preferential to have two disabled parking bays.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation, subject to amending condition seven to include two disabled parking bays.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to amending condition seven to include two disabled parking bays.</p>
117.	<p>BATTLE OF BRITAIN MUSEUM AND VISITOR CENTRE, WREN AVENUE, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2019/3868 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Proposed landscaping improvement works including surface water flood mitigation using new rain gardens, reshaping of existing bund, new tree planting and new car park spaces with associated works.</p>

	<p>Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</p>
118.	<p>THE ARENA, STOCKLEY PARK - 37800/APP/2019/3278 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Alterations to car parking and erection of 2 substations storage/plant room.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</p>
119.	<p>UXBRIDGE MORTUARY, KINGSTON LANE, HILLINGDON - 13102/APP/2019/3950 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Proposed two single storey side and rear extension to existing Mortuary Building, relocation of existing rooftop plant, new rooftop plant, shielding housing for rooftop plant, installation of roof canopy, installation of 1100mm high safety railing to the rooftop, relocation of the fence and associated works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>It was requested that the conditions made specific reference to pollution absorbing trees.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to the changes in the addendum and reference to pollution absorbing trees in the landscaping condition.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 8.12 pm.</p>

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.