

## Minutes



### MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

24 February 2021

Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, John Morgan, John Morse (Opposition Lead), Carol Melvin, Becky Haggard and Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services) and Julia Johnson (Planning Policy and Infrastructure Manager)</p>
111.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
112.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
113.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meetings.</p> <p>On minute 108, (agenda item 9 of the meeting held on 20 January 2021), it was suggested that the minute be amended to make it clear that the referred-to Cabinet Member was not involved with the decision.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meetings held on 14 January and 20 January 2021 be approved as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.</p>
114.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that agenda item 7 was now a petition item.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the plans for agenda item 11 had been omitted from the printed plans pack. The plans had been included in the officer's presentation, circulated to Members prior to the meeting.</p>

115.	<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> (Agenda Item 5)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.</p>
116.	<p><b>FORMER TARA KINDERGARTEN, CROSS ROAD UXBRIDGE - 62106/APP/2020/3031</b> (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal, for the reasons set out within. Refusal reasons highlighted included the site's location, outside of the accepted boundary for the town centre and close to a two-storey residential street, and its subsequent failure to reflect the existing character of the area. In addition, there were concerns over potential damage to, or loss of, trees.</p> <p>By way of written submission, a petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development is located in a conservation area and neither preserves nor enhances the character and appearance of the existing area.</li> <li>• DMHB10 states tall buildings should be situated in the town centres of Hayes or Uxbridge. The development site is located outside Uxbridge town centre, and the proposed 7 storey building would be an incongruous addition that would not make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.</li> <li>• The proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on existing trees, which make a significant contribution to biodiversity and climate change. If retained, the trees will need to be pruned throughout the construction phase, and after, to keep the windows clear of dense foliage. This could stress them and result in premature loss.</li> <li>• The Construction Management report shows access to the site to be via The Lynch alongside the Frays River, Lawn and Cross Roads. The roads are narrow, and large construction vehicles and heavy machinery will have difficulty accessing the site via this route without adverse impact on surrounding local roads and residents.</li> <li>• There is inadequate parking provision in the plan to support the flexible community element of the proposal, such as staff working in the facility, community using it, tradespeople needed for maintenance and supplies for the occupants of the proposed building.</li> <li>• The neighbourhood is in a Controlled Parking Zone. On street parking is already highly utilised by existing residents. The Framework Travel Plan states the proposed building will be car free. However, documentation does not address the issue of occupants of the proposed building using cars outside of the controlled parking hours. There are 2 disability car parking spaces on the site, meaning a potential influx of at least 19 extra cars having to find parking in the local streets because they cannot be accommodated on the site. This is a significant number of extra cars having to compete with existing residents.</li> <li>• The proposed development is situated in an Air Quality Management Area that is next to the A4020. An increase in private cars and commercial traffic coming into the neighbourhood will increase air pollution and noise levels for existing residents.</li> <li>• The proposed building is to be 23m high, overshadowing adjacent properties and causing loss of direct sunlight. Residents with solar panels in shadow of the proposed building will be affected, and this could deter others from purchasing</li> </ul>

panels to tackle climate change.

- Properties in this area rely on satellite for television as geography blocks all terrestrial signals. The proposed building will block satellite signals. Residents will need to take expensive subscription to cable services.

By way of written submission, the agent on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee. A brief slide presentation was also shown. Key points highlighted included:

- Regarding refusal reasons 1 and 2; (the alleged harm to the conservation area via way of the demolition of the former telephone exchange, a claimed failure of the development to sustain or enhance the conservation area, and the claim the proposed building represents an over development. The former telephone exchange is claimed to be a non-designated heritage asset, however, the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal provides no justification for this status and the only support the conservation officer was able to call in the buildings aid was that it was 'long established' and 'contributes to the development history of the area'. This could be said about any building more than 30 -40 years old.
- The application is accompanied by a detailed Heritage Assessment prepared by Alan Baxter Associates, an independent Design Review Panel (DRP) consultation and a views assessment. However, neither the Conservation Officer's consultation response nor the officers report to the Committee makes mention of these reports. All conclude that loss of the former exchange would have minimal impact on the Conservation Area.
- Following feedback from the above reports and discussion with your officers, award winning architects Richard Reid Associates updated the scheme to reduce the building from 8 to 7 storeys, introduce brick as the main elevational material, and change the ground floor façade.
- It cannot be avoided that this area displays none of the historic context which supports the Conservation Area designation and is characterised more by the raised Oxford Road and the large buildings of the town centre which, contrary to the officer's assessment, are more proximate to this site than the historic terraces of the conservation area. Within the conservation area itself, the context of this site is set by the three storey plus steeply pitched roof 1980's development across the road.
- As highlighted in the Alan Baxter report, the proposed building, framed by the retained five Oak trees, would result in a building that significantly improves the degraded street scene in this location, reinstating a lost sense of enclosure with a welcoming, high-quality and legible ground-floor entrance and surrounding landscaping. This would have the wider effect of improving the feel and appearance of this part of the conservation area.
- Any perceived harm to heritage assets needs to be balanced against public benefits resulting from the development. Delivering much needed 21 Affordable rental units in a highly accessible location is a significant benefit which the report is dismissive of.
- As Members will be aware from the London Mayor and Secretary of State approval of the Master Brewer site scheme in December, Hillingdon has delivered on only 34% of its target for affordable housing and the contribution of this scheme to addressing part of the shortfall is inescapably a major public benefit.
- It is asserted that the proposed reasons for refusal 3-6 are wholly without substance and can be dealt with via conditions if approval is granted. If Members choose to endorse these reasons, and the applicant is required to produce evidence to contest them at appeal, the applicant will be seeking costs against the Council on those matters.

- The proposed development represents a major opportunity for Uxbridge in terms of delivering affordable housing and will positively enhance the Rockingham Bridge Conservation Area. As such, Members are encouraged to support this application.

By way of written submissions, Ward Councillors for Uxbridge Soh addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Key points highlighted included:

- The three Ward Councillors for Uxbridge South, Cllr Keith Burrows, Cllr Judith Cooper & Cllr Farhad Choubedar, fully support the residents in their opposition to this development for the reasons already stated within the report.
- Ward Councillors support the recommendation for refusal and request the Committee refuse the application, to prevent harm to the area.

During discussion, Members asked whether loss of light to residents, and the impact on parking within the area, could be added as reasons for refusal. Officers advised that parking was an indefensible reason for refusal, and that an independent consultant had advised that there were no grounds for a refusal reason relating to loss of light.

Members expressed their concerns over the size and scale of the development, as well as its location outside of the town centre, as well as its impact on the existing trees at the site. Members considered that the application would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and street scene and for these reasons, together with the reasons set out within the report, the officer's recommendation to refuse the application was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

117. **217 HIGH STREET, YIEWSLEY - 68663/APP/2020/705** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum which referenced letters of support received. Officers confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

Officers confirmed that the site was located in an area at risk of flooding, and the applicant had failed to demonstrate that a replacement health centre for Yiewsley could not be provided on a suitable sequentially preferable and reasonably available site at a lower risk of flooding. The proposal therefore failed the sequential test and did not accord with policy.

By way of written submission, the applicant addressed the Committee, alongside a brief 'virtual site visit' video. Key points highlighted included:

- Yiewsley and West Drayton has seen a significant increase in population and housing accommodation over recent years and it is important that other social infrastructures such as health are provided to support this growth. The current Yiewsley Health Centre is one of the worst health facilities in West London and no longer fit for purpose for the delivery of primary care to the local population. If permitted, the proposals would secure the delivery of the new NHS health facility in 2024 and end the 20-year search by the NHS for a new health facility site. The new facility would provide 22 patient rooms, 20 car parking spaces, an ambulance drop off space and serve 25,000+ local residents.
- The proposal is being recommended for refusal due to not passing the

sequential test. (No other concerns are raised with the scheme). The applicant's submitted sequential test, which is supported by a QC's Opinion, concludes that there are no other sites in the Yiewsley / West Drayton area that are reasonably available or viable to secure the delivery of a new health facility, and therefore the sequential test is passed.

- Financial viability assessments have been carried out by both the Council and Taylor Wimpey, which confirm that a scheme of 215+ units is required to enable a new health facility to be financially viable and deliverable. Neither of the proposed alternate sites, at Yiewsley Health Centre and the Trout Road site, meet this quantum requirement. Furthermore, the Trout Road site has not entered into any discussions with the NHS and therefore not agreed delivery terms for a potential new Health Facility, nor is this site considered an attractive location by the NHS (site still in use, not on a main arterial road and next to existing industrial uses). The redevelopment of the existing facility is also not viable or practical as it would require the decanting of existing patients to temporary accommodation (portacabins) for circa 2 years.
- Viable and subsidised terms for the new premises have been agreed between Taylor Wimpey and the NHS to deliver the health facility. An important point to note is that the Council's Local Plan does not identify a location for the new health facility, and there is no adopted policy that would require any other land owner in Yiewsley or West Drayton to provide the same level of subsidy as agreed.
- From a technical perspective, the proposals have been specifically designed with drainage mitigation measures in place to ensure that future users and residents of the site are safe. Environment Agency records show the site has never flooded and neither the Environment Agency nor the Local Lead Flood Officer have raised any technical flood risk concerns to the proposals.
- If the application were to be refused, these redevelopment proposals which include an urgently needed NHS health facility for the local community, 79 affordable homes and other tangible benefits would not be delivered, and the Committee is urged to approve the proposal.

Members referenced the Environmental Agency's (EA) statement that flood risk could be mitigated via conditions. Officers advised that the EA was not responsible for the sequential test and the conditions were suggested on the proviso that the test was passed and approval granted.

Members highlighted the positive aspects of the proposal, and the Council's eagerness to promote health centres and affordable housing in areas that needed them. However, it was recognised that the site was located in an area at risk of flooding, did not meet local or national policies, and had not passed the sequential test. Concerns were therefore present over potential risks to living conditions for future occupiers. In addition, the Council's highways team had stated that there was a parking shortfall for the area and the proposal only provided 1 parking spot for disabled patients.

For these reasons, the officer's recommendation to refuse was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

118.	<p><b>LEGION HOUSE, 854-858 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 1927/APP/2020/2785</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members requested further information on whether the proposal was providing more affordable housing than the current scheme. Officers advised that this detail could be provided outside of the meeting.</p> <p>Members supported the officer's recommendation, but moved that the application be approved subject to the detail on affordable housing being deemed suitable by the Chairman and Labour Lead. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the detail on affordable housing being acceptable to the Chairman and Labour Lead.</b></p>
119.	<p><b>THE COTTAGE IN THE WALL - 3886/APP/2020/3751</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Regarding site layout, officers had been provided with a run in/out plan to confirm that the layout worked for vehicle movements. In relation to safety of pedestrians, there were several clear crossing points on nearby roads, and the majority of the movements in and out of the site would be at times when roads were likely to be relatively empty, and thus the proposal was not considered to constitute a safety risk.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that no vehicle maintenance would be conducted at the site. In addition, a dedicated staff member would be on site, whose sole job was to park the buses. It was also confirmed that the Council's Conservation Officer had worked to ensure that a heritage wall would be retained and rebuilt where required.</p> <p>Members raised concerns over the potential noise impact on residents, and suggested that conditions be amended to include strengthening of the noise plan, acoustic wall maintenance, schedule of audits, and bus maintenance.</p> <p>In response to a suggestion that a condition be added relating to electric vehicles, officers advised that Transport for London required all providers to move to electric vehicles in the future, and so the applicant was seeking to future-proof the site by providing electric charging points from day 1.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, inclusive of the suggested amendments to conditions as set out above, 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 delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning to agree additional wording and conditions relating to noise, acoustic wall maintenance, audits and bus maintenance.</b></li> </ol>

120.	<p><b>STANFORD HOUSE - 51175/APP/2020/2543</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and advised that a previous application had been refused due to concerns including issues of scale, bulk, and parking provision, a decision that the applicant had appealed. While the Inspector had supported the Council’s refusal, they had not agreed with all reasons for refusal, and particularly the refusal reason relating to parking provision.</p> <p>Since then, the application had been redesigned to address all the points raised by the Inspector, and so officers were recommending that the application be approved.</p> <p>Members retained concerns relating to the parking provision, despite the Inspector’s view. However, the officer’s recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.*</b></p> <p>*(Cllr Morse did not take part in the vote due to loss of connection)</p>
121.	<p><b>30/32 BLYTH ROAD - 68974/APP/2020/2994</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members supported the application but suggested that a condition relating to suitable tree planting and safety on the terrace roof be added. It was agreed that this was to be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Councillor Duncan (on behalf of the Labour Lead.)</p> <p>The officer’s recommendation, inclusive of the additional conditions set out above, 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;</b></li> <li><b>2. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning to agree additional conditions relating to tree planting and safety on the roof terrace, in consultation with the Chairman and Councillor Duncan*</b></li> </ol> <p>*Councillor Morse did not take part in the discussion or vote due to loss of connection</p>
122.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO SOUTHALL LANE AND SOUTH OF WESTERN INTERNATIONAL MARKET (LB HOUNSLOW) - 39705/APP/2020/3902</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and confirmed that the Council was seeking approval to respond to LB Hounslow to request that, if they were minded to approve the application, the conditions/obligations as set out in the report be attached to the grant of consent.</p> <p>Members supported the suggested conditions/obligations, and the officer’s recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the officer’s recommendation be approved.</b></p>

123.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO WHITEHEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL, WHITEHEATH AVENUE - 64510/APP/2020/4020</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members supported the officer's recommendation which was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
124.	<p><b>RIVERSIDE HOTEL - 75945/APP/2020/3314</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval. Members were informed that the site was currently unoccupied, and that the report set out several conditions to safeguard future use of the site.</p> <p>In response to a query, officers advised that conditions also included a mandate that the provider provide support to occupants of the site, including help with employment, education, and wellness programmes, etc.</p> <p>Members were very pleased to see that the proposed site would benefit some of the Borough's most vulnerable residents. The officer's recommendation was therefore moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.02 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 Democratic Services on 01895 250636 or email (recommended): [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk). 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.**