

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

16 September 2021

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Henry Higgins (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Philip Corthorne, Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead), Jas Dhot and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager) and Senober Khan (Highways Engineer)</p> |
| 32. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 33. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 34. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 August 2021 be approved as a correct record.</p> |
| 35. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 36. | <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 Part 1 and would therefore be considered in public.</p> |
| 37. | <p>FORMER WYEVALE GARDEN CENTRE, PIELD HEATH ROAD - 13831/APP/2021/2233 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum, which confirmed that the applicant had submitted a letter setting out additional information relating to site operation. The additional information did not impact upon the officer's recommendation, which remained refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.</p> |

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Key points raised included:

- The application constituted inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and was contrary to policy.
- The site's operations were resulting in significant noise and disturbance to local residents, including vehicle, equipment, and radio noise.
- Noise disturbance remained during weekends, and both very early in the morning and late at night.
- The site had impacted upon local wildlife, which was now rarely seen.
- Operations had resulted in flooding of nearby land.
- The applicant's claims that the site had resulted in employment for local residents was doubtful.
- The site had resulted in increased traffic and congestion.
- Contrary to the applicant's assertion, the site had not been vacant but had been in use by the nearby university and hospital.
- It was requested that the application be refused and enforcement action be undertaken.

In response to a question from the Committee, the petitioner advised that they had witnessed flood water run off from the site to common land.

The agent for the applicant addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The film industry was a fast growing sector with a shortage of support studios and storage structures.
- The applicant required the site to support a large scale international production's with a budget in the 100s of millions.
- There were special circumstances which should allow for development within the Green Belt, as the site was the only suitable location.
- The development was re-using a vacant lot, and was a temporary measure that did not require intrusive or permanent construction.
- The development would support substantial investment in Hillingdon including increased employment, commerce, and education opportunities.
- The production had been required to use the site prior to planning application or the production would have been lost to another European country.
- The site supported a large number of staff.
- Letters of support from the industry had been received.
- The applicant had sought to engage with officers to overcome their concerns, but this had not been possible. It was requested that the application be deferred to allow the applicant time to discuss the matter with officers.

In response to questions from the Committee, the agent advised that the landlord for the site had been the University. Regarding flooding, a flood risk assessment had been submitted as part of the application though if concerns remained, further review was needed. The applicant had not submitted an alternative site assessment as this was not required under national policy.

Officers advised that flooding had not been included as a reason for refusal as it was felt that any such concerns could be overcome via conditions, were the application to be approved. Officers confirmed that the Mayor of London had also objected to the application.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation for the reasons as set out in the report. This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

38. **LAND OFF HAYES END ROAD - 74089/APP/2020/3305** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

By way of written submission, a petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Key points highlighted included:

- By reason of its excessive height and frontage width the proposal represented an overdevelopment of what was a compact site, out of keeping with the street scene and the character of the area. The site was contrary to Mayor of London's, Policy 7.18 Protecting open space and addressing deficiency.
- The higher elevation of the development would negatively impact on the privacy of Charolais House residents.
- The report stated, "all windows met the target value" but no flats were accessed during the time stated to gain such data, therefore such data & related conclusions should be deemed inadmissible.
- The building would encroach on the setting of a listed building and listed wall across the road at Springwell Nursery.
- The proposal would be detrimental to the free movement of traffic on Hayes End Road, as well as pedestrian safety, by the creation of a "bottle-neck" due to the increase in traffic.
- The siting of car parking next to the gardens and balconies of the flats at Charolais House would subject these homeowners to noise and fumes, making the gardens and balconies unusable.
- Future users of the proposed car parking bays will have full and open views into the gardens and windows at Charolais House.
- Residents health would be impacted by increased traffic, resulting in increased ultrafine particles, carbon monoxide, NO₂, black carbon, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, etc.
- The proposed bin area would be clearly visible from the main road, contravention of guidance from the CFPA-E on bin separation distances from dwellings, Proximity of the bins to resident homes would result in increased smell and would attract vermin.
- The proposed substation was extremely close to resident property contrary to the Healthy Streets agenda, as habitable rooms were within the detectable magnetic field.

Officers advised that in their opinion, the concerns regarding separation distance, overlooking, and impact on residential amenity were not sufficient reasons for refusal. However, it was suggested that delegated authority could be given to the Deputy Director of Planning to add an informative suggesting any further submissions consider a more sympathetic site layout.

The agent for the applicant addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The applicant had undertaken significant consultation with Council officers which had resulted in a positive development which would improve the character of the area, with no adverse impact on listed buildings or walls.

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would provide family unit that would help reduce pressure for family housing within the Borough. • The application would result in a significant CIL contribution and would also attract new first-time buyers residents to the area. • The development would regenerate a site that was currently in industrial use. • Due to higher construction and material costs, the additional of affordable homes would render the application economically unviable. • It was requested the application be deferred to allow for a S106 agreement to be drafted, which in turn would allow for a review of the viability of affordable housing in the future. <p>Officers advised the committee that a deferral was not supported, as the review mechanism referred to required officers and the applicant to agree a benchmark figure, which was unlikely. The Council's opinion of the viability of affordable housing remained contrary to that of the applicant.</p> <p>The Committee supported the officer's recommendation, inclusive of the suggested informative, for the reasons set out in the report. This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the application be refused; and 2. That delegated authority be granted to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration to draft an informative recommending a more sympathetic site layout. |
| 39. | <p>ST JOHNS SCHOOL, POTTER STREET - 10795/APP/2021/2580 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, confirming that as the development proposed only minor differences to the approved scheme, the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The Committee supported the officer's recommendation. This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p> |
| 40. | <p>HPH 3, MILLINGTON ROAD - 72360/APP/2021/2656 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was recommended for approval for the reasons as set out in the report.</p> <p>The Committee supported the officer's recommendation, which was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p> |
| 41. | <p>EAGLE POINT - 2342/APP/2021/2918 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum, which set out an additional condition to control the excess on-site parking and prevent its sale or use as off airport/commuter parking. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons as set out in the report.</p> |

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

42. **MINET SCHOOL - 2297/APP/2021/2704** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum which set out amendments to condition 7 relating to landscaping. The application was recommended for approval for the reasons as set out in the report.

The Committee suggested that the Deputy Director of Planning be granted delegated authority to add a condition mandating the submission of a construction management plan.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation, inclusive of the additional condition. This was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application be approved; and
2. That delegated authority be given to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration to draft a condition regarding a construction management plan.

43. **15-17 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 69827/APP/2021/1565** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval for the reasons as set out in the report.

The majority of the Committee supported the officer's recommendation, though suggested that a condition be added mandating that any vegetation to be planted be chosen based on its ability to address air quality. In addition, it was suggested that the Deputy Director of Planning be delegated authority to discuss the potential for reducing the applicant's financial contribution to offset the development's carbon impact, and instead make the development itself greener.

Other Members felt that the application was not sympathetic to the existing location by virtue of its height and size, and therefore did not support the officer's recommendation.

The officers recommendation, inclusive of the additional condition and delegated authority as set out above, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed by a vote of 5 to 1.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application be approved;
2. That a condition relating to the planting of vegetation to help promote air quality be added.
3. That the Deputy Director of Planning be delegated authority to discuss the potential for reducing the applicant's financial contribution to offset the development's carbon impact and instead make the development itself greener.

| | |
|-----|---|
| 44. | <p>BARTON BUILDINGS - 74891/APP/2021/2071 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p> |
| | <p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.42 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@hillington.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.