

## Minutes



### Major Applications Planning Committee

18 May 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Adam Bennett (Vice-Chairman), Philip Corthorne, Darran Davies, Jas Dhot, Elizabeth Garelick and Tony Gill</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Chris Brady (Principal Planning Officer), Michael Briginshaw (Principal Planning Officer) Richard Phillips (Principal Planning Officer), Dr Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) Glen Egan (Head of Legal Services) Sehar Arshad (Senior Planning Lawyer) and Ryan Dell (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
3.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal with Councillor Darran Davies substituting.</p>
4.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
5.	<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 dated 25 April 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
6.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
7.	<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>

It was confirmed that all items were marked in Part I and would be considered in public.

8. **HYATT PLACE - 2385/APP/2022/2952** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Partial demolition of the existing building, followed by refurbishment, side extensions and upwards extensions, alongside erection of perimeter blocks around a podium level, to increase hotel capacity (Class C1) whilst introducing industrial uses (Class E(g)(ii) and E(g)(iii)) at ground and first floor level.**

Officers presented the application and noted that this item had been deferred from the April Committee meeting. Officers highlighted the addendum, which noted an amendment to the Active Travel Zone Head of Term. Officers presented additional information that had been received by the applicant which sought to clarify points raised at the previous Committee meeting around hotel use, length of stay, a Hotel Management Strategy, shuttle minibus, green credentials, and some additional conditions that had been agreed.

Before the meeting, comments had been received from Councillor Stuart Mathers and Councillor Kamal Kaur as Ward Councillors of the application site (Wood End ward). These comments included a request to extend the non-delivery hours to the site to the later time of 18:30 and requested enforcement to ensure that Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) did not wait on local residential roads during non-delivery times. The comments also noted that the shuttle bus did not alleviate concerns over potential increased traffic and parking at the site. The Ward Councillors believed that the insufficient on-site parking provision would have a detrimental impact on local residents and other businesses in an area with existing heavy traffic and very limited parking provision, which may result in an overspill of parking into the surrounding residential streets.

In response to this, officers noted that a restriction of 5.5 hours for deliveries was excessive and unreasonable. Usual hours of 07:00-09:00 and 15:00-17:00 were already in place. Increasing this to 15:00-18:30 would cause more harm as it would lengthen the construction process. Officers further noted that enforcement was usually policed through the Construction Management Plan, and so was added to Condition 3.

The Chairman noted that this application had been extensively debated at the previous Committee meeting, which included discussion around the 90-day stay and other points on which the Committee wanted further clarification.

Officers further noted the extensive debate at the previous Committee meeting, and noted the advice summarised on page 10-11 of the agenda. It was noted that the proposal was not for dwellings; and hotel bedrooms had no independent access; and guests could not use the site to register to vote. There were no restrictions on length of stay under the use classes order, and the Committee had to judge the application on its merits.

On extending the delivery restrictions to 5.5 hours, the Committee would need a very clear basis on which to impose this. It was noted that there had been one resident objection to the application since the previous Committee meeting.

Members thanked officers and the applicant for the quick turnaround in being able to bring this application back to Committee so soon. Members asked what the standard restrictions on deliveries were. Officers noted that usual restrictions were 07:00-09:00

and 16:00-18:00, or if near a school, 15:00-18:00. The current afternoon/ evening restriction on this site were 15:00-17:00.

Regarding the stated use as a hotel for business and leisure, Members asked if there was a rigid definition of this. Officers noted that while this was loosely defined, it was the role of the Committee simply to approve or reject planning permission for the hotel. The Committee could consider planning matters, not commercial matters. It was noted that the applicant had noted the concerns of Members at the recent Planning Committee and wished to respond in a positive and collaborative manner and had agreed to the request to fund the monitoring of the Hotel Management Strategy over a 10-year period at a cost of £20,000, as requested by officers.

Members asked if there was a hotel strategy for Hillingdon. Officers noted that there was a need to deliver a certain number of hotel rooms. There was the London Plan, which was, in itself, a strategy, and a local policy for the delivery of hotel rooms. This application went towards meeting some of that need. Members also asked about housing density, and whether this was sustainable. Officers clarified that as this was not a residential dwelling, density would not be relevant.

Members asked about fire access and escape routes and whether, because the site was above 30M, it required an additional escape route. It was noted that this was for residential dwellings, not hotels. Officers further clarified that as this application was a class C1 as opposed to class C3 for example. Members further asked about the construction management plan, and whether a specific decibel limit could be included within the noise plan. Officers noted Point 11 of the criteria and highlighted the Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005 regulations, and so there was no arbitrary limit. Members asked whether there would be a restriction on rental properties from having a postal address. Officers noted that the Hotel Management Strategy, in which no postal addresses are given.

Members noted that the shuttle bus route listed the option of a route from either Southall Station or Hayes and Harlington Station, and Members asked why there would not be one definitive option. Officers noted that there was a preference for the route to be flexible to demand.

Members asked about hours of work on site, and officers clarified that there was an industry standard of 08:00-18:00 Monday-Friday; 08:00-13:00 Saturday.

A verbal update was given to add a new condition to have mechanical ventilation throughout the building. Condition 3 was amended to add no waiting and idling of delivery vehicles in the surrounding residential roads. Condition 3 (xi) would be amended to impose a specific decibel level from the Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005 of 80 dB(A) and 85 dB(A) and 135 dB(C) and 137 dB(C). A new informative was added regarding construction hours: Demolition and construction works which are audible at the site boundary shall only be carried out between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08:00 hours and 13:00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Officer's recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, approved.

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

9. **CANTEEN BUILDING, FORMER NESTLE FACTORY SITE - 1331/APP/2022/2553**  
(Agenda Item 7)

**Partial demolition and redevelopment of the former canteen building to provide a new healthcare facility (Class E(e)), nursery (Class E(f)) and reconfigured residential building (Block H) (Class C3) with a commercial unit at ground floor (Class E), including associated landscaping, access, car parking and other engineering works.**

**(Re-Consultation for submission of amended plans and information. The scheme has been amended from a proposal for full demolition of the Canteen Building to partial demolition of the Canteen Building with partial facade retention).**

Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum, which listed an amendment to the Healthcare Facility Delivery Plan Head of Term; an amendment to the Affordable Housing Head of Term; and added a condition of: Prior to the commencement of development, including any works of site clearance and demolition, details of the contracts for demolition works and the Demolition Strategy covering the Canteen Building to preserve the Retained Facades must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Members noted the planning obligation relating to an NHS organisation using the site. Officers noted discussions with the Integrated Care Board (ICB)/ NHS who were looking forward to utilising the space provided. Officers clarified that the need had arisen from the existing facility within Hayes Town centre having its lease terminated. The existing facility had ground and first floor levels. The ground floor GPs were moving to the Old Vinyl Factory site, which was under construction. The first floor was moving into the Nestle facility. The current site was larger than the old facility and so would also include some out-patient capabilities as well as GP facilities. The proposed healthcare facility was supported by the NHS health care strategy at both the national and local level. The NHS North West ICB had been independently consulted and had confirmed that they were committed to the scheme and had been working closely with the developer to ensure that the proposed facility was fit for purpose for the delivery of healthcare services.

Members also asked about it not being feasible to re-purpose the existing building without any demolition, and officers noted that after discussions with the NHS, partial demolition was deemed necessary in order for the site to be fit for purpose. In response to Members' questions, officers noted that there was sufficient retention of the facade to reduce harm.

Members asked about heritage, and whether a plaque or sign would commemorate the historic facility. Officers noted that there was an existing plaque at the site, but not on the former canteen building.

Members asked about the view from nearby residential properties, and officers noted there would be a line of trees before the former canteen building. Members also asked about frosted windows being implemented and officers noted that this would depend on any GP/ NHS restrictions.

Officer's recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, approved.

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

10.	<p><b>COMAG - 24843/APP/2022/2403 (Agenda Item 8)</b></p> <p><b>Erection of building comprising 105 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and 99sq.m (GIA) Community Hub (flexible Use Class E/F.1/F.2), ranging from two to seven storeys together with associated accesses, car parking, cycle parking and hard and soft landscaping (REVISED PLANS 23.11.22).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum, which provided an amendment to the Affordable Housing Head of Term.</p> <p>Members asked about a possible condition to minimise the impact of dust. Officers noted that Condition 7 stated that a Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan (DLP/CLP) and Demolition and Construction Management Plan (DMP/ CMP) would be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Officers further noted that residents purchasing properties near to the application site would have been aware that the current site was undergoing construction work.</p> <p>Members referenced page 176 of the agenda and asked whether affordable housing was measured in rooms rather than units. Officers had worked to come to an agreement with the applicant over the appropriate provision of affordable housing, noting that the baseline was 23% as the minimum. Members also referred to, and officers clarified, that the Financial Viability Assessment would ensure a minimum level of affordable housing. Members asked about the Community Hub. This was included as part of the initial planning consent as this was something local residents had wanted. The applicant had undertaken a public engagement process, which was outside of the planning application process. Officers noted a condition on restricted usage to avoid negative impacts on local amenities and the highways network.</p> <p>Members referenced the construction logistics and asked about adding a condition on the duration of on-site lighting. Officers noted that the construction hours were 08:00-18:00. Condition 7 was updated to include light switch-off to coincide with the construction hours.</p> <p>Officer's recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, approved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.50 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ryan Dell on [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.**