

Minutes



MAJOR Applications Planning Committee

22 June 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Reeta Chamdal, Roy Chamdal, Philip Corthorne, Jas Dhot, Elizabeth Garelick and Tony Gill</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Sehar Arshad (Legal Advisor) Chris Brady (Principal Planning Officer) Glen Egan (Head of Legal Services) Ed Laughton (Strategic Planning and PPA Lead Officer) Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager) Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Richard Phillips (Principal Planning Officer) Dr Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager)</p>
11.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Adam Bennett with Councillor Reeta Chamdal substituting.</p>
12.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Philip Corthorne declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 (Haydon House) as he knew the applicant. Councillor Corthorne left the room prior to commencement of the discussion and did not vote on this item.</p>
13.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>In respect of the minutes dated 18 May 2023, an amendment was tabled in relation to item 8 – Hyatt Place – 2385/APP/2022/2952. It was confirmed that the Council wished to have some flexibility in the allocation and expenditure of the £160k contribution along the Uxbridge Road. A revised resolution was therefore proposed as follows:</p> <p><i>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, further noting that the £160,000 as a financial contribution to be used towards Active Travel Zone improvements in the vicinity of the site.</i></p> <p>The revised recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 18 May 2023 be agreed as an accurate record, subject to the agreed amendment to the minute for item 8 – Hyatt Place – 2385/APP/2022/2952 to read ‘RESOLVED: That the application be</p>

	<i>approved, further noting that the £160,000 as a financial contribution to be used towards Active Travel Zone improvements in the vicinity of the site.'</i>
14.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 11 MAY 2023 (AGM) (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 11 May 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
15.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
16.	<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 6</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
17.	<p>HAYDON HOUSE, 296 JOEL STREET, EASTCOTE - 51321/APP/2023/24 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of the existing building and construction of a four storey building, comprising 13 residential units, including associated landscape works, provision of bicycle and bin storage and car parking space (following the approved change of use ref. 51321/APP/2022/1861).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. The application was recommended for refusal for ten reasons including the lack of family accommodation offered, the size and bulk of the proposed development which would harm the character of the area, including the Eastcote Conservation Area opposite, the lack of adequate parking, the flood risk, the unsatisfactory living conditions, the harm to neighbouring properties and the failure to provide contributions towards improved services and facilities as a consequence of the development.</p> <p>A petition had been received in objection to the proposal. A petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents of Deerings Place and surrounding roads were pleased to see that the application was recommended for refusal and thanked planning officers and Ward Councillor Nick Denys for their help and due diligence; • The proposed development would be oversized, would not be in keeping with the surrounding area and could set a precedent for the future; • Insufficient parking was proposed which would add to parking stress on local congested roads; • The safeguarding and wellbeing of existing residents had to be taken into consideration – the proposed roof gardens would present a safeguarding concern; • The proposed development lacked sufficient lighting and outside amenity space which would have a negative impact on the mental health of future occupants; • Flooding was a big concern – the nearby Eastcote Tennis Club had twice been

- flooded in recent years;
- Repeated planning applications at the site were a worry and put a huge strain on local residents.

Members sought clarification regarding the flooding events at Eastcote Tennis Club. It was confirmed that the courts had been destroyed by floods in June 2016. They had been revamped but had flooded again two years later – fortunately it had been possible to save them on the second occasion.

Members noted the ten suggested reasons for refusal in the officers’ report and expressed concern that the proposed development failed to comply with planning regulations. Concerns were raised regarding the lack of suitable access as set out in reason for refusal nine.

Members sought further clarification regarding the air source heat pumps referenced on page 20 of the agenda pack. It was confirmed that these could be conditioned to ensure the noise levels generated were acceptable hence this would not constitute an additional reason for refusal.

The Committee noted that there were no 4-storey buildings in the vicinity of the application site. In response to their questions, Councillors were informed that there were no 3-storey buildings in the immediate vicinity either – the nearest were in Eastcote High Street and in Northwood Hills.

Members raised concerns regarding the lack of external amenity space proposed and its potential impact on the mental health of future occupants. The Committee enquired whether this could constitute an additional reason for refusal. It was confirmed that this was encompassed within reason for refusal six; however, it could be further clarified by making specific reference to a garden / balcony.

Councillors observed that the proposed design was unacceptable and enquired whether this should be a reason for refusal. It was explained that bringing a number of factors together under one umbrella added weight to the argument - to separate this out would essentially dilute it and was therefore not recommended.

Members commented that the application was entirely inappropriate. The officer’s recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be refused subject to the addendum changes and an amendment to reason for refusal 6 to include the words balcony/garden.

18. **HEATHROW FLIGHTPATH NCP CAR PARK, BATH ROAD, SIPSON - 41632/APP/2022/2301** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Demolition of existing car park and redevelopment for industrial (Use Class B2); storage or distribution (Use Class B8); and/or light industrial (Use Class E(g)(iii)) purposes, with ancillary office space, landscaping, car parking, servicing and access arrangements (AMENDED PLANS 18.05.23).

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. Initial concerns had been raised by officers regarding the bulk and scale of the building and the proposed redundancy of the access bridge across the M4 spur road. In response to these concerns the applicant had submitted revised drawings which reduced the height of the building, introduced additional planting along the

boundary with properties in Sipson Way and agreed to retain the use of the access bridge for employees.

Members heard that the site was located within the Bath Road Employment Area. The site was considered appropriate for industrial use and the principle of the proposed development was deemed to be acceptable.

Members welcomed the proposal which was consistent with planning policy. In response to their requests for clarification, it was confirmed that the application site was located under the flight path and next to a busy road hence it had been considered more appropriate to measure plant noise rather than background noise. Plant noise should not exceed certain prescribed levels and any breaches could be reported to the Council.

With regard to the design of the proposal, Members were informed that this had been improved under the revised plans – the development would be built further from existing boundaries, the height had been reduced and the roof form amended.

The Committee sought further clarification regarding the bridge and how this would be managed. It was explained that the applicant would be responsible for one section of the site, but the main part of the bridge was owned by Highways England. Key fob gates would be installed, and the bridge would be maintained by National Highways; however, maintenance of the gates would remain the responsibility of the landowner. It was agreed that this should be conditioned by way of a compliance condition.

In terms of highways matters, Members were advised that the numbers of trips had been based on 2019 traffic surveys. It was recognised that there would be an uplift in these under the proposed scheme, but numbers would be insignificant.

In response to further queries regarding construction times, Members heard that these would be set out in the construction management plan – approval would need to be sought to operate outside these times; this normally happened at the beginning of the process and only for a short period of time.

Members raised no further objections and welcomed the employment opportunities the new development would bring.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the addendum and an additional compliance condition relating to maintenance of the gates, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the addition of a compliance condition to ensure the developer was responsible for the maintenance of the bridge gates.

19. **LAND TO THE EAST OF LONDON SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD - 10112/APP/2022/1474** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Erection of a residential building comprising 13 flats with associated parking, cycle storage, motorcycle parking, disabled parking and bin storage following demolition of existing residential block and pair of semi-detached houses.

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. An amendment to the item description as set out at the start of the agenda pack was highlighted to refer to 13 rather than 15 flats. An amendment to the wording

in the addendum was also noted – the revised wording to read ‘No development shall take place within three months...’ rather than ‘No further development....’ Finally, it was noted that Condition 14 in relation to Dust (page 126 of the pack) should be a compliance condition and Condition 21 – fire strategy (page 128 of the pack) should not refer to ‘revision’ as the strategy had yet to be submitted.

Members heard that the current application was almost identical to a previously approved proposal to build a block of 15 flats – the only changes were to the internal layout and fenestration; parking and landscaping had remained unchanged.

It was confirmed that the previous scheme had included two discount market units whereas the current scheme offered no affordable housing. Whilst this was disappointing, it was recognised that it was difficult to find Registered Social Landlords willing to take on such a small number of units in a small scheme. However, it was noted that the current scheme would provide a generous in lieu Affordable Housing contribution which could be used to build affordable housing elsewhere in the Borough. The application was recommended for approval.

In response to their questions, Members heard that a financial viability appraisal had been submitted to a third-party independent expert who had concluded that, based on the benchmark land value, a £70,000 surplus could be secured. Officers had subsequently used the GLA formula to secure a higher sum of £320,000 as detailed in the report. This contribution included a Late Stage Review Mechanism whereby it would be reviewed again at a later stage and the sum could possibly increase if market conditions improved.

Members noted that 15 car parking spaces were planned for which exceeded the number of units to be built. However, it was confirmed that the Highways Engineer had raised no objections and it represented a very marginal increase to what was required. It was confirmed that, as set out in Condition 16, parking would be restricted to serve residents of the block only. Members were informed that the provision of car parking spaces for electrical vehicles remained the same as in the original application.

Members regretted the lack of affordable housing but welcomed the significant financial contribution which had been secured to build affordable housing elsewhere.

The Head of Legal Services informed the Committee that the lack of affordable housing did not constitute grounds for refusal. It was noted that a review mechanism was in place to ensure the maximum contribution was secured. It was agreed that said review would be carried out in consultation with the Chairman.

The officer’s recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the following amendments:

1. Contamination condition to be updated to state ‘within 3 months;’
2. Condition 21 – Fire Strategy – the word ‘revised’ to be removed from the Condition wording as the Fire Strategy had yet to be submitted;
3. Condition 14 – Dust – to be amended to a compliance condition; and
4. Late Stage review to be completed in consultation with the Chairman and Andrew Tebutt.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.31 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on Email: 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.