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| Date: | WEDNESDAY, 20 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | JANUARY 2016 |

Time: $\quad$ 7.00 PM, OR UPON THE RISING OF THE MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE, WHICHEVER IS LATEST

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM 5 CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE, UB8 1UW

Meeting Members of the Public and Details: Press are welcome to attend this meeting

## To Councillors on the Committee

Eddie Lavery (Chairman)
John Morgan (Vice-Chairman)
Peter Curling (Labour Lead)
Jem Duducu
Duncan Flynn
Raymond Graham
Carol Melvin
John Morse
John Oswell

Published: Tuesday, 12 January 2016
Contact: Alex Quayle
Tel: 01895250692
Email: democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk

This Agenda is available online at:
http://modgov.hillingdon.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?XXR=0\&Year=2016\&Cld=116\&MD=ie listmeetings\&

## Putting our residents first

[^0]
# Useful information for residents and visitors 

## Travel and parking

Bus routes 427, U1, U3, U4 and U7 all stop at the Civic Centre. Uxbridge underground station, with the Piccadilly and Metropolitan lines, is a short walk away. Limited parking is available at the Civic Centre. For details on availability and how to book a parking space, please contact Democratic Services. Please enter from the Council's main reception where you will be directed to the Committee Room.

## Accessibility

For accessibility options regarding this agenda please contact Democratic Services. For those hard of hearing an Induction Loop System is available for use in the various meeting rooms.


## Attending, reporting and filming of meetings

For the public part of this meeting, residents and the media are welcomed to attend, and if they wish, report on it, broadcast, record or film proceedings as long as it does not disrupt proceedings. It is recommended to give advance notice to ensure any particular requirements can be met. The Council will provide a seating area for residents/public, an area for the media and high speed WiFi access to all attending. The officer shown on the front of this agenda should be contacted for further information and will be available at the meeting to assist if required. Kindly ensure all mobile or similar devices on silent mode.

Please note that the Council may also record or film this meeting and publish this online.

## Emergency procedures

If there is a FIRE, you will hear a continuous alarm. Please follow the signs to the nearest FIRE EXIT and assemble on the Civic Centre forecourt. Lifts must not be used unless instructed by a Fire Marshal or Security Officer.

In the event of a SECURITY INCIDENT, follow instructions issued via the tannoy, a Fire Marshal or a Security Officer. Those unable to evacuate using the stairs, should make their way to the signed refuge locations.

## A useful guide for those attending Planning Committee meetings

## Security and Safety information

Fire Alarm - If there is a FIRE in the building the fire alarm will sound continuously. If there is a BOMB ALERT the alarm sounds intermittently. Please make your way to the nearest FIRE EXIT.
Mobile telephones - Please switch off any mobile telephones and BlackBerries before the meeting.

## Petitions and Councillors

Petitions - Those who have organised a petition of 20 or more borough residents can speak at a Planning Committee in support of or against an application. Petitions must be submitted in writing to the Council in advance of the meeting. Where there is a petition opposing a planning application there is also the right for the applicant or their agent to address the meeting for up to 5 minutes.
Ward Councillors - There is a right for local councillors to speak at Planning Committees about applications in their Ward.
Committee Members - The planning committee is made up of the experienced Councillors who meet in public every three weeks to make decisions on applications.

## How the Committee meeting works

The Planning Committees consider the most complex and controversial proposals for development or enforcement action.
Applications for smaller developments such as householder extensions are generally dealt with by the Council's planning officers under delegated powers.
An agenda is prepared for each meeting, which comprises reports on each application
Reports with petitions will normally be taken at the beginning of the meeting.
The procedure will be as follows:-

1. The Chairman will announce the report;
2. The Planning Officer will introduce it; with a presentation of plans and photographs;
3. If there is a petition(s), the petition organiser will speak, followed by the agent/applicant followed by any Ward Councillors;
4. The Committee may ask questions of the petition organiser or of the agent/applicant;
5. The Committee debate the item and may seek clarification from officers;
6. The Committee will vote on the recommendation in the report, or on an alternative recommendation put forward by a Member of the Committee, which has been seconded.

## About the Committee's decision

The Committee must make its decisions by having regard to legislation, policies laid down by National Government, by the Greater London Authority - under 'The London Plan' and Hillingdon's own planning policies as contained in the 'Unitary Development Plan 1998' and supporting guidance. The Committee must also make its decision based on material planning considerations and case law and material presented to it at the meeting in the officer's report and any representations received.
Guidance on how Members of the Committee must conduct themselves when dealing with planning matters and when making their decisions is contained in the 'Planning Code of Conduct', which is part of the Council's Constitution.
When making their decision, the Committee cannot take into account issues which are not planning considerations such a the effect of a development upon the value of surrounding properties, nor the loss of a view (which in itself is not sufficient ground for refusal of permission), nor a subjective opinion relating to the design of the property. When making a decision to refuse an application, the Committee will be asked to provide detailed reasons for refusal based on material planning considerations.
If a decision is made to refuse an application, the applicant has the right of appeal against the decision. A Planning Inspector appointed by the Government will then consider the appeal. There is no third party right of appeal, although a third party can apply to the High Court for Judicial Review, which must be done within 3 months of the date of the decision.

## Agenda

## Chairman's Announcements

1 Apologies for Absence
2 Declarations of Interest in matters coming before this meeting
3 To sign and receive the minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2015

4 Matters that have been notified in advance or urgent
5 To confirm that the items of business marked Part 1 will be considered in public and that the items marked Part 2 will be considered in private

## PART I - Members, Public and Press

Items are normally marked in the order that they will be considered, though the Chairman may vary this. The name of the local ward area is also given in addition to the address of the premises or land concerned.

## Applications with a Petition

|  | Address | Ward | Description \& Recommendation | Page |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 6 | 29 Copse Wood Way, <br> Northwood <br> 12537/APP/2015/3396 | Northwood | Two storey, 6-bed, detached <br> dwelling with habitable roof space <br> with associated parking and <br> amenity space and installation of <br> vehicular crossover to front <br> involving demolition of existing <br> detached dwelling house <br> Recommendation: Refusal | $7-18$ |
| 7 | 51 Wieland Road, <br> Northwood <br> $17990 / A P P / 2015 / 4176$ | Northwood <br> Hills | Two storey, 6-bed detached <br> dwelling with habitable roof space <br> and basement with associated <br> parking and amenity space <br> involving demolition of existing <br> detached dwelling | $82-91$ |

## Applications without a Petition

|  | Address | Ward | Description \& Recommendation | Page |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 8 | Land at Junction of <br> Field End Road, <br> Eastcote <br> $59310 / A P P / 2015 / 4125$ |  <br> East <br> Ruislip | Replacement of the existing 17.5 <br> metre pole with a 20 metre pole <br> and the installation of 1 additional <br> cabinet. <br> Recommendation: Refusal | $33-44$ |
| 9 | 34 Burwood Avenue, <br> Eastcote <br> $63119 / A P P / 2015 / 3763$ |  <br> East <br> Ruislip | Single storey rear extension |  |
| Recommendation: Refusal | $100-104$ |  |  |  |

## Other

53-70
10 S106 Quarterly Monitoring Report
This report provides financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the North Planning Committee area up to 30 September 2015 where the Council has received and holds funds.
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## Agenda Item 3

## Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
8 December 2015
HILLINGDON
LONDON
Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

|  | Committee Members Present: <br> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) <br> John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) <br> Peter Curling (Labour Lead) <br> Raymond Graham <br> Carol Melvin <br> John Oswell <br> Brian Stead <br> Ian Edwards <br> Jazz Dhillon <br> LBH Officers Present: <br> James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Maja Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transportation Consultant), Nicole Ca Advisor), Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer) and Charles Fran Services Officer) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 107. | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1) <br> Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn and John Morse with Councillors Brian Stead, Ian Edwards and Jazz Dhillon acting as substitutes. |
| 108. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (Agenda Item 2) <br> None. |
| 109. | MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (Agenda Item 3) <br> None. |
| 110. | TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (Agenda Item 4) <br> All items were considered in Public. |

## 111. 82 DUCK HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 39262/APP/2014/4357 (Agenda Item 5)

## Three storey building with associated basement to provide $3 \times 4$ bed self contained supported living flats with associated parking

Officers introduced the report and provided the Committee with an overview of the application.

Officers highlighted the changes set out in the addendum and in particular drew the Committees' attention to the withdrawal of the word 'ambulance' throughout the report and the comments of the access officer. Officers also confirmed the proposal was not contrary to H 10 .

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The size of the proposed extension was too large and out of character with the area and that it would have an adverse impact on residents.
- The design and form of the development would result in incongruous roof forms, which were out of keeping in the area
- The proposal would give rise to overlooking issues.
- The removal of trees was unnecessary.
- The business use of the proposal meant that 30 staff were required as it was a high dependency facility. This would create parking problems locally.
- Service vehicles would also create pressures on local roads.
- The proposal was situated in a cul-de-sac which had not been designed to accommodate the anticipated form of use.

The applicant raised the following points:

- The proposal sought to meet the needs of vulnerable adults with specific needs.
- The proposal met all the necessary standards, including the highways one in relation to car parking.
- A transport impact assessment had been submitted and proposal site was located 100 metres from a bus route.
- Vehicular access was good and the site was not located in a high incident area.
- The general character of the area had changed over the last 15 years and so the design was not out of keeping with the area.
- The proposal met waste management, flood and drainage standards.
- The proposal was a high level design which would meet a specific need.

Officers explained the proposal would provide assisted living flats, incorporating new vehicular access and associated car parking. An area of soft landscaping would be retained within the rear of the site, which could be utilised as communal amenity space.

While not objecting to the principle of the development, the Officer

|  | report stated the refusal reasons included siting, size, scale, bulk and massing. The proposal was also deemed to be an incongruous and intrusive form of overdevelopment which was incompatible with the street scene and wider area. Additional reasons for refusal included insufficient parking and cycle storage facilities. <br> Discussing the application, the Committee sought further clarification on the amount of car parking available and the size and scale of the development. In response, Officers confirmed the proposed provision of 6 car parking spaces for the number of residents and staff was considered to be unacceptable and due to the size and scale of the development, it was considered to be out of character with the surrounding area. <br> On this basis the recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed. <br> Resolved - <br> That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 112. | HOLLAND \& HOLLAND SHOOTING SCHOOL, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 16568/APP/2015/3140 (Agenda Item 6) <br> Extension to existing reception building and new underground shooting range, including the demolition of the existing pavilion and garage <br> Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum. <br> The Committee heard that as the application site was in use as a shooting ground, its use was deemed to be an acceptable use in the Green Belt. Furthermore, as an established business, its need to expand to continue to operate successfully was seen to demonstrate very special circumstances for the proposed increase in the size of the building. <br> Officers explained that the current application was smaller than previous approvals and the height and bulk of the building, when taken in context with the size of the site and previous consents, was considered not to cause unacceptable levels of harm to the surrounding Green Belt. <br> A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and raised the following points: <br> - This was one of the premier shooting establishments in the country <br> - The application was smaller than previous ones which had been approved. <br> - A recreational purpose was an acceptable use within the Green Belt. |  |


|  | It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the <br> application be approved as set out in the officer report. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Resolved - |  |  |
| That the application be Approved. |  |  |

113. 48 HARLYN DRIVE, PINNER - 4956/APP/2015/3462 (Agenda Item 7)

Two storey, 5-bed, detached dwelling with habitable basement space with associated landscaping involving demolition of existing dwelling house

Officers introduced the report and provided the Committee with an overview of the application.

Officers highlighted the changes in the addendum which included a petition in support of the application which had been received since the publication of the agenda.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a representative of the petitioners in support of the proposal addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The applicant had tried to work with the Council but had experienced difficulties.
- The applicant disagreed with the officer report that insufficient information had been provided about flood risk.
- The basement was not living accommodation.
- The size and scale of the application was very similar to a design which had been granted on appeal.
- The proposal had been designed to an exceptional standard.
- Harlyn Drive contained a mixture of architectural styles and so the proposal would not be out of place with the street scene.

Officers explained that while they did not object to the principle of the design, the report stated the refusal reasons included size, scale, bulk and being out of keeping with the street scene. Officers reiterated that insufficient information had been provided by the applicant regarding the flood risk posed by the development.

Discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the proposed design, including the large crown roof was a bulky and incongruous addition to the street scene. As a result, the design was considered to be out of character with the area.

On this basis the recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.

## RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the
officer's report.

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | The meeting, which commenced at 6pm, closed at 6:50pm. |  |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.
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## Agenda Item 6

## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

|  | Address 29 | 29 COPSE WOOD WAY NORTHWOOD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Development: $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Two } \\ & \text { ass } \\ \text { to f }\end{array}$ | Two storey, 6-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house |
|  | LBH Ref Nos: 125 | 12537/APP/2015/3396 |
|  | Drawing Nos: 3053 | 5329/A101 Rev G <br> Tree Statement 5329/A/DAS-rev A 5329/A100 Rev A 5329/A102 Rev A 5329/A103 Rev E 5329/A104 Rev E TS15-20M/1 TS15-20M/2 TS15-20M/3 |
|  | Date Plans Received: <br> Date Application Valid | ved: $08 / 09 / 2015$ Date(s) of Amendment(s): <br> Valid: $21 / 09 / 2015$  |
|  | 1. SUMMARY |  |
|  | The proposed proportions is of the surround be unacceptab BE39 and AM1 2012), policy $B$ 2012) and the | sed scheme by reason of its unacceptable design, scale, siting, form and is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance ounding Area of Special Local Character. As such the scheme is considered to ptable in terms of policies $B E 5, B E 6, B E 13, B E 15, B E 19, B E 22, B E 23, B E 38$, AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November cy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November the HDAS: Residential Layouts. |

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

## 1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

It is considered that the proposed scheme by reason of its siting bulk and scale, in particular the degree to which it projects beyond the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties would result in an overbearing impact on its neighbours at Nos 27 and 31 Copse Wood Way. As such the scheme is considered to be unacceptable in terms of policies BE19, BE20, BE21, BE22, and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS: Residential Layouts.

## 2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

It has not been demonstrated that the scheme makes adequate provision for the protection and long-term retention of valuable trees. As such, in the absence of sufficient information, the scheme is considered unacceptable in terms of Policies BE38 and Be39 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the

HDAS: Residential Layouts

## 3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

It is considered that the proposed scheme by reason of its unacceptable design, significant increase in scale, in terms of height, width and siting, form and proportions would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding Area of Special Local Character. As such the scheme is considered to be unacceptable in terms of policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE15, and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS: Residential Layouts.

## INFORMATIVES

## $1 \quad 159 \quad$ Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), the London Plan Policies (2015). On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

## $2 \quad$ I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
$3 \quad 153 \quad$ Compulsory Informative (2)
The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2015) and national guidance.

| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| :--- | :--- |
| BE16 | New development on the northern frontage of the A4 (Bath Road) |
| BE17 | Design and layout of new development at Heathrow Airport |
| BE18 | Design considerations - pedestrian security and safety |
| BE19 | New development must improve or complement the character of the <br>  <br> area. |
| BE20 | Daylight and sunlight considerations. <br> BE21 |
| Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions. <br> BE23 | Requires the provision of adequate amenity space. <br> RE24 |
| Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to |  |
| BE38 | neighbours. |
|  | Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of <br> new planting and landscaping in development proposals. |
| BE39 | Protection of trees and woodland - tree preservation orders |
| H3 | Loss and replacement of residential accommodation |

H6 Considerations influencing appropriate density in residential development.
HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

## 4

If this development had been found acceptable, it would have been liable for a contribution under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

No. 29 Copse Wood Way is located on the southern side of Copse Wood Way and comprises a large detached two storey house set within a large plot characteristic of houses in the street. The rear garden has an extensive wooded area that screens it from properties to the south.

The street scene is characterised by various size detached two storey dwellings set within spacious plots interspersed with mature trees. The application site is within a Developed Area and the Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character as identified in the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part 2.

The application site is covered by TPO 398.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposed dwelling would be two storeys with dormer windows in both front and rear elevations. The existing dwelling has a footprint of about 104.6 sqm and the proposed about 280 sqm. The proposed dwelling will be approximately 1.2 metres from the common boundary with No. 27 Copse Wood Way and 1.4 metres from No. 31. The existing dwelling is approximately 8 metres high and the proposed approximately 9.5 metres high. The proposed dwelling will extend between 8 and 11 metres back from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling of which approximately 6 metres will be single storey. The proposed dwelling will be approximately 10.5 m back from the pavement. This compares to the existing property which is approximately 12 metres back.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

## 12537/B/93/0680 29 Copse Wood Way Northwood

Tree surgery to 3 Hornbeams in Area A1 on TPO 398 including thinning of the crowns of two Hornbeams by $10 \%$, the removal of branches less than $1^{\prime \prime}(2.5 \mathrm{~cm})$ diameter and the pollarding one stem of one Hornbeam

Decision: 09-06-1993 Approved

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

There is no relevant planning history
UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-
Part 1 Policies:
PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment
Part 2 Policies:
AM14 New development and car parking standards.
BE16 New development on the northern frontage of the A4 (Bath Road)
BE17 Design and layout of new development at Heathrow Airport
BE18 Design considerations - pedestrian security and safety
BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
BE39 Protection of trees and woodland - tree preservation orders
H3 Loss and replacement of residential accommodation
H6 Considerations influencing appropriate density in residential development.
HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

## 5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 6. Consultations

## External Consultees

Neighbours were notified on 29/10/2015 and a site notice was displayed on 01/11/2015.
3 letters of objection have been received together with a petition with 24 signatures in objection to the application.

These submissions raise the following concerns:

- The dwelling is of excessive scale and height and covers almost the width of the plot, and extends deep into the garden
- The new dwelling will not be sympathetic to the surrounding street and will appear at odds with Copse Wood Estate
- The front projection of the proposal is completely out of character and fails to replicate the features evident on other buildings
- The rear projection will be overbearing, visually intrusive and will result in loss of privacy
- The existing Arts and Crafts dwelling will be lost


## Internal Consultees

TREE \& LANDSCAPE PLANNING OBSERVATIONS:
This site is covered by TPO 398.
Significant trees / other vegetation of merit in terms of Saved Policy BE38: There are several protected trees within and adjacent to this site that merit protection and long-term retention.

Recommendations: In order to show that this scheme makes adequate provision for the protection and long-term retention of valuable tree/s, the following detail is required (in accordance with BS 5837:2012):

1. A tree survey to categorize the trees on and off site;
2. A tree constraints plan to show how the proposal fits within the context of the trees on and off site;
2.1 Existing and proposed levels (any proposed changes in levels must be clearly defined and shown in colour on the plans)
2.2 ALL existing and proposed drainage must be shown
3. A tree protection plan to show how the trees (to be retained) will be protected during development;.
4. An arboricultural method statement to show any incursion into tree root protection areas (RPA's) will be addressed.
5. Details of how the tree protection measures will be assessed before demolition / construction starts and how the tree protection (and any procedures described within approved arboricultural method statements) will be supervised during construction.
6. A landscape scheme in accordance with the HDAS showing at least $25 \%$ of the front garden retained as soft landscaping

Conclusion (in terms of Saved Policy BE38): The scheme is considered unacceptable because it does not make adequate provision for the protection and long-term retention of valuable trees.

OFFICER NOTE: In light of the recommendation additional details have not been sought.
HIGHWAYS:
No highways objection

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The site is within the Developed Area and the proposed replacement dwelling is acceptable in principle.
7.02 Density of the proposed development

It is not considered that the density of development is highly relevant to consideration of applications for a single dwelling where the assessment should be based more on the actual impacts of the proposal, however it is noted that the proposal would not change the density of development of the site which would continue to have a single dwelling within a generous plot.

### 7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

The application site is not located within an archaeological priority area, nor would the proposal affect the setting of any listed buildings.

Consideration of the impacts on the Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character are contained within the 'Impact on the character \& appearance of the area' section of this report.

### 7.04 Airport safeguarding

The proposal does not raise any airport safeguarding issues.
7.05 Impact on the green belt

The application site is not within the green belt.
7.06 Environmental Impact

The proposal is not considered to give rise to any unacceptable environmental impacts.

### 7.07 Impact on the character \& appearance of the area

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design.

Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seek to ensure that new development complements and improves the character and amenity of the area. Policy BE5 requires new developments within Areas of Special Local Character to harmonise with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in the area.

Policies BE6 and BE22 apply specifically to development within the ASLC at Copsewood estate. These policies seek to ensure that two-storey developments in the Copsewood Estate are set-in 1.5 metres from the side boundary. Further, there is a requirement for these to be constructed on building plots of a similar average width as surrounding residential development, be constructed on a similar building line (formed by the front main walls of existing houses), be of a similar scale, form and proportion as adjacent houses, and reflect the materials, design features and architectural style predominant in the area.

In terms of the layout and siting of the proposed dwelling, the predominant character within this part of Copse Wood Way, is dwellings set a substantial distance from the front boundary. The proposed building has been sited 10.5 metres from the front boundary to the site. Whilst No. 27 has a projection further forward than the proposed front building line, this is single storey. The development would be wholly two-storey with dormer windows in the roof and further forward than both its neighbours at Nos 27 and 31 Copse Wood Way. The dwelling would be significantly larger than both its immediate neighbours. The proposal would be 1.4 metres and 1.2 metres from the respective boundaries. This is below the standard referred to above and the result will be an overly intensive development which is harmful to the character of the area.

The proposed dwelling would be 9.5 metres in height, compared to the existing 8 metre building. The existing dwelling is two storeys but with the second storey in the roofspace. The proposed development would be approximately 2.5 metres higher than No. 27. It is on rising land which tends to emphasise its dominance. No. 31 is on higher land and would appear taller than the proposal. The applicant has referred to the resultant development being narrower than the existing. The existing front elevation measures 18 metres in width and the proposed 15.5 metres. However, the existing has cat slide roofs and a single storey garage on the side closest to No. 31. This design effectively retains a gap and gives views of the trees beyond. In contrast, the proposed development effectively fills the plot and significantly reduces the visual separation between the plot and its neighbours. It is considered that the overall size, scale and massing of the proposed dwelling is unacceptable as it would dominate the plot and its setting to an unacceptable degree.

Overall, the scheme is considered unacceptable and does not comply with policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE15, BE19, and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP

Policies (November 2012) and BE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (November 2012).

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

Policy BE21 states that planning permission will not be granted for new buildings which by reason of their siting, bulk and proximity would result in a significant loss of residential amenity.

Paragraph 4.11 of HDAS Residential Layouts states that the 45 degree principle will be applied to new development to ensure the amenity of adjoining occupiers and future occupiers are protected. Paragraph 4.9 states that a minimum acceptable distance to minimise the negative impact of overbearing and overshadowing is 15 m . Paragraph 4.12 requires a minimum of 21 m distance between facing habitable room windows to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy. There are no habitable rooms in either of the side elevations of the neighbouring properties. No. 29 has a first floor window in the flank elevation but this appears to serve a landing. The proposed development has side 1st floor windows. These either serve on-suite bathrooms where obscure glazing would be expected or would not face towards any windows in the adjoining properties.

No. 31 is located to the south west of the application site and consists of a large detached dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be located 1.4 metres from the party boundary and it is important to note that there is a rise in ground level of approximately 1.5 metres from the application site to No. 31

In terms of the impact of the proposed development on this property, the proposed dwelling would extend approximately 6 metres beyond the rear elevation at ground floor level and 2 metres at first floor level. No. 31 has rear facing windows and it is considered that the rear projection beyond the rear elevation would exceed the amount normally permitted by the Council's Policies and Guidance and it is considered that the development would appear unduly overbearing and visually intrusive to this occupier.

In relation to the impact of the proposal on No. 27, the development will project some 10.5 metres back from the existing rear wall with approximately 4 metres being two-storey. No. 27 has both rear windows and a side facing first floor window. Due to the significant increase in scale, bulk, height and depth it is considered that the development would appear unduly overbearing and visually intrusive to this occupier.

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

The London Plan seeks to ensure that all housing developments are to the highest quality,both internally and externally, and in relation to their context. It sets out minimum internal floor spaces required for residential developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants.

However, on 25 March 2015 through a written ministerial statement, the government introduced new technical housing standards in England and detailed how these would be applied thorough planning policy. The system comprises of new additional 'optional' building regulations on water and access, and national space standards for new homes (referred to as "the new national technical standards"). These new standards came into effect on 1 October 2015.

Until such time as the Minor Alterations to the London Plan have been adopted, transitional arrangements will apply. Details are set out in the London Plan Housing Standards Policy Transitional Statement.

The floor space standards therefore need to be assessed against the London Plan Transition Statement and the Mayor's Draft SPG. The standard under the Draft SPG is for a six bedroom dwelling is 129 sqm . All the bedrooms are capable of twin occupation. The proposed dwelling is 280 sqm which significantly exceeds the minimum standard. The development significantly exceeds this level of internal floorspace.

The size of the amenity space at over 750 sq.m would easily meet London Plan and Council standards. It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policies 3.5 and 5.3 of the London Plan (2015).

Overall, it is concluded that the development will result in a high standard of living conditions.

### 7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The proposed dwelling would continue to benefit from sufficient off road parking to the front driveway. Therefore, the proposed development would comply with Policy AM7, AM9, AM14 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part 1 and Part 2 Strategic Policies.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

The issues relating to urban design have been covered in Section 7 of the report. Issues relating to security would be covered by the imposition of a secure by design condition in the event of any approval.

### 7.12 Disabled access

No specific details have been provided. However, given the scale of the proposal there is no doubt that it could easiliy provide disabled access or modifications to achieve this.

### 7.13 Provision of affordable \& special needs housing

This is a single unit of accommodation and there is no requirement to provide affordable or special needs housing.

### 7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The application site is covered by TPO 398 and there are other protected trees adjacent to the site. there are no details within the application to demonstrate that valuable trees will be retained or protected. There is an objection from the Council's Trees and Landscape officer and the proposals are considered to be contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

The submitted Design and Access statement sets out sustainability provisions. Were the application to be approved these matters could be secured by appropriate conditions

### 7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

The submitted Design and Access statement sets out sustainability provisions. Were the application to be approved these matters could be secured by appropriate conditions

### 7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

No issues arise

### 7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

No issues arise

### 7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The issues arising from the consultation are addressed within the body of the report.
7.20 Planning Obligations

The application is subject to Community Infrastructure Levy.
7.22 Other Issues

North Planning Committee - 20th January 2016
PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC \& PRESS

None

## 8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

## General

Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

## Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

Planning Obligations
Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights
Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances.

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in
particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.

## 9. Observations of the Director of Finance

None
10. CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposed scheme by reason of its unacceptable design, significant increase in scale, in terms of height, width and siting, form and proportions will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding Area of Special Local Character. In addition, it will have an overbearing impact on its neighbours at Nos 27 and 31 Copse Wood Way. As such the scheme is considered to be unacceptable in terms of policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE15, BE19, BE22, BE23, BE38, BE39 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS: Residential Layouts.

Furthermore, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the scheme makes adequate provision for the protection and long-term retention of valuable trees. As such, in the absence of sufficient information, the scheme is considered unacceptable in terms of Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS: Residential Layouts

## 11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
HDAS: Residential Layouts
The London Plan 2015 and Housing Standards transition statement and SPG
The Mayor's London Housing Supplementary Planning Document
HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon
National Planning Policy Framework
Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster
Telephone No: 01895250230
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## Agenda Item 7

## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address 51 V | 51 WIELAND ROAD NORTHWOOD |
| :---: | :---: |
| Development: $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Two } \\ & \text { with } \\ \text { deta }\end{array}$ | Two storey, 6-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and basement with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling |
| LBH Ref Nos: 179 | 17990/APP/2015/4176 |
| Drawing Nos: $\quad$ Fl | Flood Risk Assessment <br> Design and Access Statement <br> Basement Construction Method Statement <br> 00614 Sheet 1 <br> 00614 Sheet 2 <br> 00614 Sheet 3 <br> 5205/PL/LP <br> 5205/PL/02 Rev A <br> 5205/A101 Rev G <br> 5205/A103 Rev E <br> 5205/A102 Rev F |
| Date Plans Received: | ed: 12/11/2015 Date(s) of Amendment(s): |
| Date Application Valid | Valid: 12/11/2015 |

## 1. SUMMARY

Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene, and BE19 states the LPA will seek to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and the character of the area.

The proposed dwelling is not acceptable in design terms and would result in a bulky and incongruous addition to the street scene to the detriment of the Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would also have a dominant and overbearing impact on the adjacent properties to the detriment of their residential amenity.

It is therefore recommended for refusal.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

## 1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design, would represent a visually unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the character, appearance and architectural composition of the original dwelling and the visual amenity of the wider Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

## 2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would project beyond the rear elevations of the flanking properties and therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, by reason of over dominance, visual intrusion and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

## INFORMATIVES

## $1 \quad \mathrm{I} 59$ <br> Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), the London Plan Policies (2015). On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

## $2 \quad$ I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

## $3 \quad 153 \quad$ Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2015) and national guidance.

| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM7 | Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments. |
| BE13 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene. |
| BE19 | New development must improve or complement the character of the <br> area. |
| BE20 | Daylight and sunlight considerations. <br> BE21 |
| SE22 | Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys. |
| BE23 | Requires the provision of adequate amenity space. <br> Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to |
| BE24 | neighbours. <br> Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of <br> new planting and landscaping in development proposals. |
| BE5 | new development within areas of special local character |
| BE6 | New development within Gate Hill Farm and Copsewood Estates <br> areas of special local character |
| OE1 | Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties |


| OE5 | Siting of noise-sensitive developments <br> OE8 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional <br> surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures |

LPP 3.5 (2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.13
LPP 5.14
(2015) Sustainable drainage
(2015) Water quality and wastewater infrastructure

HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
LDF-AH Accessible Hillingdon, Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

## 4

If this development had been found acceptable, it would have been liable for a contribution under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a large detached property situated on the south eastern side of Wieland Road. The property benefits from a good sized front garden with parking for at least 3 cars and a large rear garden.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising two storey detached properties.

The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and within the Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and replacement with a two storey 6 -bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and basement with associated parking and amenity space.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

17990/73/1388 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Alterations and additions.
Decision: 14-08-1973 Approved

17990/APP/2001/1541 51 Wieland Road Northwood
ERECTION OF REAR CONSERVATORY EXTENSIONS
Decision: 29-11-2001 Withdrawn

17990/APP/2001/578
51 Wieland Road Northwood

## ERECTION OF A REAR CONSERVATORY

Decision: 17-05-2001 Refused

17990/APP/2002/685 51 Wieland Road Northwood
ERECTION OF A REAR CONSERVATORY
Decision: 04-10-2002 Refused

17990/APP/2014/1170 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Part two storey, part single storey rear extension with habitable roofspace, conversion of existin roofspace to habitable use involving installation of 2 x rooflights to front, construction of baseme and alterations to front porch

Decision: 28-05-2014 Withdrawn

17990/APP/2014/3428 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 front roof lights, construction of basement and alterations to porch to front

Decision: 21-11-2014 Refused

17990/APP/2015/2372 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Two storey, 6-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and basement with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling

Decision: 15-09-2015 Refused

17990/APP/2015/645 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Part two storey, part first floor rear extension, construction of basement, conversion of garage tc habitable use, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 rear rooflights, alterations tc front elevation and demolition of existing rear element

Decision: 24-04-2015 Approved

17990/B/90/0785 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Erection of single-storey rear extension incorporating swimming pool
Decision: 22-03-1991 Refused
Appeal: 22-03-1991 Dismissed

17990/C/97/0512 51 Wieland Road Northwood
Tree surgery to T26 (Oak), including pollarding at 7 metres (20 feet), and T27 (Oak), including reducing the height by 40\% to secondary (lower/ mid) crown, on TPO 172

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

17990/APP/2015/2372 - Two storey, 6-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and basement with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling (refused)
17990/APP/2015/645 - Part two storey, part first floor rear extension, construction of basement, conversion of garage to habitable use, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 rear rooflights, alterations to front elevation and demolition of existing rear element (approved)
17990/APP/2014/3428 - Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 front roof lights, construction of basement and alterations to porch to front (refused)

The previous submission was refused on the scale and design of the proposed dwelling being out of keeping with the character of the wider area and the detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties.

## 4. Planning Policies and Standards

## UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-
Part 1 Policies:
PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment
Part 2 Policies:
AM14 New development and car parking standards.
AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22 Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
BE5 New development within areas of special local character
BE6 New development within Gate Hill Farm and Copsewood Estates areas of special local character

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE5 Siting of noise-sensitive developments
OE8 Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures

LPP 3.5 (2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.13 (2015) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.14 (2015) Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
LDF-AH Accessible Hillingdon, Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

## 5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

### 5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 6. Consultations

## External Consultees

The following neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 8 December 2015 as follows: -

- 49 Wieland Road
- 59 Elgood Avenue
- 59a Elgood Avenue
- 53 Wieland Road
- 8 Wieland Road
- 43 Wieland Road
- 2a Wieland Road

One response was received from an adjoining neighbour and a further objection was also received from a local resident who raise the following points:

- Overwhelming effect on the adjacent property from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over dominance
- The plans do not show the relationship of the proposals to no. 49
- Whilst the proposal has been re-designed the area and footprint appear to be the same as previously refused
- Loss of light
- Breaches the 45 degree line of sight from my windows
- The dormer windows are an unsightly protrusion from the roof and are bulky and oppressive
- I note para 7.18 of 17790/APP/2015/2372, which considers there would be no unacceptable air quality issues. There are existing spicy cooking smells and emissions coming from 51 and windows have to be closed. I request a condition be imposed to provide adequate filtration equipment is installed
- I object to the situation of the plant room as I will be affected by emissions, noise of air conditioning, heating pumps etc.
- The Basement Construction Method Statement makes no mention of the installation of movement and vibration and noise sensors before work commences
- I an concerned that the basement is only 1.5 m from 49 and the construction process will undermine and damage my property
- The increased bulk in addition to the existing conifers on the boundary between 51 and 53 will virtually provide a continuous barrier from the roofline to the end of the garden, blocking the benefit of the sun, particularly when it is low but also in high summer when the shadows already extend to my garden
- Over dominant and out of character
- Potential impact on watercourses as a result of the basement

A petition of 31 signatories was also submitted against the proposal.
Gatehill Residents Association - The GRA formally object on the following issues

- Too large for the plot and will dominate the neighbours. Still 4 x the size of the immediate neighbours
- Loss of light to neighbouring properties
- Less than 1.5 m from the side boundary contrary to policy
- The eaves are still very deep and the 45 degree line shown is based on the corner of the wall not the gutter as required in the guidelines. It therefore breaches the 45 degree rule
- Roof design more bulky and not in keeping with the immediate neighbours
- The front elevation is unattractive and out of keeping with the surrounding properties
- The revised design still results in building over part of the existing front garden and is likely to reduce the number of car parking spaces available
- The red outline identifies land owned by the GRA who do not allow parking on this land as it is used as a pedestrian refuge from passing traffic
- The revised plans do not comply with the LBH requirement fro $25 \%$ soft landscaping to the front
- The style is out of keeping with the estate
- Detrimental impact on surface water in the immediate area. The documents submitted appear to relate to a previous smaller extension
- Increased traffic due to removal of a significant mount of soil to accommodate the development

Officer Response: The issue of land ownership was raised with the applicant in the previous application, who then confirmed the land was in their ownership.

Northwood Residents Association: No response
Northwood Hills Residents Association: No response

## Internal Consultees

Access Officer:
No response
Conservation and Urban Design:
No comments
Trees/Landscaping:

- No tree survey has been submitted.
- A topographic survey indicates the location of trees on the site.
- The Design \& Access Statement indicates most of the amenity space in the back garden will remain unaffected by the development and 'none of the trees on the site will be affected by the new proposal or during the construction process'. No evidence has been produced to support this statement.
- It is very likely that trees in the front driveway will be affected either by the footprint of the new building or the space required to demolish the old and construct the new building.
- Most of the space and trees in the large rear garden will be unaffected by the proposal.
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- On balance, the anticipated minor tree loss is not significant given the amount of space remaining for new planting which should be secured as part of a comprehensive landscape scheme, which should be conditioned.
- Due to the extensive nature of the proposal, including the excavation of the basement, it is possible that there will be some collateral impact to nearby trees due to the excavation and construction process.
- Tree protection will be required to safeguard the retained trees.

If the application is recommended for approval, landscape conditions should be imposed to ensure that the proposals preserve and enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment.

Drainage Officer:
The applicant taken on board advice that the width of the proposed building does not extend the full width of the the plot allowing an appropriately design drainage scheme to deal with any potential groundwater across the site and allow space for it to flow round the building and proposed basement. No objection subject to a condition to secure appropriate sustainable water management measures.

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The proposed site currently comprises of a single residential dwelling within its own curtilage and therefore constitutes 'previously developed land' i.e. 'brownfield land'. There is a presumption in favour of residential development on brownfield land subject to other material planning considerations as detailed below.

The area is an established residential area and therefore the principle of residential development of the site is considered acceptable.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that the new development takes into account local context and character, the design principles in Chapter 7 and public transport capacity development should optimise housing output for different types of location within the relative density range shown in Table 3.2. Development proposals which compromise this policy should be resisted.

The density matrix, however, is only of limited value when looking at small scale development such as that proposed with this application. In such cases, it is often more appropriate to consider how the development harmonises with its surroundings and its impact on adjoining occupiers.

### 7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

With specific reference to the site location within an Area of Special Local Character, Policy BE5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) states that new development should harmonise with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in such areas.

The proposed dwelling is significantly larger than the existing dwelling and the majority of the other properties in the street scene. It measures 15.75 m in width by 13.9 m in depth with a height of 8.8 m . The increased roof height is even higher than no. 61, (at 8.5 m ) which is the largest extended property nearby. The resultant crown roof detail, presents a large bulky box like appearance, which is out of keeping with the character of the ASLC.

### 7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable to this application

### 7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application

### 7.07 Impact on the character \& appearance of the area

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place. Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that the layout and appearance of new development should "harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area." The NPPF notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

The proposed dwelling is significantly larger than the existing dwelling and the majority of the other properties in the street scene. At a height of 8.8 m the roof line is even higher than no. 61, (at 8.5 m ) which is the largest extended property nearby. The resultant crown roof detail ( $39 \%$ of the overall height of the building) presents a large bulky box like appearance, which is out of keeping with the character of the ASLC. The mock Georgian facade is not in keeping with the 1930's style of properties and the 0.9 m set back from the boundary of no. 63 fails to respect the requirements of HDAS and adds to the cramped over developed appearance of the site.

Therefore the proposal fails to reflect the architectural character and appearance of the Gate Hill Estate ASLC. As such it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE15 \& BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

With regard to the impact of the amenities on the adjoining occupiers, Sections 4.9 of the SPD: New Residential Layouts, in relation to new dwellings, states all residential developments and amenity space should receive adequate daylight and sunlight. The daylight and sunlight available to adjoining properties should be adequately protected. Where a two or more storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible over-domination.

The proposed block plan as submitted within the application combines with the ground floor plan and only shows the relationship with the neighbouring properties attached garages and not the dwellings themselves. The proposed dwelling would extend 8.5 m beyond the rear of the adjacent garage at no. 49 and is set back from the boundary by 1.6 m . It would extend 5.65 m beyond the garage of no 53 and would be set back from the boundary by 0.9 m . The first floor plan shows a recess of 1.75 m at the rear corner of the north eastern elevation (adjacent to no. 49) and a diagonal line which would appear to demonstrate compliance with a 45 degree line of sight from no. 49 . However the site plan submitted under application 17990/APP/2015/645 for the rear extensions did show the relationship to the adjacent properties. Measurements taken from that plan in relation to the neighbouring garages show that the maximum depth to ensure the preservation of a 45 degree line of site would be 4.25 m from the rear of no.49's garage and 6 m from the rear of no.53's garage. Given that the depth clearly exceeds that requirement for no. 49 the proposed development would clearly encroach on a 45 degree line of sight.

Given the scale and bulk of the proposed dwelling; the level of projection beyond the rear of
the adjacent dwellings and the limited degree of separation from the side boundaries, it is considered that the proposal would have a dominant and overbearing impact resulting in an unacceptable degree of over dominance, visual intrusion and over shadowing.

In relation to any loss of privacy arising from the proposal, the proposed first floor windows on the side elevation are to serve en-suite bathrooms and dressing rooms. As such they could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut. It is not considered that the front or rear windows would result in any increased overlooking to the current dwelling.

As such it is considered that the proposal is un-neighbourly form of development and fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE20, BE21 \& BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

London Plan Policy 3.5 seeks to ensure that all housing developments are of the highest quality, both internally and externally and in relation to their context and the wider environment.

The London Plan sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. . Due to the substantial nature of the proposal the internal floor space for the new dwelling would be in excess of the minimum requirements and therefore is considered acceptable.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, would have an adequate outlook and source of natural light, and therefore comply with the SPD: New Residential Layouts: Section 4.9.

This is a deep plot and sufficient private amenity space would be retained for occupiers of the new house in accordance with the Council's adopted standard. The proposal therefore complies with policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

### 7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by the proposed development is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy AM14 states that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards. These require a provision of 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

The front building line is as existing and the through driveway shows there is still sufficient provision to accommodate 2 parking spaces as required within the adopted parking space standards. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) and the adopted SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

Section 4.40-4.41 of the SPD: Residential layouts deals with waste management and specifies bin stores should be provided for, and wheelie bin stores should not be further than 9 m from the edge of the highway. No details have been provided with regard to this issue, however it is considered this could be dealt with by a suitable condition.

A Secured by Design condition could be added to any approval to ensure the development complies with such principles should the application be acceptable in all other respects.

### 7.12 Disabled access

The Access Officer has not raised any concerns relating to Lifetime Home Standards and to achieving level access.

### 7.13 Provision of affordable \& special needs housing

Not applicable to this application
7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

Due to the extensive nature of the proposal, including the excavation of the basement, it is possible that there will be some impact to nearby trees due to the excavation and construction process. Tree protection will be required to safeguard the retained trees. If all other aspects of the proposal were acceptable, landscape conditions could be imposed to ensure that the proposals preserve and enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment.

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to this application
7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application
7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The application is accompanied by a flood risk attenuation strategy. This proposes the utilisation of SuDS in the form of rainwater harvesting and attenuation storage. Infiltration has been
discounted due to poor draining soils.

The design of the proposed basement is such that an appropriate drainage scheme to deal with ground water and surface water matters could be secured by a condition were the application to be acceptable in other respect. Subject to such a condition the proposal would comply with relevant policies including policies 5.13-5.15 of the London Plan 2015 and Policy OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

### 7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application

### 7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The issues raised have been addressed as appropriately in the report.
7.20 Planning Obligations

The proposal would not necessitate the provision of planning obligations, however based on the information before officers at this stage it would be liable for payments under the Community Infrastructure Levy.

### 7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application

### 7.22 Other Issues

The basement proposed is large and close to neighbouring boundaries. A comprehensive basement construction and method statement has been provided that concludes that there is a safe and
effective method of excavating and constructing the basement without significant impact on the
public highway or neighbouring properties.

As the basement is satisfactory from a drainage and flood risk perspective there is no reason to refuse the planning application in this regard.

## 8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

## General

Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

## Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

Planning Obligations
Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights
Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances.

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.
9. Observations of the Director of Finance

N/A
10. CONCLUSION

The proposal fails to comply with with policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and is therefore recommended for refusal.
11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2
The London Plan
Supplementary Planning Document 'Accessible Hillingdon'
National Planning Policy Framework
Contact Officer: Liz Arnold
Telephone No: 01895250230
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## Agenda Item 8

## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | LAND AT JUNCTION OF FIELD END ROAD AND HIGH ROAD EASTCOTE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Replacement of the existing 17.5 metre pole with a 20 metre pole and the <br> installation of 1 additional cabinet. |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 59310/APP/2015/4125 <br> Drawing Nos: <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Design and Access Statement <br> 100 Rev A <br> 200 Rev A <br> 201 Rev A <br> $300 ~ R e v ~ A ~$ <br> $301 ~ R e v ~ A ~$ <br> 400 Rev A <br> ICNIRP Compliance detail reference CTIL 147016 <br> Supplementary Information |


| Date Plans Received: | $06 / 11 / 2015$ | Date(s) of Amendment(s): | $06 / 11 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Application Valid: | $06 / 11 / 2015$ |  | $10 / 11 / 2015$ |

## 1. SUMMARY

The applicant seeks planning permission for the installation of a 20 m high telecommunications mast and new and replacement cabinets. The proposed mast would provide improved coverage for Telefonica and Vodafone.

Although the proposed mast and cabinets would not cause harm to pedestrian or highway safety, it is considered that the proposed structures in this location, by reason of their height, siting and design would add undue clutter to the street scene and appear as visually incongruous additions, which would be considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed development does not comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic policies, BE5, BE13 and BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Chapter 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

## 1 NON2 Refusal reason

The proposed mast installation, by virtue of its height, design and location, would result in an incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development that would be out of keeping with the visual character of the surrounding street scene, and have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the wider Eastcote Village Conservation Area. Further the proposed cabinets, by reason of their size, siting and design would add undue clutter to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Chapter 5 of the NPPF, Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies BE4, BE13 and BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## INFORMATIVES

## $152 \quad$ Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

## $2 \quad 153 \quad$ Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2015) and national guidance.
AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE37 Telecommunications developments - siting and design
BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
NPPF5 NPPF - Supporting high quality communication infrastructure

## $3 \quad 159 \quad$ Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies (2015). On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

## 4

Should you be minded to submit an alternative application for consideration you are advised to undertake an assessment of alternative sites in order to establish if alternative locations might be more appropriate in terms of avoiding the impacts cited within the refusal reason.

Officers are mindful that when planning permission for a mast on this site was first granted there was a moratorium preventing the installation of telecommunications antennae on land owned by the Council. This moratorium no longer exists which means preferable alternative sites may be available.

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the grass verge and immediately adjacent to the footpath. It is opposite the mini roundabout at the junction of High Road and Field End Road. An electricity sub-station building and wooded amenity area are located to the west of the site,
beyond which is a lawn tennis club. Eastcote House Gardens are located to the north east, on the opposite side of Eastcote Road. Residential properties are located along Field End Road to the south east and Eastcote Road to the south west.

The site falls within the Eastcote Village Conservation Area as designated in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies. Tree Protection Orders apply to the adjacent trees. No. 2 Field End Road, opposite, is a Grade II Listed Building.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks consent for the replacement of the existing 17.5 metre high pole, with a new 20 metre high pole and the installation of 1 new cabinet. The proposed upgrade is required to provide new 4G coverage for both Telefonica and Vodafone and improve existing 2 G and 3 G coverage to the surrounding area.

There is an existing 17.5 metre high pole and four cabinets located on the verge adjacent to the junction of Field End Road and High Road. It is proposed to remove the existing pole and two cabinets, and replace these with a new 20 metre high pole located 5 metres to the south of its existing location. The two cabinets removed will be replaced with new three new cabinets, which although in the same area as the existing, are more dispersed along the verge.

This scheme is similar to one refused by Members at the planning committee on the 13th May 2015. The main changes between this and the previous submission is that instead of moving the mast 5 metres south of its current location, it has been replaced on the same footprint. Also only one new cabinet is proposed to the south of the mast.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

59310/APP/2004/585 Land At Junction Of Field End Road Eastcote Road Ruislip
INSTALLATION OF A 15M HIGH STREETWORKS COLUMN FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS USE WITH TWO ANCILLARY GROUND-BASED EQUIPMENT CABINETS (APPLICATION UNDER PARAGRAPH A. 3 (3) OF PART 24 OF SCHEDULE 2 TO THE TOWN AND COUNTR) PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) (AMENDMENT) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2001)

Decision: 08-04-2004 Refused Appeal: 03-02-2005 Allowed

59310/APP/2005/2123 Land At Junction Of Field End Road Eastcote Road Ruislip REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING 15 METRE HIGH TELECOMMUNICATION MAST WITH 17.5 METRE HIGH MONOPOLE MOBILE PHONE MAST AND EQUIPMENT CABINET

Decision: 22-09-2005 Refused
Appeal: 06-04-2006 Allowed

59310/APP/2010/2005 Land At Junction Of Field End Road High Road Eastcote, Pinner
Replacement of the existing O2, 17.5 m high streetworks pole with a 17.5 m high streetworks pol complete with three dual user antennas within a shroud, an associated radio equipment cabinet and development ancillary.

Decision: 10-01-2012 Approved
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59310/APP/2012/2309 Land At Junction Of Field End Road Eastcote Road Ruislip
Installation of $1 \times$ DSLAM cabinet (Consultation Under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended)

Decision: 05-11-2012 PRQ

59310/APP/2013/3137 Land At Junction Of Field End Road And High Road Eastcote Replacement of one existing cabinet and the installation of one new additional cabinet

Decision: 06-12-2013 Refused

59310/APP/2014/3633 Land At Junction Of Field End Road And High Road Eastcote
Installation of $2 \times$ DSLAM cabinet to replace 2 x existing cabinets (Consultation Under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended)

Decision: 28-11-2014 PRQ

59310/APP/2015/767 Land At Junction Of Field End Road And High Road Eastcote
Relocation and replacement of a 17.5 metre high telecommunications monopole with a 20 metre high telecommunications monopole, replacement of two existing cabinets and installation of one additional equipment cabinet.

Decision: 13-05-2015 Refused

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

There have been a number of applications on this site relating to the installation of DSLAM cabinets and masts, which are summarised above.

O2 originally submitted an application for the installation of a 15 m high streetworks column and two ancillary equipment cabinets at this site in 2004 (ref: 59310/APP/2004/585). Following the Council's refusal of the application, and strong local opposition, the installation was allowed at appeal on 03/02/05 (PINS ref: APP/R5510/A/04/1153756).

In 2005, O2 submitted two parallel applications for the replacement of the existing 15 m high mast with a 17.5 m high mast and additional equipment cabinet. One of these (ref: 59310/APP/2005/2123) proposed a direct replacement installation at the existing site and the second (ref: 60985/APP/2005/2149) proposed a 20 m high replacement installation in the wooded area adjacent to the sub-station building, as an alternative. Despite some local support for the second location, over the existing location on the footway, both applications were refused by the Council's Planning Committee on 22/09/05. O2 subsequently submitted an appeal relating to the original site and this was allowed on 06/04/06 (ref:
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APP/R5510/A/05/1196440). At that time, the Inspector concluded that the proposed changes, including the increased height, would not be so noticeable as to materially harm the character and appearance of the area.

59310/APP/2010/2005 - Replacement of the existing O2, 17.5m high streetworks pole with a 17.5 m high streetworks pole, complete with three dual user antennas within a shroud, an associated radio equipment cabinet and development ancillary. Approved subject to conditions.

59310/APP/2015/767 - This application refused consent for the relocation and replacement of a 17.5 metre high telecommunications monopole with a 20 metre high telecommunications monopole, replacement of two existing cabinets and installation of one additional equipment cabinet.

## 4. Planning Policies and Standards

## UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-
Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage
Part 2 Policies:

| AM7 | Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments. |
| :--- | :--- |
| BE4 | New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas |
| BE13 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene. |
| BE37 | Telecommunications developments - siting and design |
| BE38 | Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting <br> and landscaping in development proposals. |
| NPPF5 | NPPF - Supporting high quality communication infrastructure |

## 5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 6. Consultations

## External Consultees

9 residents were notified of the application and a site notice displayed at the site. 3 comments were received to this consultation which raised the following concerns:

1. Can the mast not be set back from the pavement to minimise its visual impact and resolve safety concerns;
2. The mast and cabinets are on a very dangerous road and unnecessarily on the footpath, which make the pavement very narrow;
3. The location of the mast does have a significant impact on the surrounding area as it is close to

Forge Green and the heritage sign;

## EASTCOTE CONSERVATION PANEL

This application is stated to be a resubmission of the previously refused application 59310/APP/2015/767.

The document entitled 'Ten Commitments Consultation' states that this proposed 20 mtr high pole will now be erected on the existing base. However, the drawings in the document marked 'Plan' show the pole on a new base in the same position as the refused application.

This conflict of information gives cause for great concern should this application with incorrect drawings be passed the community will not have anyway to redress a mistake of this nature.
Please can the applicant be asked to submit correct drawings before any determination is made.
It is also noted that a CIL form is not submitted. This omission should be rectified.
The applicant states that they have not asked LBH if they can site the pole further away from the High Road on LBH land, as it is a forgone conclusion that it would be refused.

It is also stated that although this site is within 3 km of an airfield the relevant authorities have not been notified. This omission should be rectified.

The objections raised by the Eastcote Conservation Panel to the previous application still apply here,[copied below] based on the position of the mast on the submitted drawings.

Should the proposed mast be erected on the same base as existing, it would still be over dominant in this sensitive part of the Conservation Area. Please note the photograph of the site page 1 of the document marked 'Plan', the current mast is still much higher than the surrounding trees, whilst the drawings show it lower than the trees, another contradiction. The extra cabinet is large, ugly and again will add to the amount of clutter already on the village green, which will detract from the rural setting of the area.

This application is full of mistakes and contradictions, we ask that correct information is supplied to the LPA before any determination is made, that interested parties be informed if such information is received.

The Panel's overall view is that this application should be refused.

## Internal Consultees

CONSERVATION OFFICER
This site lies within the Eastcote Village Conservation Area and sits opposite the Grade II Listed property, 2 Field End Road. The site also lies within the Eastcote Village Archaeological Priority Area. The location of the site is very sensitive and is prominently positioned at an intersection. The existing cabinets and telecommunications equipment alongside other street furniture as existing can be considered to be visually intrusive.

The current NPPF states that as part of an application, an applicant would need to 'describe significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting' (para.128). The submitted Design and Access Statement does not address that the site is situated within a Conservation Area.

Whilst there are in principle no objections to the replacement of the existing cabinets, the additional proposed cabinet would have a negative impact to the character of the conservation area. Overall the bulky cabinets would increase the density of street furniture clutter within that location, which would be considered detrimental to the street scene. NPPF (para. 64) is quite clear: 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.' Therefore all cabinets would need to be reduced to the same size as the existing cabinets, in order to remain in keeping with the surrounding area.

The increase in height of the telecommunications monopole would be considered in principle unacceptable. This increase in height would increase the visual intrusiveness of the monopole as it would stand beyond the height of the existing surrounding vegetation. The telecommunications pole and associated cabinets are situated along a narrow footpath situated along roundabout junction, which is continuously busy with vehicular movements.

It is important that development within a Conservation Area enhances and preserves the character and significance of the area. The proposal would be considered detrimental to the wider setting of the Conservation Area.

In conclusion the application is considered to be unacceptable.

## HIGHWAYS OFFICER

The proposed position of the new pole/antenna is much closer to the dropped kerbs, facilitating pedestrian movements. The remaining footway width is approximately 1 metre.

The new pole/antenna would encroach on the footway, but there is a possibility to adjust the pole position, right at the back of footway.

## LANDSCAPE OFFICER

No trees or other landscape features of merit will be directly affected by the proposal, no objection.

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The application has been assessed principally against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Saved Policy BE37 of the Unitary Development Plan. The NPPF stresses the importance of high quality communications infrastructure and the role it plays in supporting sustainable economic growth. It goes on to advise that the aim should be to keep the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts and sites to a minimum, consistent with the efficient operation of the network and that existing masts and sites should be used unless there is a demonstrable need for a new site. Saved Policy BE37, amongst other criteria, advises of the desirability of operators to share existing facilities.

The site is required to provide new 4G coverage, for both Vodafone and Telefonica, to the surrounding area. Government guidance supports the avoidance of proliferation of sites and the sharing of masts between operators. Given the existence of the existing telecommunications equipment on this location, there is no objection, in principle, to the continued use of this site for telecommunications equipment.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

Not applicable to this application.
7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

Policy BE4 states that development within Conservation Areas should be of a high quality and will be expected to preserve or enhance its significance by making a positive
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contribution to its character and appearance.
Given the location of the mast on a prominent junction and the increase in its height, the proposed mast would appear considerably higher than the existing mast, and would appear as a utilitarian and incongruous feature in the street scape. The proposed mast would consist of a support pole and wider antennae shroud at the top, and would be finished in steel. At present the cabinets are located one behind the other so as to minimise their visual appearance within the area. A larger replacement Lancaster Tef cabinet ( $0.8 \times 1.9 \times 1.6$ ) is proposed and a new Vulcan cabinet of the same size proposed 2 metres to the south of this replacement cabinet. The addition of this cabinet and scale of both, would increase the density of street furniture clutter within the locality, which would be considered to add undue clutter to the street, and harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Overall, the design and appearance of the proposed mast and cabinets, are considered to harm the character and appearance of the conservation area, and conflict with the Council's adopted policy BE4, which seeks to ensure that development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas.

### 7.04 Airport safeguarding

The application site is not located within 3 km of an aerodrome or airfield. Therefore this is not a site subject to a height specific restriction which would affect the determination of this application.

### 7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.07 Impact on the character \& appearance of the area

Policy BE37 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) states that telecommunications developments will be acceptable in principle provided that any apparatus is sited and designed so as to minimise its effect on the appearance of the surrounding areas. The policy also states that permission for large or prominent structures will only be granted if:
(i) there is a need for the development in that location;
(ii) no satisfactory alternative means of telecommunications is available;
(iii) there is no reasonable possibility of sharing existing facilities;
(iv) in the case of radio masts there is no reasonable possibility of erecting antennae on an existing building or other structure; and
(v) the appearance of the townscape or landscape is not seriously harmed.

This proposal is for a mast 20 metres in height, considerably higher than the existing mast.
Given the location of the mast on a prominent junction and its height, the proposed mast would appear considerably higher than the existing mast, and appear as a utilitarian and incongruous feature in the street scape. The existing mast and ground equipment is located at the rear of the pavement adjacent to the roundabout junction of Field End Road and Eastcote Road. To the rear of the cabinets and mast is a green area that contains a substantial number of tall dense, mainly deciduous trees some 12-15m in height that form the backdrop against which the existing mast is viewed. Having reviewed the site
throughout the year when leaves are present and absent from the trees, it is evident that the mast is highly prominent addition within the street scene. Rather than the trees obscuring the views of this mast, given its utilitarian appearance, it contrasts with the trees behind, and therefore any increase in height, will be even more prominent.

At present the cabinets are located one behind the other so as to minimise their visual appearance within the area. The proposed alterations to the siting and design of the new cabinets, which would expand the area over which they are placed, is considered to add undue clutter to the street and harm the visual character of the area. Overall, the design and appearance of the proposed mast and cabinets, are considered to harm the character and appearance of the area, and conflict with the Councils adopted policy BE13, which seeks to ensure that development harmonises with the existing street scene.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed installation would have an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene. Its excessive height and design in this location would be clearly visible and the mast would appear as an incongruous addition within the surrounding area. In addition, regardless of whether this is a replacement unit. Alternative sites/designs should be thoroughly investigated before a street works installation of the scale proposed in this location can be considered. As such the proposed development is considered to be contrary the Council's adopted policies and guidelines.

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

The nearest residential property to the proposed development is approximately 20 m away in Field End Road, although this does not look directly onto the site. Whilst visible from some residential properties, on balance, given that the mast would not be directly overlooked by the majority of properties which surround it, it is not considered that the proposed installation would impact on residential amenity sufficient to justify refusal.

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The installation would be set against the pavement in an area where there is a busy traffic flow. The Council's Highway Engineer has reviewed the application and has commented that the new mast would encroach on the footway, but there is a possibility to adjust the pole position, right at the back of footway. Whilst the comments of the Officer are noted, given that a mast has been present in this location for over 10 years and this application seeks to replace an existing mast in the same location, the Council do not consider that a refusal on such grounds could be justified in this instance.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

See section 'Impact on the character and appearance of the area'.

### 7.12 Disabled access

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.13 Provision of affordable \& special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The scheme involving the replacement of one mast with another and the provision of a replacement cabinet is not considered to have any lasting adverse impact upon any trees, landscaping or existing hedging.

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application.
7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The comments raised through the public consultation have been addressed within the body of the report.

### 7.20 Planning Obligations

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.
7.22 Other Issues

Health:
In terms of potential health concerns, the applicant has confirmed that the proposed installation complies with the ICNIRP (International Commissions for Non lonising Radiation Protection) guidelines. Accordingly, in terms of Government policy advice, there is not considered to be any direct health impact. Therefore, further detailed technical information about the proposed installation is not considered relevant to the Council's determination of this application.

## 8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

## General

Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

## Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

## Planning Obligations

Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The
obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights
Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances.

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.

## 9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable to this application.

## 10. CONCLUSION

The applicant seeks planning permission for the installation of a 20 m high telecommunications mast. The proposed mast would provide improved coverage for Telefonica and Vodafone.

Although the proposed mast and cabinets would not cause harm to pedestrian or highway safety, it is considered that the proposed structures in this location, by reason of their height, siting and design would add undue clutter to the street scene and appear as visually incongruous additions, which would be considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed development does not comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic polices, BE5, BE13 and BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Chapter 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

## 11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) Chapter 5
Contact Officer: Charlotte Goff
Telephone No: 01895250230
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## Agenda Item 9

## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | 34 BURWOOD AVENUE EASTCOTE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Single storey rear extension |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 63119/APP/2015/3763 |
| Drawing Nos: | 0721-os-01 Rev A <br> 0721-pl-01 Rev A <br> Design Statement <br> $0721-e x-01$ |
| Date Plans Received: 09/10/2015 | Date(s) of Amendment(s): |
| Date Application Valid: 28/10/2015 |  |

## 1. CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a semi detached period property situated eastern side of Burwood Avenue. The property has a mock Tudor frontage with projecting gable feature and a hipped roof; there is an attached single garage to the side. It also benefits from a good sized part landscaped, part paved front garden with parking provision for 2 cars and a larger rear garden.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising similar sized semi detached period properties of varying design.

The application site lies within the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area and the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

> 63119/APP/2007/1501 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
> ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY PART SIDE/ PART FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE).

Decision Date: 12-07-2007 Refused Appeal:
63119/APP/2008/403 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE/ FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY PART REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE)

Decision Date: 29-04-2008
Refused
Appeal:
63119/APP/2009/1640 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
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Single storey side and rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side.

| Decision Date: $22-09-2009 \quad$ Approved Appeal: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 63119/APP/2009/1642 |  |
| Single storey side and rear extension (Application for Conservation Area Consent). |  |

Decision Date: 28-07-2009 Withdrawn Appeal:
63119/APP/2009/357 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
Single storey side and rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side.
Decision Date: 23-04-2009
Refused
Appeal:
63119/APP/2009/359 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
Demolition of existing detached garage to side (Application for Conservation Area Consent).
Decision Date: 15-04-2009 NFA Appeal:
63119/APP/2010/618 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
Removal of rear extension and enlargement of side extension (Application for a non-material amendment following grant of planning permission ref:63119/APP/2009/1640 dated 22/09/2009

Decision Date: 29-06-2010 Approved Appeal:
63119/APP/2015/2468 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
Single storey rear extension
Decision Date: 01-09-2015 Refused Appeal:
63119/APP/2015/3640 34 Burwood Avenue Eastcote
Single storey rear extension
Decision Date: 02-10-2015 NFA Appeal:
Comment on Planning History
63119/APP/2015/2468 - Single storey rear extension (refused)
63119/APP/2010/618 - NMA - Removal of rear extension and enlargement of side extension
63119/APP/2009/1640 - Single storey side and rear extension (approved)
63119/APP/2009/357 - Single storey side and rear extension (refused)
The previous submission was refused on the basis of the scale and bulk of the extension being detrimental to the character of the existing dwelling and the wider Conservation Area. the current proposal has reduced the height of the roof.

## 2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 2nd December 2015
2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- 30th November 2015

## 3. Comments on Public Consultations

The following neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 23
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November 2015 as follows:

- 32 Burwood Avenue
- 8 Nightingale Close
- 36 Burwood Avenue
- 38 Burwood Avenue
- 40 Burwood Avenue
- 42 Burwood Avenue
- 44 Burwood Avenue

No responses were received from adjoining neighbours.
Eastcote Residents Association - No response received.
Eastcote Park Estate Association - No response received.
Eastcote Village Conservation Panel - No response received.
Trees/Landscaping - No Objection.
Conservation and Urban Design - The current scheme proposes a single storey extension, with a very shallow pitched roof, running across the whole of the rear of the original house, and across the rear of the side extension too. It would actually cut off a diagonal section of the canted bay, so that the bay would appear to balance on the sloping roof of the extension. The extension pays no regard to the character, appearance or plan form of the original house and would detract significantly from it. It is considered that the rear extension previously permitted would comprise the largest that could be accommodated without serious harm to the character of the original house. Recommendation: Unacceptable.

Trees/Landscaping - No Objection.
Officer Comments: In discussion with the applicant they suggested reducing the height to 3.4 m in line with HDAS, maintaining the roof slope up to a flat roof of a maximum of 3.4 m (creating a crown roof). I advised that the objection from the Conservation Officer was not specifically the height but rather the transection of the bay feature and in design terms the crown roof would be less acceptable than as existing. The applicant agreed to retain as submitted, but wanted to know how the extension at no. 30 was approved across the whole width, when this was a problem for his property. The extension to the rear of no. 30 is 3 m deep and was approved under permitted development rights on a Certificate of Lawful Development application and as such was not subject to design considerations.

A request has been made by the local ward councillor for the decision on this application to be taken by the North area planning committee.

## 4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-
Part 1 Policies:
PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| :--- | :--- |
| BE4 | New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas |
| BE13 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene. |
| BE15 | Alterations and extensions to existing buildings |
| BE19 | New development must improve or complement the character of the area. |
| BE20 | Daylight and sunlight considerations. |
| BE21 | Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions. <br> BE23 |
| Requires the provision of adequate amenity space. |  |
| BE24 | Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to <br> neighbours. |
| BE38 | Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new <br> planting and landscaping in development proposals. |
| HDAS-EXT | Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design \& Access <br> Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008 |

## 5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property.

The proposed single storey rear extension measures 8.5 m in width (across the whole rear elevation) and 3.6 m in depth, with a pitched roof measuring 4 m in height and 2.65 m at the eaves. HDAS advises that for single storey rear extensions a depth of 3.6 m with a pitched roof of 3.4 m would be acceptable, therefore the proposal is contrary to HDAS guidance. It is acknowledged that there are a number of other larger extensions in the area however these were approved a number of years ago or have been constructed under permitted development rights. Furthermore the Conservation Officer has raised concerns over the design and scale of the proposal.

The current scheme proposes a single storey extension, with a shallow pitched roof, running across the whole of the rear of the original house, and across the rear of the side extension also. It cuts off a diagonal section of the canted bay, so that the bay would appear to balance on the sloping roof of the extension. The extension pays no regard to the character, appearance or plan form of the original house and would detract significantly from it.

This proposal is significantly larger than the proposal assessed and found unacceptable under application 63119/APP/2009/357 and it is considered that the rear extension previously permitted (63119/APP/2009/1640) would comprise the largest that could be accommodated without serious harm to the character of the original house. As such it is considered that the proposed extension is not appropriate and would detract from the architectural integrity of the original property and the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area. Therefore it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Section 3.0 of HDAS:

HDAS advises that the roof height should not exceed 3.4 m and generally roof design must not significantly obstruct sunlight and daylight to adjoining neighbouring properties. The height of the proposed extension exceeds this recommendation; however the proposed roof design has a shallow pitch rising from the boundary to a central ridge, with the height at the eaves at 2.75 m and rises away not exceeding 3.4 m in height until 2 m from the boundary. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not impact of the amenities of the adjoining occupiers in terms of visual intrusion, overlooking or a loss of daylight or sunlight due to its projection, height and siting. Therefore, the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development and would be in compliance with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Paragraph 3.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. The property benefits from a good sized rear garden and will still retain more than sufficient garden space.

There is no impact on existing parking provision as a result of this proposal.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal
The proposed rear extension, by reason of its height, scale and bulk, would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the existing property and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the wider Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

## INFORMATIVES

1 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2015) and national guidance.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.
BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new plantins and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-E〉 Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

3 On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), the London Plan Policies (2015). On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

## Standard Informatives

1 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (July 2011) and national guidance.

Part 1 Policies:
PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment
Part 2 Policies:
AM14 New development and car parking standards.
BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21
Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold
Telephone No: 01895250230


Report of the Head of Planning and Enforcement

## S.106/278 PLANNING AGREEMENTS - QUARTERLY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT

## SUMMARY

This report provides financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the North Planning Committee area up to 30 September 2015 where the Council has received and holds funds.

## RECOMMENDATION

That Members note the contents of this report.

## INFORMATION

1. Paragraph 24 of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance, encourages local planning authorities to make publically available information with regard to what planning obligation contributions are received by the Council and how these contributions are used. This ensures transparency and is therefore considered to be good practice. Details of the financial obligations held by the Council are reported to Cabinet on a quarterly basis through the "Planning Obligations Financial Monitoring Report". The report informs members and the public of the progress being made in the allocation of financial obligations and their implementation.
2. The information contained in this report was reported to Cabinet on 17 December 2015 and updates the information received by Cabinet in September 2015. The attached Appendix 1 provides updated financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the North Planning Committee area up to 30 September 2015, where the Council has received and holds funds.
3. Appendix 1 shows the movement of income and expenditure taking place during the financial year. The agreements are listed under Cabinet portfolio headings. Text that is highlighted in bold indicates key changes since the previous report of October 2015 to the Planning Committee. Figures shown in bold under the column headed 'Total income as at 30/09/15' indicate new income received. Agreements asterisked under the column headed 'case ref' are those where the Council holds funds but is unable to spend them for a number of reasons. These include cases where the funds are held as a returnable security deposit for works to be undertaken by the developer and those where the expenditure is dependant on other bodies such as transport operators. In cases where schemes have been completed and residual balances refunded, the refund amount is either the amount listed in the "Balance of Funds" column or where the
amount listed in this column is zero the difference between the amounts listed in the columns titled "Total Income as at 30/06/15" and "Total Income as at 30/09/15".
4. Members should note that in the Appendix, the 'balances of funds' held include funds that may already be committed for projects such as affordable housing and school expansion projects. Expenditure must be in accordance with the legal parameters of the individual agreements and must also serve a planning purpose and operate in accordance with legislation and Government guidance in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012). The Council has adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for Planning Obligations that provides the framework in which the Council will operate.
5. Members should also note that the listed "balances of funds", i.e. the difference between income received and expenditure, is not a surplus. A majority of the funds is linked to projects that are already underway or programmed but have not been drawn down against the relevant s106 (or s.278) cost centre. The column labelled "balance spendable not allocated" shows the residual balance of funds after taking into account funds that the Council is unable to spend and those that it has committed to projects.

## Financial implications

6. This report provides information on the financial status on s106 and s278 agreements up to 30 September 2015. The recommendation to note has no financial implications.

## CORPORATE CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

## Legal

It is a requirement of the District Audit report into planning obligations and the Monitoring Officers report that regular financial statements are prepared.

## EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

There are no external consultations required on the contents of this report.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

District Auditor's "The Management of Planning Obligations" Action Plan May 1999
Monitoring Officers Report January 2001
Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted July 2008 and revised 2014.
Cabinet Report December 2015.
Contact Officer: Nikki Wyatt
Telephone No: 01895-2508145

North Planning Committee - 20th January 2016
PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC \& PRESS

| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SECTION 278 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PORTFOLIO: PLANNING TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PT278/46/135 } \\ & { }^{3} 32 \end{aligned}$ | Northwood | 10A Sandy Lodge Way, Northwood 54671/APP/2002/54 | 7,458.07 | 7,458.07 | 2,458.00 | 2,458.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.07 | 0.00 | Improvement of visibility for junction of Sandy Lodge Way \& Woodridge Way. ECU fees have been claimed and $£ 5,000$ security remains. Works substantially complete 12 month maintenance period, ended 16 September 2006. Final certificate has been prepared. Security held to part offset outstanding education contribution which is being sought via legal proceedings. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT278/63/175A } \\ & { }^{*} 49 \end{aligned}$ | South Ruislip | BFPO, R.A.F Northolt 189/APP/2006/2091 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | $£ 5 \mathrm{k}$ received as the security deposit for the due and proper implementation of junction works at the White House Gate entrance to the development. Signals complete and in operation. Currently within 12 month maintenance period. Date of final completion to be confirmed. |
| PT/278/64/173 | Eastcote \& East Ruislip | R.A.F. Eastcote 10189/APP/2004/1781 | 19,200.00 | 19,200.00 | 12,201.13 | 12,201.13 | 0.00 | 6,998.87 | 0.00 | Engineers fees paid prior to the execution of an agreement to secure access works associated with this application. Waiting restriction in Lime Grove undertaken. Elm Ave/Lime Grove junction improvement pending. Elm Ave Pedestrian crossing technical approval pending.( $£ 5,500$ ) design fees received plus further $£ 6,700$ for temporary footpath works carried out by LBH. $£ 7,500$ engineering fees claimed. Funds spent towards temporary footpath works. Further $£ 5,000$ security deposit for proper execution of highway works. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { PT/278/72/231A } \\ * 66 \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | West Ruislip | R.A.F West Ruislip (Ickenham Park) Design check on S278 Designs 38402/APP/2007/1072 | 53,986.57 | 53,986.57 | 45,486.57 | 45,486.57 | 0.00 | 8,500.00 | 0.00 | Fees received for design checks. Pelican crossing and signals on Long Lane. S278 agreement and technical approval pending. Further $£ 18,000$ returnable deposit received to ensure reinstatement of temporary crossover on Alysham Drive. Further fees received towards inspection fees and traffic orders. Spend towards fees \& inspection. Works completed, deposit returned. |
| PT/278/73 | South Ruislip | R.A.F Northolt., South RuislipMain Gate 189/APP/2007/1321 | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,000.00 | 0.00 | Fees received for design checks. Junction improvements at West End Road/ Bridgewater Road. S278 agreement and technical approval pending. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { PT/278/77/197 } \\ \text { *62 } \end{array}$ | Ruislip Manor | Windmill Hill Public House, Pembroke Road, Ruislip 11924/APP/2632 | 24,000.00 | 24,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 0.00 | 23,000.00 | 0.00 | Fees received for design checks ( $£ 1,000$ ). $£ 23,000$ received as a security deposit to ensure works are carried at to a satisfactory standard. $£ 1,000$ engineering fees claimed. |
| PT/278/78/238G *76 | West Ruislip | Fmr Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 19,782.00 | 19,782.00 | 14,782.00 | 14,782.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | Fees received for design checks and monitoring \& supervision. $£ 5,000$ received as a security deposit to ensure highway works are carried out to a satisfactory standard. Fees claimed for design checks \& monitoring ( $£ 14,752$ ). |
| PT/278/86/237E | Eastcote \& East Ruislip | Bishop Ramsey School (lower site), Eastcote Road, Ruislip - High Grove access 19731/APP/2006/1442 | 14,146.46 | 14,146.46 | 10,729.21 | 10,729.21 | 0.00 | 3,417.25 | 0.00 | Funds received for the completion of remedial highway works and fees associated with the 278 agreements. $£ 7,993.58$ claimed towards remedial works \& fees $13 / 14$. Further $£ 307.63$ claimed. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { PT/278/89/349 } \\ { }^{1115} \end{array}$ | Harefield | West London Composting, New Years Green Lane, Harefield. | 106,884.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 106,884.18 | 0.00 | Funds received as a returnable bond to ensure the satifactory completion of the highway works associated with the development. |
|  |  | SECTION 278 SUB - TOTAL | 252,457.28 | 145,573.10 | 86,656.91 | 86,656.91 | 0.00 | 165,800.37 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SECTION 106 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PORTFOLIO: PLANNING TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | $\begin{gathered} \text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{gathered}$ | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { PT/25/56 } \\ * 24 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | South Ruislip | J Sainsbury, 11 Long Drive, Ruislip 33667/T/97/0684 | 37,425.09 | 37,425.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37,425.09 | 0.00 | Highway improvements adjacent to the site. Legal advice stated that because of time that has elapsed, it would not be reasonable to proceed without Sainsbury's agreement. Officers investigating the potential to utilise these funds for traffic congestion mitigation at that junction to complement current works that have been commissioned for that location. A portion of land owned by Sainsbury's would need to be dedicated as public highway for the scheme to be feasible. Traffic congestion mitigation scheme is fully funded. Officers investigating whether improvements could be tied into 114 bus route project. Excess funds are to be refunded to the developer following the date of the Final Account. |
| PT/76/119 | Northwood | Land at 64 Ducks Hill Road Northwood/ 26900L/99/1077 | 35,253.56 | 35,253.56 | 28,119.15 | 28,119.15 | 0.00 | 7,134.41 | 0.00 | To provide a speed camera, anti-skid surface and associated road markings in Ducks Hill Road. Speed camera cannot be installed in this location, as the accident rate in this location is below the threshold established by TfL. Deed of variation not required. site includeded in vehicle activated sign (VAS) forward programme. Officers looking into feasibility of 'Driver Feedback Sign'. Implementation due Spring 2007, subject to feasibility. Quotes being sought with the view to possible purchase of signs. Interest accrued. No time constraints. Utilities works completed Nov 08. Scheme programmed for implementation April/May 2010. Spend towards the provision of anti skid and electrical work. VAS signs installed, scheme complete, awaiting invoices. |
| PT/117/231B | West Ruislip | Former RAF West Ruislip (Ickenham Park), High Road, Ickenham. 38402/APP/2007/1072 | 30,000.00 | 30,000.00 | 26,422.03 | 3,222.60 | 23,199.43 | 3,577.97 | 0.00 | Funds received towards improvements to cycle route 89/network 93 as part of the London Cycle Network. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (Nov 2015). Funds allocated towards improved provision for cyclists in Ickenham High Road (Cabinet Member Decision 29/1/15). Scheme complete, awaiting invoices. |
| PT/127/238H | West Ruislip | Fmr Mill Works, Bury St, Ruislip. 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 34,603.50 | 34,603.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34,603.50 | 34,603.50 | Contribution received towards carbon reduction projects in the Ruislip area. Earmarked towards projects to reduce CO2 emissions at Ruislip Early Years Centre. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Apr 2019). |
| PT/143/323A | Cavendish | 150 Field End Road, (initial House), Eastcote, Pinner 25760/APP/2013/3632 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | Contribution received towards improving town centre facilities in the Authority's Area. No time limits for spend. |
| PT/148/327 *105 | Northwood <br> Hills | Northwood School, Potter Street, Northwood. 12850/APP/2013/1810 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received as the travel plan bond to ensure compliance by the owner to its monitoring and reporting obligations. Funds to be returned at the end of the monitoring period (2024). |
| PT/154/350A | South Ruislip | Fmr Arla Dairy Site, Victoria Rd, Ruislip. 66819/APP/2014/1600 | 135,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 135,000.00 | 135,000.00 | Contribution towards the provision of public transport infrastructure improvements and related intitiatives inthe authority's area including; bus priorty measures, improvements to bus services and cycle provision (see legal agreemnt for details). Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Sept 2022). |
|  |  | PLANNING TRANSPORTATION \& RECYCLING SUB - TOTAL | 312,282.15 | 177,282.15 | 54,541.18 | 31,341.75 | 23,199.43 | 257,740.97 | 189,603.50 |  |
|  |  | PLANNING TRANSPORTATION \& RECYCLING TOTAL | 564,739.43 | 322,855.25 | 141,198.09 | 117,998.66 | 23,199.43 | 423,541.34 | 189,603.50 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| EYL/110/205C | Eastoote | RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove, Ruislip. 10189/APP/2004/1781 | 3,755,319.11 | 3,755,319.11 | 3,066,954.11 | 3,066,954.11 | 0.00 | 688,365.00 | 688,365.00 | A total of $£ 3,755,319$ received in three instalments towards the cost of providing nursery, primary or secondary education places or improvements in the North Secondary Planning Area. Funds to be spent by September 2016. £658,998 has been allocated and spent towards expansion at Ruislip High School (Cabinet Member Decision 21/10/2010) and $£ 342,000$ towards Deansfield Early Years Centre (Cabinet Member Decision 28/10/2010). A further $£ 779,000$ has been allocated and spent towards the expansion of Harlyn Primary School and $£ 686,496.96$ allocated and spent towards Field End Primary School as part of Phase 2 of the Primary Expansion Programme(Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13). £414,115.99 not used in financing 20113/14. Reallocated and spent towards Harlyn Primary School (Cabinet Member Decision $19 / 03 / 2015$ ). $£ 688,365$ remains available from this contribution to be allocated towards secondary school places. |
| EYL/137/237B | Eastoote | Bishop Ramsey School (lower site), Eastcote Road, Ruislip. 19731/APP/2006/1442 | 426,346.97 | 426,346.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 426,346.97 | 426,346.97 | Funds received towards the costs of providing primary education places to primary schools in Primary Area 3 . Funds to be spent by February 2016. |
| EYL/138/238C | West Ruislip | Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip. 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 512,742.69 | 512,742.69 | 298,439.38 | 298,439.38 | 0.00 | 214,303.31 | 214,304.00 | Funds received as $50 \%$ of the education contribution towards the cost of providing nursery, primary and secondary facilities in the Borough (See legal agreement). Funds to be spent by February 2018. Further $£ 261,446.35$ received as remaining $50 \%$ education contribution. $£ 112,742$ allocated and spent towards expansion at Ruislip Gardens Primary School as part of Phase 2 of the Primary Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/2013). Further $£ 185,696$ allocated and spent towards expansion at Ruislip Gardens Primary School (Cabinet Member Decision 24/01/2014). |
| EYL/203/320 | Northwood | 15 Nicholas Way, Northwood 16824/APP/2012/3220 | 12,796.00 | 12,796.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,796.00 | 12,796.00 | Contribution received towards providing educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (Feb 2019). |
| EYL/211/330 | Harefield | Little Hammonds, Breakspear Rd North, Harefield | 33,436.00 | 33,436.00 | 17,869.51 | 17,869.51 | 0.00 | 15,566.49 | 0.00 | Fund received towards the provision of educational facilities within the London Borough of Hillingdon. No time limits for spend. Funds allocated towards expansion at Harefield Primary School as part of the Primary Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 19/03/2015). £17,869.51 spent 2014/15. |
| EYL/216/335 | West Ruislip | 157-161 High Street, Ruislip 64711/APP/2011/214 | 2,176.00 | 2,176.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,176.00 | 2,176.00 | Contribution received towards additional or improved educational facilities within a 3 mile radius of the site to accomodate the nursery, primary and secondary school child yield arising from the development. No time limits for spend. |
| EYL/217/336 | Northwood | Land Adj to 27 Lees Ave, Northwood 69195/APP/2013/1310 | 25,593.00 | 25,593.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,593.00 | 25,593.00 | Contribution received towards providing educational improvements or faciilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. |
| EYL/218/337 | Northwood | 37 Moor Park Road, Northwood 4581/APP/2013/3765 | 12,796.00 | 12,796.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,796.00 | 12,796.00 | Contribution received towards providing educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. |
| EYL/221/341 | Northwood | Plumtree Cottage, 89 Ducks Hill Road, Northwood 4730554/APP/2014/3276 | 2,265.00 | 2,265.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,265.00 | 2,265.00 | Contribution received towards additional or improved educational facilities within a 3 mile radius of the site to accommodate the nursery and primary yield arising from the development. No time limits. |
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| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | TOTAL INCOME | $\underset{\substack{\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE }}}{ }$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE }}}{ }$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | BALANCE $\substack{\text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMMENTS } \\ \text { (as at mid November 2015) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EYL222/342 | Northwood | London School of Theology, Green Lane, Northwood 10112/APP/2013/1837 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AS AT 30/09/15 } \\ 29,834.07 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AS AT 30106615 } \\ & 29,834.07 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AS AT 30/09/15 } \\ 0.00 \end{array}$ | $\frac{\text { AS AT } 30 / 06 / 15}{0.00}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { To } 30 / 09 / 15 \\ 0.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AS AT 30/09/15 } \\ 29,834.07 \end{array}$ | AS AT 30109915 | Contribution received towards providing educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. |
| EYL224/343 | Harefield | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Roval Quay, Coppermill Lock, } \\ & \text { Harefield } \\ & \text { 43159/APP/20131094 } \end{aligned}$ | 75,649.88 | 75,649.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 75,649.88 | 75,649.88 | Funds received towards the costs of providing nursery, secondary and post 16 year old education or improvements or facilities in the authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate external leisure spaces (see agreement for details). No time limit for spend. |
| EYU223/346A | Northwood | 42-46 Ducks Hill Road, Northwood 49987/APP/2013/1451 | 128,490.42 | 128,490.42 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 128,490.42 | 128,490.40 | Contribution received towards providing educationa improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisur details) No time limits for spend. |
| EYU226/351A | Northwood | $\begin{array}{ll}103,105 \& & 107 \text { Ducks Hill Road, } \\ \text { Northwood. } & 64345 / \text { PPP/2014/1044 }\end{array}$ | 29,531.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 29,531.00 | 29,531.00 | Contribution received towards providing education, educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and externa leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. |
| EYL229/35 | West Ruislip | 28 Withy Lane, Ruislip. 6885/APP/2014/987 | 5,081.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,081.00 | 5,081.00 | Contribution received towards providing education, educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. |
|  |  | EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE SUB - TOTAL | 5,052,057.14 | 5,017,445.14 | 3,383,263.00 | 3,383,263.00 | 0.00 | 1,668,794.14 | 1,653,228.32 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: CENTRAL SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CENTRAL SERVICES SUB - TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/57/238D | West Ruisip | Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip. 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 20,679.21 | 20,679.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,679.21 |  | Contribution towards construction training initiatives within the Borough. Funds to be spent within 7 years of feeeeipt (February 2018). Funds allocated towards the services of a Construction Workplace Co-orriinator within the Borough (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13). |
| PPR/58/239C | Eastoote | Highgrove House, Eastcote Road Ruislip. 10622/APP/2006/2294 \& 10622/APP/2009/2504 | 9,667.50 | 9,667.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,667.50 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards construction training and the provision of a work place co-ordinatoro witithn the Borough. No time linits. Funds allocated towards the services of a (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13). Construction Workplace Co-ordinator within the Borough |
| PPR/62/231C | Ruislip | Former RAF West Ruislip (Ickenham Park), High Road, Ickenham. 38402/APP/2007/1072 | 75,000.00 | 75,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 75,000.00 | 75,000.00 | Funds received towards the installation of 3 CCTV cameras and associated infrasturucture within the vicinity of the development. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (Nov 2015). Funds transferred from PT/118/231C |
| PPR/65/263C | South Ruisilip | Road, Ruislip (plot A). 67080/APP/2010/1419 | 9,782.64 | 9,782.64 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,782.64 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and the provision of a construction work placement coordinator within Hillingdon. No time limits. Funds allocated towards the services of a Construction Workplace Co-ordinator within the Borough (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13). |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED $\square$ | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| PPR/76/282C | West Ruislip | Lyon Court 28-30 Pembroke Road, Ruislip . $\quad 66895 /$ APP/2011/3049 | 47,950.86 | 47,950.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 47,950.86 | 47,950.86 | Contribution to be used towards construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and the provision of a work place co-ordinator within the authority's area. Funds to be spent within 5 years of completion of the development (estimated to be 2019). |
| PPR/77/282D | West Ruislip | Lyon Court, 28-30 Pembroke Road, Ruislip 66895/APP/2011/3049 | 25,330.03 | 25,330.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,330.03 | 25,330.03 | Contribution received towards the provision of CCTV, lighting, safety improvements to public transport facilities and car parks or safer town centres (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 5 years of completion of the development (estimated to be 2019). |
| PPR/79/299E | Cavendish | 161 Elliot Ave (fmr Southbourne Day Centre), Ruislip. 66033/APP/2009/1060 | 16,353.04 | 16,353.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16,353.04 | 16,353.04 | Contribution received towards construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and the provision of a construction work place co- ordindator for Hillingdon Residents. No time limits for spend. |
| PPR/82/301B | Northwood | 37-45 Ducks Hill Rd, Northwood 59214/APP/2010/1766 | 22,192.63 | 22,192.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22,192.63 | 22,192.63 | Contribution received towards public realm improvements in the vicinity of the development including, CCTV, footpath safety, safer town centres, public transport interchange facilities in the locality of the site (see agreement for details). Funs to be spent within 5 years of receipt (July 2018) |
| PPR/83/301D | Northwood | 37-45 Ducks Hill Rd, Northwood 59214/APP/2010/1766 | 19,669.95 | 19,669.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 19,669.95 | 19,669.95 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place coordinator serving the locality of the development. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (July 2018). |
| PPR/90/331B | Cavendish | 216 Field End Road, Eastcote. 6331/APP/2010/2411 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 | Contribution received towards the costs of providing construction training schemes within the London Borough of Hiliingdon. No time limit for spend. |
| PPR/91/331C | Cavendish | 216 Field End Road, Eastcote. 6331/APP/2010/2411 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards community facilities in the Authority's area. No time limit for spend. |
| PPR/95/343B | Harefield | Royal Quay, Coppermill Lock, Harefield 43159/APP/20131094 | 17,700.00 | 17,700.00 | 17,700.00 | 0.00 | 17,700.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place coordinator serving the locality of the development. No time limits. Contribution returned, paid in error. |
| PPR/94/346B | Northwood | 42-46 Ducks Hill Road, Northwood 49987/APP/2013/1451 | 8,026.42 | 8,026.42 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8,026.42 | 8,026.42 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place coordinator serving the locality of the development. No time limits. |
| PPR/100/351B | Northwood | 103, 105 \& 107 Ducks Hill Rd, Northwood | 10,959.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,959.04 | 10,959.04 | Funds received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place co-ordinator within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. |
|  |  | COMMUNITY, COMMERCE \& REGENERATION SUB - TOTAL | 298,311.32 | 287,352.28 | 17,700.00 | 0.00 | 17,700.00 | 280,611.32 | 240,481.97 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSL/6/189A | Ruislip | 30 Kings End, Ruislip. 46299/APP/2006/2165 | 7,674.48 | 7,674.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,674.48 | 0.00 | Towards the provision of community facilities in the immediate vicinity of the land. No time limits. Earmarked towards Manor Farm Library. Subject to formal allocation of funding. |
| CSL9/199A | Ruislip | 41, Kingsend, Ruislip. 2792/APP/2006/3451 | 9,338.43 | 9,338.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,338.43 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of community facilities in the Borough. No time constraints. Earmarked towards Manor Farm Library. Subject to formal allocation of funding. |
| CSL/10/200B | Manor | Former Ruislip Manor Library, Victoria Road, Ruislip. 14539/APP/2008/2102 | 5,200.00 | 5,200.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,200.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards improvements to neary by community facilities. Earmarked towards Ruislip Manor Library and Community Resources Centre. Subject to formal allocation of funding. |
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| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| CSL/1 1/205B | Eastoote | RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove, Ruislip. 10189/APP/2004/1781 | 277,131.54 | 277,131.54 | 276,881.40 | 276,881.40 | 0.00 | 250.14 | 0.00 | Contribution towards the provision or improvement of leisure, youth and/or cultural services within Eastcote and East Ruislip ward boundary. Funds to be spent by September 2014. £265k from this contribution has been allocated towards Highgrove pool improvement programme (Cabinet Member approval received 1/09/2011). Scheme completed 2013. Remaining balance allocated towards the upgrade of the Music studio at Ruislip Youth Centre (Cabinet Member Decision 09/07/2014). |
| CSL $12 / 215 \mathrm{~A}$ | Ruislip | 5-11, Reservoir Road, Ruislip 61134/APP/2006/260 | 13,338.00 | 13,338.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13,338.00 | 13,338.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of community facilities in the locality. No time limits on spend. Earmarked towards the provision of a new community facility at the former RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove. Subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL15/231D | Ruislip | Former RAF Ruislip (Ickenham Park), High Road, Ickenham 38402/APP/2007/1072 | 269,750.00 | 269,750.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 269,750.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the construction of a new facility or the extension of an existing facility to provide for improvement of leisure, elderly, youth and/or cultural services witihn the locality of the land. Funds to be spent by November 2015. Funds allocated towards improvements to the Compass Theatre (Cabinet Member Decision 23/09/15). Scheme on site. |
| CSL17/238A | West Ruislip | Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip, 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 31,645.25 | 31,645.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31,645.25 | 31,645.25 | Funds received as $50 \%$ of the community facilities contribution towards community facilities,schemes or measures within the Borough. Funds to be spent by February 2018. Further $£ 16,135.84$ received as remaining $50 \%$ of community facilities contribution. Funds earmarked towards the provision of a new community facility at the former RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove. Subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL18/238B | West Ruislip | Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip, 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 3,268.46 | 3,268.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,268.46 | 3,268.46 | Funds received towards the provision of library facilities and/or library books within the Borough. Funds to be spent by February 2018. |
| CSL22/241B | Ruislip | 28 \& 29a Kingsend, Ruislip. 5740/APP/2008/1214 | 3,250.00 | 3,250.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,250.00 | 3,250.00 | Funds received towards the expansion of local community facilities in the area of the development. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (April 2016). |
| CSL29/263A | South Ruislip | Former South Ruislip Library, Victoria Road, Ruislip (plot A). 67080/APP/2010/1419 | 356.03 | 356.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 356.03 | 356.03 | Contribution received towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books in Hillingdon. No time limits. Earmarked towards eBooks scheme, subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL/35/282E | West Ruislip | Lyon Court,28-30 Pembroke Road, <br> Ruislip. <br> 66895/APP/2011/3049 | 2,263.48 | 2,263.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,263.48 | 2,263.48 | Contribution received towards the provision of library facilities and/or library books within the authority's area. Funds to be spent within 5 years of completion of the development (estimated to be 2019). Earmarked towards eBooks scheme, subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL/36/299B | Cavendish | 161 Elliot Ave (fmr Southbourne Day Centre), Ruislip. 66033/APP/2009/1060 | 955.56 | 955.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 955.56 | 955.56 | Contribution towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. Earmarked towards eBooks scheme, subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL37/299C | Cavendish | 161 Elliot Ave (fmr Southbourne Day Centre), Ruislip. 66033/APP/2009/1060 | 11,028.95 | 11,028.95 | 11,028.95 | 11,028.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision or improvement of community facilities within the Authority's area. No time limit for spend. Funds spent as part of end of year financing towards a scheme to provide an extension to Eastcote Bowls Club. (Cabinet Member Approval 07/07/2015). |
| CSL/38/301C | Northwood | 37-45 Ducks Hill Rd, Northwood 59214/APP/2010/1766 | 1,375.61 | 1,375.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,375.61 | 1,375.61 | Contribution received towards the provision of library facilities and/or library books serving the locality of the development. Funds to be spent witihn 5 year of receipt (July 2018). Earmarked towards eBooks scheme, subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL/43/313 | South Ruislip | Queenswalk Resource Centre, Queens Walk, Ruislip 12059/APP/2012/2570 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as a contribution towards sports and leisure facilities at Deansfield Primary School. Funds to be used towards sports items such as goal posts, rounders equipment , training kit and other sporting equipment (see agreement for details). No time limit for spend. |
| CSL/45/319B | Northwood Hills | 117 Pinner Rd, Northwood 12055/APP/2006/2510 | 2,580.63 | 2,580.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,580.63 | 2,580.63 | Contribution received towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books in Hillingdon. No time limits |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| CSL/48/323E | Cavendish | 150 Field End Road (Inital House), Eastcote, Pinner 25760/APP/2013/3632 | 1,500.73 | 1,500.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,500.73 | 1,500.73 | Contrbution received towards the provision of or improvements to library facilities and/or books witihn the Authority's Area. No time limits. Earmarked towards eBooks scheme, subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL51/331D | Cavendish | 216 Field End Road, Eastcote 6331/APP/2010/2411 | 458.62 | 458.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 458.62 | 458.62 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. Earmarked towards eBooks scheme, subject to formal allocation. |
| CSL54/343C | Harefield | Royal Quay, Coppermill Lock, Harefield <br> 43159/APP/20131094 | 1,846.79 | 1,846.79 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,846.79 | 1,846.79 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. |
| CSL/53/346C | Northwood | 42-46 Ducks Hill Road, Northwood 49987/APP/2013/1451 | 1,355.94 | 1,355.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,355.94 | 1,355.94 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. |
| CSL56/351C | Northwood | 103, 105 \& 107 Ducks Hill Rd, Northwood | 659.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 659.51 | 659.51 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. |
|  |  | COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION SUB - TOTAL | 654,978.01 | 654,318.50 | 287,910.35 | 287,910.35 | 0.00 | 367,067.66 | 64,854.61 |  |
|  |  | COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION -TOTAL | 953,289.33 | 941,670.78 | 305,610.35 | 287,910.35 | 17,700.00 | 647,678.98 | 305,336.58 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: FII | CE PROPERT | Y \& BUSINESS SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/47/177B | Manor | 41-55, Windmill Hill, Ruislip planning ref.48283/APP/2006/2353 | 38,258.39 | 38,258.39 | 32,124.97 | 32,124.97 | 0.00 | 6,133.42 | 0.00 | Funds received towards open green space and recreational open space within a 3 mile radius of the land. This sum includes approximately $£ 8 \mathrm{k}$ for bins and benches and $£ 30 \mathrm{k}$ for children's play space. Funds not spent within 5 years of receipt (24 December 2012) are to be refunded. Officers currently drawing up a programme of works for Warrender Park. Funds allocated towards a scheme of improvements at Warrender Park (Cabinet Member Decision 3/9/2010). Works complete Dec 12. Accounting ajustment made, scheme to be closed. |
| E/62/231E | Ruislip | Former RAF Ruislip (Ickenham park), High Road, Ickenham. 38402/APP/2007/1072 | 146,879.75 | 146,879.75 | 30,383.12 | 30,383.12 | 0.00 | 116,496.63 | 0.00 | Funds received as a commuted sum towards the maintenance of the playing fields as part of the scheme for a period of 10 years. Spend subject to conditions as stipulated in the legal agreement. $£ 44,063$ allocated towards the annual cost of maintaining the playing fields provided at Ickenham Park development (Cabinet Member Decision 7/11/2012). £15,191.56 Spend towards maintenance costs 2012/13. Maintenance costs claimed 2014/15. |
| E/65/237C | Eastoote | Bishop Ramsey School (lower site), Eascote Road, Ruislip. 19731/APP/2006/1442 | 80,431.31 | 80,431.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80,431.31 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the off site provision of formal recreational open space in the vicinity of the site. Funds to be spent by February 2016. Earmarked towards improvements at Churchfield Gardens. |
| E/66/239D | Eascote | Highgrove House, Eascote Road, Ruislip. 10622/APP/2006/2294 \& 10622/APP/2009/2504 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 7,214.17 | 6,678.17 | 536.00 | 2,785.83 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of enhancement and/or nature conservation works at Highgrove Woods. No time limits. Funds allocated towards conservation works at Highgrove Woods Nature Reserve (Cabinet Member Decision 16/3/12). Works on going. |
| E/71/250 | South Ruislip | Land adjacent to Downe Barns Farm, West End Road, West End Road, Northolt. <br> 2292/APP/2006/2475 | 30,000.00 | 30,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | Funds received as maintenance instalments to assist with the management of Ten Acres Wood Nature Reserve including, staffing, tree \& river Maintenance and volunteers' tools \& equipment. Funds to be spent within 11 years of receipt (August 2021). $£ 15,000$ allocated towards ongoing mangement works at the reserve (Cabinet Member Decision 7/11/2012). Spend towards stock fencing and ditch restoration at the reserve. $£ 5,000$ spent towards access improvements at the reserve. |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE <br> SPENDABLE NOT <br> ALLOCATED | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| E/78/282A | West Ruislip | Lyon Court, 28-30 Pembroke Road, Ruislip. 66895/APP/2011/3049 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 9,451.62 | 548.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received as the first instalment towards the cost of providing a scheme to protect and enhance the off site nature conservation interest in the locality of the site. Estimated time limit for spend 2019 (see agreement for details). Funds allocated towards ecological improvements at Pinn Meadows (Cabinet Member Decision 31/10/13). Scheme complete. |
| E/86/305B | Northwood | London School of Theology, Green Lane, Northwood 10112/APP/2012/2057 | 30,609.90 | 30,609.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 30,609.90 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of tennis courts within Northwood Recreation Ground. No time limits. |
| E/91/323B | Cavendish | 150 Field End Road (Initial House), Eastcote, Pinner 25760/APP/2013/3632 | 55,000.00 | 55,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 55,000.00 | 55,000.00 | Funds received towards the costs of improvements to public open space in the Authority's Area. No time limits for spend. |
| E/99/350B | West Ruislip | Fmr Arla Dairy Site, Victoria Rd,  <br> Ruislip. 66819/APP/2014/1600 | 50,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 | Funds to be used towards initiatives to improve air quality in the Authority's Area including (but not limited to): use of low fuel technology; tree and other planting; restrictions on certain types of vehicles; use of cleaner fuels; use of combined heat \& power; environmental management and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (Sept 2022). |
|  |  | FINANCE PROPERTY \& BUSINESS SERVICES SUB -TOTAL | 451,179.35 | 401,179.35 | 94,722.26 | 93,637.88 | 1,084.38 | 356,457.09 | 120,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PORTFOLIO: SO | SERVICES, H | IEALTH AND Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| H/9/184C *55 | West Ruislip | 31-46, Pembroke Rd, Ruislip 59816/APP/2006/2896 | 21,754.72 | 21,699.53 | 21,754.72 | 8,584.43 | 13,170.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards primary health care facilities within a 3 mile radius of the development. Funds not spent by July 2015 must be returned to the developer. $£ 8,584$ allocated towards improvements at King Edwards Medical Centre, Ruislip (Cabinet Member Decision 6/12/2013). Funds transferred to NHS Property Services (Feb 2014). Remaining balance allocated towards capacity improvements at Uxbridge Health Centre (Cabinet Member Approval 12/06/2015). Funds transferred to HCCG (July 2015). |
| H/11/195B *57 | Ruislip | Highgrove House, Eascote Road, Ruislip. 10622/APP/2006/2494 | 3,156.00 | 3,156.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,156.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of local health care facilities in the vicinity of the site. No time limits. |
| H/20/238F * 72 | West Ruislip | Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip. 6157/APP/2009/2069 | 31,441.99 | 31,441.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31,441.99 | 0.00 | $£ 15,409$ received as $50 \%$ of the health contribution towards providing health facilities in the Borough (see legal agreement for further details). First instalment to be spent by February 2018. $£ 16,032$ received as remaining $50 \%$ health contribution. Funds to be spent by June 2018. |
| H/21/237D *73 | Eastoote | Bishop Ramsey School (lower site), Eastcote Road, Ruislip. 19731/APP/2006/1442 | 22,516.57 | 22,455.88 | 22,516.57 | 0.00 | 22,516.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of primary health care facilities in the Uxbridge area. Funds to be spent by February 2016. Funds allocated towards capacity improvements at Uxbridge Health Centre (Cabinet Member Approval 12/06/2015). Funds transferred to HCCG (July 2015). |
| H/22/239E *74 | Eastoote | Highgrove House, Eascote Road, Ruislip. 10622/APP/2006/2494 \& 10622/APP/2009/2504 | 7,363.00 | 7,363.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,363.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health faciities in the Borough (see legal agreement for further details). No time limits. |
| H/24/184A | West Ruislip | 31-46 Pembroke Road, Ruislip 59816/APP/2006/2896 | 49,601.53 | 49,601.53 | 48,364.47 | 31,512.07 | 48,364.47 | 1,237.06 | 0.00 | Funds have been earmarked towards the dining centre for Northwood and Ruislip elderly persons association (Elm Park). Funds not spent by $1 / 07 / 2015$ to be returned. Funds transferred to Social Services, Health \& Housing Portfolio from CSL/5/184A. Contribution allocated towards improvements at the Elm Park Dining Centre. (Cabinet Member Decision 19/03/2015). Scheme completed, awaiting invoices. |
| H/28/263D *81 | South Ruislip | Former South Ruislip Library, Victoria Road, Ruislip (plot A). <br> 67080/APP/2010/1419 | 3,353.86 | 3,353.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,353.86 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including the expansion of health premises to provide additional facilities, new health premises or services (see legal agreement for details). No time limit for spend. |

FINANCIAL UPDATE ON SECTION 106 AND 278 AGREEMENTS AT 30 September 2015 (North Area)

| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | COMMENTS (as at mid November 2015) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/06/15 | To 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 | AS AT 30/09/15 |  |
| H/34/282F ${ }^{\text {* }} 92$ | West Ruislip | Fmr Lyon Court, 28-30 Pembroke Road, Ruislip. <br> 669895/APP/2011/3049 | 15,031.25 | 15,031.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 15,031.25 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development.Funds to be spent within 5 years of completion of the development (estimated to be 2019). |
| H/35/282G | West Ruislip | Fmr Lyon Court, 28-30 Pembroke Road, Ruislip. 669895/APP/2011/3049 | 40,528.05 | 40,528.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40,528.05 | 40,528.05 | Funds received as the affordable housing contribution to be used by the Council to provide subsidized housing through a registered social landlord to persons who can't afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market. Funds to be spent within 5 years of completion of the development (estimated to be 2019). |
| H/36/299D *94 | Cavendish | 161 Elliot Ave (fmr Southbourne Day Centre), Ruislip. 66033/APP/2009/1060 | 9,001.79 | 9,001.79 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,001.79 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits for spend. |
| H/37/301E *95 | Northwood | 37-45 Ducks Hill Rd, Northwood 59214/APP/2010/1766 | 12,958.84 | 12,958.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,958.84 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (July 2018). |
| H/43/319C | Northwood Hills | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117 Pinner Road, Northwood } \\ & \text { 12055/APP/2006/2510 } \end{aligned}$ | 221,357.83 | 221,357.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 221,357.83 | 221,357.83 | Contribution to be used towards the cost of providing affordable housing in the Authority's area. No time limits for spend. |
| H/44/319D *103 | Northwood Hills | 117 Pinner Road, Northwood 12055/APP/2006/2510 | 24,312.54 | 24,312.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24,312.54 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits |
| H/45/323F | Cavendish | 150 Field End Road (Initial House), Eastcote, Pinner 25760/APP/2013/3632 | 86,000.00 | 86,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 86,000.00 | 86,000.00 | Contribution received towards subsidised housing available trough a Registered Provider to persons who cannot afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market. No time limit for spend. |
| H/46/323G *104 | Cavendish | 150 Field End Road (Initial House), Eastcote, Pinner 25760/APP/2013/3632 | 14,126.88 | 14,126.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14,126.88 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits |
| H/48/331E *107 | Cavendish | 216 Field End Road, Eastcote 6331/APP/2010/2411 | 4,320.40 | 4,320.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,320.40 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits. |
| H/51/231H *110 | Ruislip | Fmr RAF West Ruislip (Ickenham Park), High Road, Ickenham 38402/APP/2013/2685 \& 38402/APP/2012/1033 | 17,374.27 | 17,374.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17,374.27 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to meet increased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits |
| H/52/205G | Eastoote | Former RAF Eastcote (Pembroke <br> Park), Lime Grove, Ruislip <br>  <br> 3360 | 298,998.00 | 298,998.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 298,998.00 | 298,998.00 | Funds received as the affordable housing contribution to be used by the Council to provide subsidized housing through a registered social landlord to persons who can't afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market. No time limit for spend. |
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$\left.\begin{array}{cccccc} & \text { total bal } & \text { spendable unalloci unspendable } & \text { allocated (live/not live) } \\ \text { June figs } & 14,142,736.87 & 7,852,440.05 & 3,297,900.32 & 2,992,396.50\end{array}\right)$



|  | Honeywell Site, Trout Road Yiewsley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PT/102 | 335/APP/2002/2754 <br> West Drayton to Heathrow Cycle | 151,948 | 151,948 |  | 151,948 |  |  |  |  | 151,948 | 151947.8 |  |
| PT/103 | Scheme | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/104 | DRA Site at Kingston Lane | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6,486,241 | 6,301,241 | 185,000 | 6,265,484 | 35,757 | 1,257,467 | 1,259,055 | $(1,588)$ | 252,014 | 252,014 |  |
| CSL/1/13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (formerly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/15/13) | Sainsbury-Minet D. / 40601H/91/1970 DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton - Community Facility | 1,433,000 | 1,433,000 |  | 1,433,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| CSL/2/147E | 45658/APP/2002/3012 <br> MOD Records Office Stockley <br> Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes | 243,005 | 243,005 |  | 243,005 |  |  |  |  | 243,005 | 243004.77 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CSL/3/140I } \\ & \text { CSL/4/152A } \end{aligned}$ | 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 66,134 | 66,134 |  | 66,134 |  |  |  |  | 66,134 | 66133.52 |  |
| (Formerly: PPR/35) | Middlesex Lodge, 189 Harlington Road, Hillingdon 12484/APP/2005/1791 CULTURE, SPORT AND LEISURE | 19,839 | 19,839 |  | 19,839 |  |  |  |  | 19,839 | 19839.13 |  |
|  | SUB - TOTAL | 1,761,977 | 1,761,977 |  | 1,761,977 |  |  |  |  | 328,977 | 328,977 |  |
|  | Hillingdon Hospital - North Site / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/03 /12B | 4058/99/1568 <br> Land at 78-84 The Crescent, Harlington | 668,174 | 668,174 |  | 668,174 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/14/75 | / 46970/APP/1999/2169 <br> The Springs, Springwell Lane, | 21,640 | 21,640 |  | 21,640 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/19/44 | Rickmansworth / 6679/AZ/98/0897 <br> Former Elec S/S, Kingston Lane, West | 31,620 | 31,620 |  | 31,620 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/28/79 | Drayton 55015/APP/2001/2590 Hyde House, Newhaven Close, | 20,318 | 20,318 |  | 20,318 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/29/54 | Hillingdon 2306/SPP/2002/238 <br> Former Bridge Works, Bentinck Road | 36,836 | 36,836 |  | 36,836 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EYL/30/30 } \\ & \text { EYL/31/19A } \end{aligned}$ | W/D/ 20610/APP/2002/2407 | 161,898 | 161,898 |  | 161,898 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (see: PT/51, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/13 \& E/12) | County Court Site, 114 High Street, Uxbridge / 5067/APP/00/1149 \& 1385 Defence Research Agency, West | 194,922 | 194,922 |  | 194,922 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/38/104 | Drayton - New Nursery \& W Drayton Primary School Improvements / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| see: PT278/22 | 49542F/98/1509 | 394,733 | 394,733 |  | 394,733 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/39/65A | Land at North Works, Summerhouse Lane, Harefield 201AJ/98/2472 | 121,107 | 121,107 |  | 121,107 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/40/74D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PT/65, <br> $E / 20$ \& $E / 21$ ) | Land at Johnson's Yard 53936/APP/2002/1357 | 18,900 | 18,900 |  | 18,900 |  |  |  |  | 18,900 | 0 | 18,900 |
|  | Herne House, Church Walk, Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/43/67 | 15405/APP/2003/188 <br> 339-353 High Street, Harlington | 66,514 | 66,514 |  | 66,514 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/44/81 | 53740/APP/99/310 | 18,680 | 18,680 |  | 18,680 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/45/82 | 113 Belmont Road \& 2-4 Fairfield Road, Uxbridge 55741/APP/2003/1467 Land at 9 Orchard Drive Cowley | 18,610 | 18,610 |  | 18,610 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/49/106 | 11972/APP/2003/1546 <br> 2-6 Swan Road West Drayton/ | 11,465 | 11,465 |  | 11,465 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/55/110 EYL/56/108B\& C | 5722/APP/2004/589 | 69,984 | 69,984 |  | 69,984 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (See also PT278/41) | Larchmont, Ladygate Lane, Ruislip. 14633/APP/2002/203 <br> Land at the Chestnuts, Barra Hall, | 22,865 | 22,865 |  | 22,865 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/57/118 <br> (See also | Hayes 8134/APP/2003/2838 \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/31) | 8134/APP/2003/2831 <br> Land at Buchan Close Cowley | 167,440 | 167,440 |  | 167,440 |  |  |  |  | 167,440 | 167440.09 |  |
| EYL/59/129A | 58254/APP/2003/783 <br> 5-19 Botwell Lane Hayes | 13,565 | 13,565 |  | 13,565 |  |  |  |  | 13,565 | 0 | 13,565 |
| EYL/60/131 | 53799/APP/2003/360 <br> St Vincent's Hospital Northwood | 19,427 | 19,427 |  | 19,427 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/62/137 | 138/APP/2001/1240 <br> Land at Dalegarth \& Rydall Orchard | 371,818 | 371,818 |  | 371,818 |  |  |  |  | 197,818 | 197817.94 |  |
| EYL/63/138 | View Cowley 56481/APP/2003/2735 <br> 3 Reginald Road, Northwood | 8,417 | 8,417 |  | 8,417 |  |  |  |  | 8,417 | 0 | 8,417 |
| EYL/65/142B | 58866/APP/2004/274 <br> 68 Ducks Hill Road | 28,460 | 28,460 |  | 28,460 |  |  |  |  | 15,321 | 15321.45 |  |
| EYL/66/144 | 11900/APP/2005/1087 <br> 6A Swan Road West Drayton | 179,174 | 179,174 |  | 179,174 |  |  |  |  | 86,922 | 86921.5082 |  |
| EYL/67/145 | 9037/APP/2005/2945 <br> 91 Cowley Road Uxbridge | 21,276 | 21,276 |  | 21,276 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/68/146 | 263/APP/2003/1769 <br> The Retreat, 26 Field End Road, | 68,663 | 68,663 |  | 68,663 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/69/150 | Eastcote 2011/APP/2002/876 <br> 35 The Drive, Ickenham | 30,346 | 30,346 |  | 30,346 |  |  |  |  | 16,205 | 16204.9883 |  |
| EYL/70/151 | 32381/APP/2004/282 <br> Fmr RAF West Drayton, Porters Way, | 14,256 | 14,256 |  | 14,256 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/71/155B | West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 18-24 Hercies Road, Uxbridge | 471,253 | 471,253 |  | 471,253 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/72/156 | 60045/APP/2005/1997 <br> 23b Green Lane, Northwood | 13,120 | 13,120 |  | 13,120 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/73/157 | 38244/APP/2005/2654 <br> 29 Dawley Road, Hayes | 21,063 | 21,063 |  | 21,063 |  |  |  |  | 11,248 | 11247.642 |  |
| EYL/74/158 | 11280/APP/2005/678 <br> 23-26 Queens Road Uxbridge | 14,543 | 14,543 |  | 14,543 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/75/162 | 53248/APP/2005/680 18a Colham Ave, West Drayton | 19,129 | 19,129 |  | 19,129 |  |  |  |  | 19,129 | 0 | 19,129 |
| EYL/76/163 | 29679/APP/2006/1048 <br> DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton | 18,939 | 18,939 |  | 18,939 |  |  |  |  | 8,826 | 0 | 8,826 |
| EYL/77/147F | 45658/APP/2002/3012 <br> Former Honeywell Site, Trout Road, West Drayton | 328,366 | 328,366 |  | 328,366 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/78/161B | 335/APP/2002/2754 | 238,153 | 238,153 |  | 238,153 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |


|  | MOD Records Office Stockley Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EYL/79/140G | 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 768,003 | 768,003 |  | 768,003 |  |  | 357,890 | 0 | 357,890 |
| EYL/80/165 | Yiewsley 39054/APP/2004/2894 | 77,511 | 77,511 |  | 77,511 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/81/166 | Land at Dell Court, Green Lane, Northwood 59117/APP/2006/872 367-371, High St, Harlington | 29,087 | 29,087 |  | 29,087 |  |  | 15,532 | 15532.458 |  |
| EYL/82 | 19758/APP/2005/371 <br> Dairy Farm Breakspear Rd | 45,214 | 45,214 |  | 45,214 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| EYL/87 | 27314/APP/2005/844 <br> 37, Watford Rd., Northwood | 73,803 | 73,803 |  | 73,803 |  |  | 73,803 | 73802.65 |  |
| EYL/83 | 35199/APP/2006/884 <br> Hayes Goods Yard 10057/APP/2005/ | 7,722 | 7,722 |  | 7,722 |  |  | 7,722 | 7721.63 |  |
| EYL/84 | 2996 \& 2999 <br> 11-21, Clayton Rd, Hayes | 262,182 | 252,606 | 9,576 | 252,606 |  |  |  | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| EYL/85 | 56840/APP/2004/630 <br> Honeywell Site, Trout Rd., Yeiwsley | 98,853 | 98,853 |  | 98,853 |  |  | 98,853 | 98852.87 |  |
| EYL/86 | 335/APP/2002/2754 <br> former True Lovers' Knot Public | 765,637 | 765,637 |  | 765,637 |  |  | 405,787 | 529545.08 | $(123,758)$ |
| EYL/88 | House, <br> EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE SUB - TOTAL | 66,591 $\mathbf{6 , 1 2 0 , 2 7 4}$ | 6,044,107 | 66,591 76,167 | 6,044,107 |  |  | 1,523,377 | 1,220,408 | 302,969 |
| PPR/02/39C | The Chimes - Uxbridge Initiative / 42966/AH/96/1862 <br> Blunts Field Training Programme, Bath | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/05/33 PPR/07/15A | Road / 45486/G/98/2296 | 66,778 | 66,778 |  | 66,778 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (see: PT/50) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Land at Barnsfield Place, Uxbridge Small Business Units / 43562/F/99/2018 | 150,570 | 150,570 |  | 150,570 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/09/42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *8 | Abbess Warehouse, Hayes / <br> 49614B/96/110 <br> Land At Masterdrive Unit, Printing | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/10/16 | House Lane, Hayes / 45736/APP/2000/2577 | 86,195 | 86,195 |  | 86,195 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/13/19C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PT/51, EYL/31 \& | County Court Site, 114 High Street, Uxbridge - Uxbridge TC Improvements / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/12) PPR/15/21B | 5067/APP/00/1149 \& 1385 | 15,803 | 15,803 |  | 15,803 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (see: PT/54 \& | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road - Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/13) PPR/24/05 | TC Partnership / 6198/BS/98/1343 Denbridge Industrial Estate, Oxford | 131,081 | 131,081 |  | 131,081 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| *35 | Road/4551CL/98/435 <br> Land at Former Sadia Works, High St, | 200,000 | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/26/84 | Yiewsley / 41515/B/93/606 Land at junction of Hayes Bypass, Uxbridge Road \& Coldharbour Lane | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/32/50 (Formerly | (Specific Environmental Works - former Uxbridge College Access) / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/02) | 40601H/91/1970 <br> Former SKM House Springfield Road | 47,466 | 47,466 |  | 47,466 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/33/139 | Hayes 35515/APP/2005/516 MOD Records Office Stockley Road, | 5,000 | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/34/140D | Hayes 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 78,171 | 78,171 |  | 78,171 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Polar Park, Bath Road, Harmondsworth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/36/153A | 2964/APP/2002/1436 \& 1437 <br> Horton Close, West Drayton | 13,250 | 13,250 |  | 13,250 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/37/159 | 46871/APP/2006/1037 <br> DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton - Town Centre | 4,200 | 4,200 |  | 4,200 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/40/147G | 45658/APP/2002/3012 <br> 9-15, Harefield Road, Uxbridge | 67,153 | 67,153 |  | 67,153 | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/41/167 | 59532/APP/2005/2401 <br> Hayes Goods Yard | 8,500 | 8,500 |  | 8,500 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/42 | 10057/APP/2004/2996 \& 2999 Colham House, Uxbridge, Training | 78,939 | 78,939 |  | 78,939 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/43 | 27298/APP/2006/875 <br> Honeywell Site, Trout Rd., Yiewsley | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/44 | 335/APP/2002/2754 <br> PERFORMANCE, PARTNERSHIPS \& REGENERATION SUB - TOTAL | 18,229 $\mathbf{1 , 1 2 1 , 3 3 6}$ | 18,229 $\mathbf{1 , 1 2 1 , 3 3 6}$ |  | 18,229 $\mathbf{1 , 1 2 1 , 3 3 6}$ | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 0 |  |
| E/02/18 | Old Mill House, Thorney Mill Road, <br> West Drayton / 41706C/91/1904 <br> BT Site, Willow Tree Lane, Yeading - | 59,556 | 59,556 |  | 59,556 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/06/2A E/09/11B | Play Ground Works | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (see: PT/48 \& EYL/01) | Little London Nurseries, Harlington Road - Morello Avenue Play Area / 3408/APP/2000/703 | 38,021 | 38,021 |  | 38,021 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/10/85 | A4 Heathrow Corridor scheme - Match Funding for Heathrow Villages Chrysalis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (see: PT/36) } \\ & \text { E/13/21A } \end{aligned}$ | Projects | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (formerly <br> PT/54/21A) <br> E/17/26D | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road / 6198/BS/98/1343 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| (see: PT/56 \& PPR/18 ) | Trident Site, Phase 3 Stockley Park Lake Farm \& Botwell Green Play Area 37977/P/94/335 | 1,323,400 | 1,323,400 |  | 1,323,400 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/18/27B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> EYL/35) | Carmichael Close, Ruislip - Sidmouth Open Space / 55898/APP/2000/2736 | 125,274 | 125,274 |  | 125,274 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { E/19/36 } \\ & \text { (see: PPR/21) } \end{aligned}$ | Land adj. Eastern Perimeter Rd. H'row. Air Quality 53546/APP/98/2307 | 43,999 | 43,999 |  | 43,999 |  |  |  | 0 |  |

E/21/74C

| 5, |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| EYL/40 \& | Land at Johnson's Yard - Uxbridge TC |
| E/20) | CCTV 53936/APP/2002/1357 |
|  | Land at West Drayton Depot Stockley |
| E/22/97B | Road West Drayton - Monitoring of |
|  | Noise \& Dust Emissions |
| (see: PT/69) | 2760/APP/2003/2816 |
| E/24/62 <br> (See also | Land at Lyon Industrial Estate, High Rd, |
|  | Cowley - Uxbridge Cowley Initiative |
| PT/60 \& |  |
| PPR/23) | Highway Works) 51095/APP/2000/1004 |
| E/25/38A |  |
| (See also | Former Airspeed House, Stanwell Road, |
| PT/18/38B) | Heathrow / 50395/A97/1297 |
| E/26/93 |  |
| (Formerly |  |
| PT/33) | H.S.A Land, Bath Road 41687S/98/16 |
| E/27/92 |  |
| (Formerly | A4 Heathrow Corridor scheme - Oxford |
| PT/36) | Avenue Green |
| E/28/71 A |  |
| (Formerly | Land at Hendrick Lovell, S.W of Dawley |
| PT/40) | Road, Hayes 43554/C/92/787 |
|  | Land to the West of Stone Close, |
| E29/94D | Horton Road, Yiewsley / |
|  |  |
|  | 54822/APP/2003/718 (full) |
|  | Land at the Chestnuts, Barra Hall, |
| E/31/124 | Hayes |
| (see also |  |
| EYL/57) | 8134/APP/2003/2831 |
| E/32/01 |  |
| (Formerly | Sainsbury Minet Site - Grapes Junction / |
| PT/43/01) | 40601/H/91/1970 |
|  | MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, |
| E36/140E | Hayes 18399/APP/2004/ 2284 |
|  | Middlesex Lodge, 189 Harlington Road, |
| E/37/152B | Hillingdon 12484/APP/2005/1791 |
|  | Polar Park, Bath Road, Harmondsworth |
| E/38/153B | 2964/APP/2002/1436 \& 1437 |
|  | 9-15 Harefield Rd, Uxbridge |
| E/39/160 | 59532/APP/2005/2401 |
|  | Fmr RAF West Drayton, Porters Way, |
| E/40/155C | West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 |
| E/41/49 (Formerly | Land at junction of Hayes Bypass, |
|  | Uxbridge Road \& Coldharbour Lane |
| PPR/31/49) | (Maintenance of Environmental Work) / 40601H/91/1970 |
|  | MOD Records Office Stockley |
|  | Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes |
| E/42/140J | 18399/APP/2004/2284 |
|  | Lombardy Retail Park, Coldharbour |
| E/43/1B | Lane, Hayes 40601/APP/2002/1710 |
| E/44 | Air Quality Action Plan |
| E/45 | Porters Way Play Area |
|  | Former True Lovers Knot P.H Green |
| E/46 | Spaces provision |
|  | ENVIRONMENT SUB -TOTAL |
| H/1/152C |  |
|  | Middlesex Lodge, 189 Harlington Road, |
| *40 | Hillingdon 12484/APP/2005/1791 |
|  | 9-15 Harefield Rd, Uxbridge |
| H/2/160B | 59532/APP/2005/2401 |
| H/3/155A |  |
|  | Fmr RAF West Drayton, Porters Way, |
| *41 | West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 |
| H/4/140H | MOD Records Office Stockley |
|  | Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes |
| *43 | 18399/APP/2004/2284 |
| H/5/161C | Former Honeywell Site, Trout Road, West Drayton |
| *44 | 335/APP/2002/2754 |
| H/6 | 11-21, Clayton Rd., Hayes |
| *48 | 56840/APP2004/630 |
|  | Hayes and Harlington Scrapyard. Health |
| H/7 | Provision |


| 5,370 | 5,370 | 5,370 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5,463 | 5,463 | 5,463 | 0 |


| 13,940 | 13,940 | 13,940 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39,015 | 39,015 | 12,204 | 0 |
| 12,204 | 12,204 | 50,000 | 0 |
| 50,000 | 50,000 | 12,692 | 0 |
| 12,692 | 12,692 | 2,852 | 0 |
| 2,852 | 2,852 |  | 0 |


| $1,008,500$ |  | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 52,114 | 52,114 | 52114.04 |
| 8,607 |  | 0 |
| 10,000 | 10,000 | 10000 |
| 8,532 |  | 0 |
| 20,147 | 20,147 | 20147.3 |

$453,000453,000453,00$

| 100,737 | 100,737 |  | 100,7 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11,544 | 11,544 |  | 11,5 |
| 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |
| 125,000 |  | 125,000 |  |
| 21,195 |  | 21,195 |  |


| 3,597,138 |  |  |  |  | 93,805 | 93,805 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8,562 |  | 8,562 | 8,562 |  |  | 0 |
| 300,000 |  |  |  |  | 300,000 | 300000 |
| 74,041 |  | 74,041 | 74,041 |  |  | 0 |
| 51,133 |  | 51,133 | 51,133 |  |  | 0 |
| 50,032 |  | 50,032 | 50,032 |  |  | 0 |
| 30,066 |  | 30,066 | 30,066 |  |  | 0 |
| 513,834 |  | 213,834 | 213,834 |  | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| 21,482,213 | 5,757 | 2,700,413 | 2,702,001 | $(1,588)$ | 2,518,173 | 2,215,204 |

## Agenda Annex

# Plans for <br> North Applications Planning Committee 

## Tuesday 20th January 2016



## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | 29 COPSE WOOD WAY NORTHWOOD |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Two storey, 6-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace with <br> associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover <br> to front involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $12537 / A P P / 2015 / 3396$ |

Date Plans Received: 08/09/2015 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 21/09/2015



## SEABROOK ARCHITECTS

CHARTERED ARCHITECTS

## 29 Copse Wood Way

 Northwood, HA6 2TZAll dimensions and levels to be checked on site by contractor prior to preparation of shop drawings and commencement of work on site. Dimensions MUST NOT be scaled from this drawing.

This drawing and the copyrights and patents therein are the property of the Architect and may not be used or reproduced without consent.

This drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant consultants and/or specialist's drawings/documents and any discrepancies or variations are to be notified to the Architect before the affected work commences.

## Location Plan

| Drawn By BW | Date $07 / 09 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Checked By - | Date 07/09/2015 16:39:18 |
| Approved By - | Date 07/09/2015 16:39:18 |



|  |  |  |  | ¢ |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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1) ${ }^{\text {03: }}$ 100 100 West (Front) Elevation

(3) $\begin{aligned} & \text { 01.South East (Rear) Elevation } \\ & 1: 100\end{aligned}$
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(1) ${ }^{\text {Proposed Site Plan }}$
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(2) Proposed Street Elevation
-

P. 29
(1) Existing Street Elevation




## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | 51 WIELAND ROAD NORTHWOOD |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Two storey, 6-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and basement <br> with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing <br> detached dwelling (Resubmission) |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $17990 / A P P / 2015 / 4176$ |

Date Plans Received: $\quad 12 / 11 / 2015 \quad$ Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 12/11/2015
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2 3D View 5



## Notes:

Site boundary
For identification purposes only.
This copy has been made by or with the authority of the Head of Committee Services pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (the Act).
Unless the Act provides a relevant exception to copyright.
© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 100019283

## Site Address:

| 51 Wieland Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northwood |  |\(\left.\quad \begin{array}{c}OF HILLINGDON <br>

Residents Services <br>
Planning Section <br>
Civic Cente, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 <br>
Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111\end{array}\right]\)

## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | LAND AT JUNCTION OF FIELD END ROAD AND HIGH ROAD EASTCOTE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Replacement of the existing 17.5 metre pole with a 20 metre pole and the <br> installation of 1 additional cabinet. |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $59310 /$ APP/2015/4125 |


| Date Plans Received: | $06 / 11 / 2015$ | Date(s) of Amendment(s): | $06 / 11 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Application Valid: | $06 / 11 / 2015$ |  | $10 / 11 / 2015$ |
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EXISTING WEST ELEVATION


|  | EASTGATE ROAD EASTGATE VILLAGE HILLINGDON MIDDLESEX HA5 2QW |
| :---: | :---: |
| Drawing Tille: | EXISTING SITE ELEVATION |
| Purpose of is | CONSTRUCTION |







PROX.

| ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN mm UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N.G.R | E: $510588 \quad$ N: | 188638 |  |  |  |  |
| CONCESSION REQUIRED | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTES: |  |  |  |  |  |  |


GallifordTry

## o.

O-

| EASTGATE ROAD SW |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cell ID No |  |  |
| CTIL | TEF | VF |
|  |  |  |


| 147016 | 009076 | 46999 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Site Address / Contact Details

(3)

\section*{| Slotiz | 10 | Sloitza | XdJo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |}




## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 34 BURWOOD AVENUE EASTCOTE
Development: Single storey rear extension
LBH Ref Nos: 63119/APP/2015/3763

Date Plans Received: 09/10/2015
Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 28/10/2015




\footnotetext{

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revisions: \| |  |  |  |
| ABA Chatered Surveyors <br> 49 The Green, Southall UB2 4AR |  |  |  |
| scale 1:100@A3 <br> date 11/06/15 |  | title <br> Existing elevations |  |
| $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \text { drg no } \\ 0721-\mathrm{ex}-01 \end{array}$ | rev |  | e, Eastcote |





[^0]:    Lloyd White
    Head of Democratic Services
    London Borough of Hillingdon,
    3E/05, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW
    www.hillingdon.gov.uk

