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# Useful information for residents and visitors 

## Watching \& recording this meeting

You can watch the public (Part 1) part of this meeting on the Council's YouTube channel, live or archived after the meeting. Residents and the media are also welcome to attend in person, and if they wish, report on the public part of the meeting. Any individual or organisation may record or film proceedings as long as it does not disrupt proceedings.

It is recommended to give advance notice of filming to ensure any particular requirements can be met. The Council will provide seating areas for residents/public, high speed WiFi access to all attending and an area for the media to report. The officer shown on the front of this agenda should be contacted for further information and will be available to assist.

When present in the room, silent mode should be enabled for all mobile devices.

## 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 wa away. Limited parking is available at the Civic Centre. For details on availability and how to book parking space, please contact Democratic Service Please enter from the Council's main reception where you will be directed to the Committee Roon

## Accessibility

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

## Emergency procedures

If there is a FIRE, you will hear a continuous alarn EXIT and assemble on the Civic Centre forecourt.
 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 SECURITY INCIDENT follow the instructions issued via the tannoy, a Fire Marshall or a Security Officer.

Mobile telephones - Please switch off any mobile telephones before the meeting.

## Petitions and Councillors

Petitions - Those who have organised a petition of 20 or more people who live, work or study in the borough, 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;
petition organiser or of the agent/applicant;
4. The Committee debate the item and may seek clarification from officers;
5. 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.
4. The Committee may ask questions of the

## 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 previous meetings - 18 May, 9
June and 28 June 2016
4 Matters that have been notified in advance or urgent
5 To confirm that the items of business marked Part I will be considered in Public and that the items marked Part 2 will be considered in private

## PART I - Members, Public and the 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 | 14 Moorfield Road, <br> Cowley, <br> $69313 / A P P / 2016 / 1283$ | Brunel | Conversion of existing dwelling <br> into 2 x 2-bed self contained <br> dwellings with associated amenity <br> space <br> Recommendation: Refusal | $31-46$ |

## Applications without a Petition

|  | Address | Ward | Description \& Recommendation | Page |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 7 | Easyhotel Heathrow, <br> Brickfield Lane, <br> Harlington <br> 18/APP/2016/1416 | Heathrow <br> Villages | Change of use from Use Class B1 <br> (former mini cab/chauffeurs office) <br> to Use Class C1 (Hotel) <br> (Retrospective) <br> Recommendation: Approval | $47-58$ |
| $167-174$ |  |  |  |  |


| 8 | Easyhotel Heathrow, Brickfield Lane, Harlington <br> 18/APP/2016/1414 | Heathrow Villages | Rear infill extension (Retrospective) <br> Recommendation: Refusal | $\begin{gathered} 59-72 \\ 175-182 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | 128 Long Lane, Hillingdon 230/APP/2016/1491 | Hillingdon East | Change of use of existing outbuilding to rear from a games room to a bedroom and storage area ancillary to the main dwelling <br> Recommendation: Approval | $\begin{gathered} 73-82 \\ 183-188 \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | Euro Garages Heathrow North Shepiston Lane, Hayes 7981/ADV/2016/46 | Pinkwell | Installation of 1 internally illuminated ATM sign (Retrospective) <br> Recommendation: Approval | $\begin{gathered} 83-88 \\ 189-194 \end{gathered}$ |
| 11 | Euro Garages <br> Heathrow North Shepiston Lane, Hayes 17981/APP/2016/1404 | Pinkwell | Installation of ATM (Restrospective) <br> Recommendation: Approval | $\begin{gathered} 89-96 \\ 195-200 \end{gathered}$ |
| 12 | Nanaksar Primary School, Springfield Road, Hayes <br> 4450/APP/2016/1928 | Townfield | Variation of conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref: <br> 4450/APP/2014/1427 dated 16/06/14 (Provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, substation, car/cycle parking, new access arrangements and ancillary development on existing school site) to extend the use until 31st August 2017. <br> Recommendation: Approval | $\begin{aligned} & 97-116 \\ & 201-203 \end{aligned}$ |
| 13 | 8 Bawtree Road, Uxbridge 18278/APP/2015/4309 | Uxbridge North | Enlargement of basement to create habitable space and ground floor rear extension <br> Recommendation: Refusal | $\begin{gathered} 117- \\ 128 \\ 204-208 \end{gathered}$ |

## Monitoring Report

14 S106 Quarterly Monitoring Report for Central \& South Committee Pages 129-160
This report provides financial information on S106 and S278 agreements in the Central and South Planning Committee area up to 31 March 2016 where the Council has received and holds funds.

PART I - Plans for Central and South Planning Committee Pages 162-208

Hilling DON
LONDON

## Central \& South Planning Committee

18 May 2016
Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

|  | Committee Members Present: <br> Councillors lan Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad- <br> Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), <br> John Morse and Brian Stead. <br> LBH Officers Present: <br> Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts \& Planning Information), Alex Chrusciak (Planning <br> Service Manager) Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal <br> Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer). |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1) <br> Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Janet Duncan and Manjit <br> Khatra, with Councillors Mohinder Birah and John Morse substituting. |
| 5. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <br> (Agenda Item 2) <br> Councillor John Morse declared a pecuniary in agenda items 9 and 10, which related to <br> Brunel University as he was an employee of the University. Councillor Morse left the <br> room during discussion of the items. |
| 6. | TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 31 MARCH <br> 2016 (Agenda Item 3) |
| The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2016 were agreed. |  |
| 7. | MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (Agenda Item <br> 4) <br> To matters had been notified in advance or were urgent. |
| 8. | TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE <br> CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE <br> CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (Agenda Item 5) <br> It was confirmed that agenda items numbered 1 to 18 were Part I and would be <br> considered in public. The agenda items numbered 19 to 23 were Part II and would be <br> heard in private. |

## First floor rear extension.

Officers introduced the report, which related to a first floor rear extension on a detached two storey dwelling. This was located on the west side of Moorfield Road. There had been a number of previous applications at the site and construction had taken place to extend the property. Applications to increase the height of the building to two storeys had previously been approved by the Committee and most of the works carried out had been undertaken as permitted development.

The application was for the construction of a first floor extension above a previously constructed single storey element. This would have a depth of 3.6 metres and a width of 6.6 metres. This would be less than half the width of the existing extended dwelling. The proposed design of the extension was in character with the existing building. It was noted that the dwelling was within a flood zone three. The Council's flooding experts had been consulted and had raised no objections. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

A petition had been submitted by the applicant in objection to the application. Councillor Richard Mills addressed the Committee on behalf of the petitioner and made the following points:

- A number of applications had previously been submitted in relation to the property.
- The development overpowered and was overbearing and out of keeping with the small and tight road that it was within.
- The property had previously been referred to as a "Lego" building, with bricks and extensions being added on wherever the applicant found some space.
- A number of extensions had been added to what had originally been a bungalow.
- Approval of the current plans would amount to giving permission to a bigger dwelling than that which had previously been refused.
- Only five neighbours had been consulted in relation to the proposals, all of whom had objected.
- Local residents had needed to put together multiple petitions in objection to the various applications at the site.
- Cllr. Mills did not completely agree with officers that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact on neighbours.
- The site plan was incorrect as it did not reflect all the work undertaken at the site.
- It was frustrating that the applicant had not engaged with officers in order to understand which schemes were likely to be viable at the site.
- The site was within a flood risk area, so the more development that took place, the bigger the likely impact.
- It was requested that the application be refused, but that as a minimum, the Committee should undertake a site visit.

Neither the applicant nor their agent wished to address the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman advised that the Committee should consider the building as it currently stood and the application currently before Committee, rather than what had previously
been at the site.
Members asked for confirmation of the number of proposed bedrooms at the property, the gaps between buildings, the number of car park spaces and for clarification of whether the extensions built so far all had permitted development rights. Officers advised that permitted development rights had been used to build the rear extension. The growth in footprint of the premises had all occurred due to the permitted development rights that the property had. The gap between the property and neighbouring properties was one metre on one side and considerably more on the other. The property had a garage which Members had previously conditioned should be retained as a garage. Parking provision was compliant with relevant policies. It was confirmed that maximum permissible parking provision for the premises was two spaces, which the property had. The proposals did not suggest any changes to the existing parking provision. It was also confirmed that the garage was large enough for a car to be parked in it.

Some Members felt that a site visit would be beneficial in order to help them to more fully understand the possible impact of the proposals on the area. Other Members were not convinced of the benefit of undertaking a site visit as they felt that there were not any valid planning grounds for considering refusal of the application.

Officers advised that should the Committee feel that the development was becoming so significant that it was out of character with the area, that this could be a ground for refusal. However, the difficulty was that the original bungalow had also been out of character with the area and the previous extensions were such that the dwelling was now considered to be in character with the other properties in the street. In order to be able to refuse the application on the basis of the impact on the local area, it would be necessary to evidence the harm that this was causing. Officers considered that the application was policy compliant and would have very limited impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The proposal to defer the application for a site visit was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for a site visit to take place.
4 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 42162/APP/2016/915 (Agenda Item 7)
Demolition of existing building and erection of a three storey building to provide $6 \times 2$-bed self contained flats with associated parking (Outline application).

Officers introduced the application, drawing Members' attention to a number of associated issues. The application had been submitted as an outline but the plans did show the proposed design, scale and appearance. The site was within a floodplain three zone. The applicant had not provided the supporting justification that was required to support proposed development in such an area. General advice provided by the Government, London Plan and Council policies was that the location of new development within such areas was unacceptable when there were other sites available that were less at risk of flooding.

The property was currently a bungalow, with the proposal being to provide a substantially larger footprint and to use the remainder of the site for car parking. The proposals did not provide any amenity space. This in itself would be a reason for refusal. Access to the car parking was also too narrow. The proposed building was not
considered to be in keeping with neighbouring properties in the road. It would also have an impact in terms of outlook. No information had been provided by the applicant to advise whether the trees that were currently in the rear garden of the property would be retained. It seemed unlikely that the trees would be retained, which was unacceptable. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal.

Officers advised that in relation to reason for refusal number two contained within the officer's report, policy H 12 was not applicable in this case and it was requested that this be deleted from the reason for refusal. This was because policy H 12 related specifically to residential development behind existing buildings.

Councillor Richard Mills, ward Councillor for Brunel, addressed the Committee. The following points were made:

- The flood risk at the site was a significant issue and this could be detrimental to neighbouring properties.
- The three storey building would overlook neighbouring properties on Moorfield Road and on High Road, Cowley. This would result in loss of privacy and the casting of shadows.
- The removal of the existing garden and construction of six flats with no amenity space would not provide a good quality of life for residents of the flats.
- The Committee was asked to consider refusing the application.

The Committee was concerned about the architectural merit of the proposals, parking arrangements, access difficulties, the flood risk and possible overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously refused.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation, subject to the removal of reference to Policy H 12 from reason for refusal number two.

4 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 42162/APP/2016/912 (Agenda Item 8)
Demolition of existing building and erection of $4 \times 3$-bed, semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space (Outline application).

Officers introduced the application, noting that the concerns with regard to this application were similar to concerns raised in relation to the other application at the same site (42162/APP/2016/915) that had just been determined by the Committee. These concerns included that the application site was within a flood plain, the use of land that had previously been used as a garden and the impact on adjoining occupiers. The width of the development, minimal amenity space, the size of the proposed dwellings and likely loss of trees at the site were also considered to be unacceptable. The proposals were also out of character when compared to neighbouring properties. Officers recommended that the application be refused.

Councillor Richard Mills, ward Councillor for Brunel, addressed the Committee. The following points were made:

- Approval of the application would result in the development of garden space.
- A number of factors suggested that the proposals were not suitable for the site.

| These included construction on the flood plain and the negative impact on <br> neighbours, the narrow entrance to the parking and the houses being too small <br> to meet minimum standards for acceptable living space. <br> - It was requested that the Committee support the officer recommendation for <br> refusal. |
| :--- | :--- |
| The Committee considered that the proposed reasons for refusal were the same as for <br> the application at the same site that had previously been refused. These were <br> considered to be strong. <br> It was requested that reason for refusal number 2 be strengthened to reflect that the <br> proposals amounted to tandem development and their likely impact on biodiversity of <br> the area. <br> The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a <br> vote, was unanimously refused. <br> RESOLVED: That <br> 1. The application be refused as per the officer recommendation, subject to <br> an amendment to the reason for refusal number 2 to ensure that it <br> appropriately reflects the harm created by virtue of the tandem nature of <br> the development and the impact on biodiversity. |
| 2. Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement |
| to agree, in conjunction with the Chairman and Labour Lead, the final |
| wording of the reasons for refusal. |

The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

## RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

14. HAYES FOOTBALL CLUB YARD - 29439/APP/2016/322 (Agenda Item 11)

## Erection of two linked portacabins for use as a day nursery.

The application site was the Hayes Football Club Yard, which was located on the northern side of Kings Hill Avenue. The application proposed the erection of portacabins to the rear of the main building, linked together to create a children's nursery. The structure would be 13 metres wide, eight metres in depth and three metres in height. It was designed to accommodate a maximum of 35 children between 8 am and 4 pm on term time week days.

It was noted that the Council's Family Information Service had advised that there was a shortage of childcare places in the area, which were required in order to meet the local authority's statutory duty to provide free child care for disadvantaged two year olds. There were 79 two year olds living in the area who were eligible for free child care, but only 22 places available, leaving a shortfall of 57 places.

The application site was located within the green belt. Development of such a structure in the green belt would only normally be considered where the applicant could demonstrate a case of special circumstances. The applicant had stated that they had tried without success to find alternative locations and that the site was within walking distance of the main catchment area for the proposed childcare facility. They also considered that the layout of the existing building at the site was inadequate.

The proposed development was relatively small in scale compared to the existing site. Officers considered that the need for the development outweighed the need to prevent such a structure being built within the green belt. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

A 54 signature petition had been received in support of the application. The lead petitioner was present, but did not wish to address the Committee.

In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that the existing car park, pedestrian access and existing amenities would be reused to service the proposed development. It was anticipated that some of the storage containers at the rear of the site would be removed, although some would remain operational for the football club.

Members considered that the need for additional childcare facilities outweighed the fact that the development would be on green belt land.

The proposal for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

1 SALCOMBE WAY, HAYES - 48976/APP/2016/520 (Agenda Item 12)
Erection of a lean-to structure (Retrospective).
The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

Officers introduced the application, noting that although the doors of the bicycle store and bin store opened over the adjacent footpath, a proposed condition would require that the doors would remain closed and locked when not in use. It was noted that the footpath served only five or six neighbouring dwellings. The proposals would have little visual impact. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

Members noted that the doors to the bicycle and bin store would only open over half the width of the footpath and therefore, the footpath would not be completely impeded, even when the doors were open.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.
16. 49 CENTRAL AVENUE, HAYES - 38444/APP/2016/744 (Agenda Item 13)

Change of use from a 6 person house in multiple occupation (Use Class C4) to a 10 person house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis).

Officers introduced the application. The house was currently in use under use Class C4, which allowed it to be inhabited by up to six people. The application proposed that this be increased to ten people, which would change the use category to Sui Generis. No changes were proposed to the size of the building, with extensions having previously been granted permission.

The only proposed alterations to the external appearance of the building were changes to the front garden layout. Four parking spaces would be provided at the site, which complied with requirements. The proposed room sizes were also complaint with Council standards. No complaints had been received in relation to the management of the premises. The application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman asked officers to confirm how accessible the site was for public transport. The site was located on the edge of a public accessibility level 2 area and was close to being in a level 3 area. The site was therefore considered to have adequate access to public transport.

The Chairman advised that the issue for the Committee to consider was the proposed intensification of the use of the property and the appropriateness of this.

The Committee sought clarification as to whether a ten bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would normally be required to be built in a detached house. Officers confirmed that the Council's supplementary planning guidance from 2004 specified that HMO'S with around ten people in should normally be located within detached dwellings. Although the house that the application concerned was semi-detached, at 160 square metres plus in size, it was quite large. Therefore, the fact that it was not
detached, was not considered to be particularly problematic by officers.
Concerns were raised that one of the habitable rooms appeared to have a garage door to the front of it, rather than a window. Officers advised that an acceptable residential environment for the occupier of the room could be ensured by imposing a planning condition to require the replacement of the garage door with a window.

The Chairman said that the Committee should consider whether the proposed intensification of use, in close proximity to other properties, was appropriate. The Committee should consider the potential for harm to be caused to neighbouring occupiers through noise and disturbance.

Members considered that the proposals amounted to an extreme intensification of use as the proposals were in an area that contained predominantly three bedroom properties. It was suggested that four parking spaces was not enough, although it was acknowledged that it may meet the Council's required parking standards. The availability of amenity space was also mentioned as being a possible cause for concern. Officers advised that space provided by the proposals was well above the minimum level required.

In response to a Member question about whether the applicant would subsequently be able to convert a lounge into a bedroom, officers advised that while there was no specific condition, the applicant would be required to comply with approved plans and to maintain this. It was also noted that approval of the application would grant permission for a 10 person residence. Therefore, allowing more people than this to live at the premises would be in breach of this permission.

Members discussed the possibility of overturning the officer recommendation due to the intensification of use and the inappropriateness of use when compared to the surrounding area. It was considered that building had not been designed for such a use and that it was unlikely that neighbours would welcome ten people living at the premises.

Officers advised that the provision of parking was not a valid reason for refusal and that the Committee needed to consider what harm would be caused by intensification of use. Officers had assessed the ability of the building to reasonably accommodate ten people and had determined that all the room sizes met the minimum standards. The Committee was encouraged to consider what the difference was between the current six people living at the property and the application under consideration which proposed that ten people be allowed to live there. The Committee would need to consider how this intensification would become evident to people living in the vicinity. Officers had not been able to find a reason as to why the proposed intensification would make approval of the proposals unacceptable.

Members felt that the proposed increase in occupancy of the premises from six to ten persons, a $66 \%$ increase, was significant. However, it was difficult for valid refusal reasons to be identified as the proposals complied with the relevant planning policies. Members were also concerned about the increase in noise and rubbish that could be caused by an increased number of people living at the property.

The Chairman summarised the Committee's view that the application amounted to an intensification of use by a sizeable amount. The location in a residential street, adjoining another dwelling, created the possibility of a noise and disturbance being
caused in the event that ten people were permitted to live at the property. The fact that the Council's own guidance specified that properties housing ten persons or more should normally be detached was also of concern. While it was recognised that the property may be large enough to accommodate ten people, there was concern with regard to there being sufficient separation from neighbouring properties. The Committee needed to consider whether this intensification of use amounted to a valid reason for refusal.

Officers advised that the maximum number of people permitted to live at the property under its current C4 use class was six. More than six people living at a property would be classed as a Sui Generis use. This demonstrated that the Government considered there to be a more significant impact when more than six people lived at a property. It was for the Committee to determine at what point the threshold was crossed for where the number of people in a property was likely to start causing a disturbance.

Officers considered that the applicant was responsible and would be willing to put in place a suitable management plan in order to ensure that issues such as refuse were dealt with. The requirement for a management plan had been secured through a planning condition. This had been in included in one of the recommended conditions for approval within the officer report.

The proposal to overturn the officer recommendation for approval of the application was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

## RESOLVED:

1. That the application be refused for the following reasons:
i) The increased intensification of the use would create noise and disturbance to the detriment of the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers.
ii) The application site fails to accord with the Council's HMO SPG which advises that HMO's to house this number of people should be detached properties.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to determine the precise wording of the reasons for refusal.

86 EAST AVENUE, HAYES - 40159/APP/2015/4610 (Agenda Item 14)
Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to a nursery (Use Class D1).
Officers introduced the application, advising that the application site was located within a secondary shopping area. The proposal was seeking change of use from retail to a nursery. This was considered to be unacceptable due to the resulting loss of a retail unit and the fact that it would cause retail frontage in the area to fall below the target level of $50 \%$.

The applicant had not provided details of the proposed number of children and staff at the nursery facility, details of parking provision at the site or the proposed operating hours. Details of operating hours would be required to enable consideration to be given to recommending approval of the application. This was due to the potential impact on neighbouring occupiers. Although additional childcare provision was needed within the Borough, the applicant had not provided sufficient information to enable officers to

|  | consider recommending approval of the proposal. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal. <br> The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. <br> RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 18. | 94 HERCIES ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 19969/APP/2016/757 (Agenda Item 15) <br> Extension of roof to create additional habitable roof space to include 2 new side dormers and enlargement of existing dormers (Part Retrospective). <br> Officers introduced the application, which was part retrospective. The proposals did not comply with the Council's normal requirements for dormers. The dormer occupied the majority of the side of the dwelling and was substantially larger than what would normally be considered for approval. The application was recommended for refusal. <br> The Chairman advised that the character of the building had been changed by the development. <br> Officers advised that the plans submitted did not fully reflect what had been built as the plans did not show the link that had been built between the dormers. <br> The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. <br> RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation. |
| 19. | 133B HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 68976/APP/2016/253 (Agenda Item 16) <br> Retention of outbuilding to the rear as built to be used as a community centre/place of worship. <br> Officers introduced the application, which was presented to the Committee jointly with application number 68976/APP/2016/254. <br> Member's attention was drawn to the comments made by the Conservation Officer. These comments had set out in detail the aspects of the proposals that were considered to be unacceptable. It was noted that the building that the application premises was attached to was a listed building. Works that had been carried out at the site had not be carried out in accordance with previously approved plans. This had had an impact on the listing building. Officers were recommending that the applicant be asked to ensure that the development complied with the previously approved drawings. The applicant had been asked to submit revised drawings, but these had not been provided and officers had been attempting to negotiate an agreeable solution with the applicant for a number of months. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal. <br> Members were concerned that what had been built did not match the previously approved plans and that damage had been caused by work that had been undertaken. <br> The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. |


|  | RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20. | 133B HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 68976/APP/2016/254 (Agenda Item 17) |
| Retention of outbuilding to the rear as built to be used as a community |  |
| centre/place of worship (Listed Building Consent). |  |
| Officers introduced the application, which was presented to the Committee jointly with |  |
| application number 68976/APP/2016/253. |  |
| Member's attention was drawn to the comments made by the Conservation Officer. <br> These comments had set out in detail the aspects of the proposals that were <br> considered to be unacceptable. It was noted that the building that the application <br> premises was attached to was a listed building. Works that had been carried out at the <br> site had not been carried out in accordance with previously approved plans. This had <br> had an impact on the listing building. Officers were recommending that the applicant be <br> asked to ensure that the development complied with the previously approved drawings. <br> The applicant had been asked to submit revised drawings, but these had not been <br> provided and officers had been attempting to negotiate an agreeable solution with the <br> applicant for a number of months. Accordingly, the application was recommended for <br> refusal. <br> Members were concerned that what had been built did not match the previously <br> approved plans and that damage had been caused by work that had been undertaken. <br> The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, <br> was unanimously agreed. <br> RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation. |  |
| 21. | RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per the officer's <br> recommendation. <br> 27 KINGSTON AVENUE, YIEWSLEY - 67220/APP/2015/3631 (Agenda Item 18) <br> Single storey side extension. <br> The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, <br> Officers introduced the application, which was for what was considered to be a very <br> minor development. It was considered that the proposals would have very little impact <br> on the street scene or on neighbouring occupiers. The application was being <br> considered by Committee due to the site having an enforcement history. An <br> enforcement notice had previously been served on the outbuilding to the rear of the <br> property. This was in the process of being demolished, which was evidence that the <br> enforcement notice was being complied with. The application was recommended for <br> approval. |
| The agreed. The application had been referred to Committee |  |
| 27 |  |

22. ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 19)
23. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.
24. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).
23. ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 20)

1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.
2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).
24. ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 21)

1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.
2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

| 25. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 22) <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was <br> agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it <br> outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing <br> the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the <br> identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority <br> proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which <br> requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in <br> withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt <br> information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local <br> Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended). |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 23) <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was <br> agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it <br> outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing <br> the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. |
| This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the <br> identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority <br> proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which <br> requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in <br> withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt <br> information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local <br> Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended). |  |
| The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 pm, closed at $8: 40$ pm. |  |
| The |  |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.
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## CENTRAL \& SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 June 2016
Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

|  | Committee Members Present: <br> Councillors lan Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad- <br> Wallana, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra and <br> Brian Stead. <br> LBH Officers Present: <br> Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts \& Planning Information), James Rodger (Head of <br> Planning and Enforcement), Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer), Nicole <br> Cameron (Legal Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer). |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27. | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1) <br> Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal. There was no <br> substitute present. |
| 28. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <br> (Agenda Item 2) <br> There were no Declarations of Interest made. |
| 29. | TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON <br> 19 APRIL 2016 AND 12 MAY 2016 (Agenda Item 3) |
| The minutes of the meetings held on 19 April 2016 and on 12 May 2016 were agreed <br> as being accurate. |  |
| 30. | MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT <br> (Agenda Item 4) <br> The Chairman advised the Committee that an additional late report had been received <br> and would be considered in relation to agenda item number 16. |
| 31. | TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE <br> CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE <br> CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (Agenda Item 5) <br> It was confirmed that the agenda items numbered 1 to 14 were Part I and would be <br> considered in public. The agenda items numbered 15 to 17 were Part II and would, <br> therefore, be heard in private. |

## Single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and first floor front extension.

Officers introduced the report, which was for a two storey detached property located on the north side of Abingdon Close. The application was for a single storey rear extension and a single storey and first floor front extension.

The application had been the subject of two letters and a petition, with the grounds for the objection being set out within the agenda. Officers had no objection to the single storey rear extension as this complied with the Council's normal requirements.

The main issue for consideration was the impact of the front extension on the character of the property and its visual impact on the street scene and the wider area. It was noted that the Council's supplementary planning document on residential extensions stated that changes and extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions that extended across the entire frontage of a house would normally be refused.

A large number of the properties in Abingdon Close were characterised by single storey front projections, which originally had been garages. A number of these projections, including the application site, had a balcony above. The loss of the balcony feature, the addition of a first floor and the squaring off of the ground floor would represent a significant change to the design and appearance of the dwelling. It was considered that these changes would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the property, its character and appearance and would not be in keeping with the appearance of other properties in Abingdon Close. It was confirmed that there were not any protected trees that would be affected by the proposals. The application was recommended for refusal.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- Everyone who had signed the petition lived on Abingdon Close.
- Abingdon Close was a cul-de-sac, with no through traffic and was quiet and peaceful, with all the houses being in harmony.
- The petitioners felt that the proposals were ill considered and not in harmony with the houses in the street and they did not want the building line to be changed.
- The officer report had effectively summarised the concerns of the petitioners. UPP planning policy numbers BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 were considered to be particularly relevant to the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the applicant addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The proposed reduction in the size of the garden to 90 square metres was 10 square metres less than specified by policy.
- A reason for refusal was the change in character of the house due to the proposed front extension.
- The planning officer had acknowledged that the small shortfall in the proposed
size of the garden was not a sufficient reason for refusal of the application.
- The applicant would be prepared to omit the rear extension and to reduce the overall bulk of the extension.
- The substantive reasons for the recommendation for refusal were the proposed changes to the front and side of the property.
- The applicant accepted that the proposed changes would result in a change in the character of the house. However, these would not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.
- The balcony at the front of the house was badly designed and rarely used. The flat roof had leaked many times.
- The proposals would improve the appearance of the property and the street scene.
- Similar developments had been allowed at house number 1 Abingdon Close and number 55 Court Drive.
- The appearance of the property had already been changed by a previously approved extension.

Officers advised that house numbers 2 to 8 in Abingdon Close were properties of a similar character, the majority of which had a balcony feature. The properties at numbers 1 Abingdon Close and 55 Court Drive were corner plots, with different orientations and aspects in comparison to the application site. Therefore, officers did not consider that the appearance of these properties was of particular significance in relation to the application under consideration. The extensions at these properties were also not considered to be examples of good architecture. It was not considered that anything that had been raised by the petitioner altered the recommendation made by officers for the committee to refuse the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, comments provided in relation to the application by a ward Councillor for Uxbridge North, Councillor Raymond Graham, were read to the Committee:
"I am familiar with the location and support the petitioners; that being so I am in agreement with the decision to 'refuse' this application, especially with regard to the proposed front extensions by reason of their position, size, scale and design, which would be detrimental to the architectural style of the existing house. The loss of the balcony feature would be regrettable, given that any changes to the street scene ought to set out to blend in with and complement the character of the area."

Members concurred with the officer recommendation and concerns were expressed in relation to the appearance of the proposed roof to the front of the property. Officers advised that the angle of the roof followed the angle of the existing roof and was subsidiary to the main roof. The roof design was not considered to be a reason for refusal. The Chairman stated that while the proposed roof matched the pitch of the existing roof on the left hand side, the angle was different on the right hand side.

Committee Members agreed that the proposals were of unsuitable bulk and would be incongruous.

The legal advisor confirmed that the concerns put forward by Members were considered to be valid grounds for refusal and could be put forward at any subsequent appeal in relation to the application.

The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

|  | RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 33. | 14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2016/203 (Agenda Item 7) <br> First floor rear extension. <br> Officers introduced the application, which had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 18 April in order to allow a site visit to take place. This had now taken place, with Members having seen the site and the adjoining site. The application was for a first floor rear extension. The proposals were considered to be acceptable and accordingly, they were recommended for approval. <br> Members expressed some dissatisfaction with the appearance of the proposed development but did not consider that there were any planning grounds for refusal. In response to a Member question, officers confirmed that a condition would be included to ensure that the garage was retained for the parking of cars and was not used for any other purpose. <br> The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously. <br> RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report. |
| 34. | LAND ADJACENT TO SIPSON ROAD IN HOLLOWAY LANE, HARMONDSWORTH 46223/APP/2016/492 (Agenda Item 8) <br> Section 73 application to vary Condition 1 of planning permission 46223/APP/2015/1195 dated $15^{\text {th }}$ June 2015 (Variation of Condition 3 of planning permission 46223/APP/2013/2899 dated $4{ }^{\text {th }}$ December 2013 (Use of part of the site fronting Sipson Road, for a period of 18 months, as a construction compound and training facility in conjunction with the rebuilding of the structural supports for the A4 Hammersmith Flyover) to allow the continued use of the site until January 2016 (S73 Application))) to now extend the part use of the site until January 2017, as a construction compound and training facility in conjunction with rebuilding of the structural supports for the A4 Hammersmith Flyover. <br> Officers introduced the report, which was before the Committee for consideration due to works at the site having overrun. The site was not clearly visible from the adjacent road and was due to be dismantled by the end of the year. The application was recommended for approval. <br> The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously. <br> RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report. |

## Single storey outbuilding to rear for use as a games room.

Officers introduced the report, which was for a single storey outbuilding to be used as a games room. The proposed building would be 30 square metres and its size was considered to be reasonable. The application was recommended for approval.

Officers considered that the proposed condition 6, which would restrict the type of usage permissible in the outbuilding, was overly restrictive and requested that the restriction on it being used as a living room or study be removed.

The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the removal of the words "living room" and "study" from condition number 6.
36.

88 THE LARCHES, HILLINGDON - 71105/APP/2015/4180 (Agenda Item 10)
Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion from $1 \times 3-$ bed dwelling to $2 \times 2$ - bed self contained flats.

Officers introduced the application, which related to a two-storey, semi-detached property on the south side of the road. The proposal was for a part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extension and its conversion to a two bedroom self contained flat. The size of the property met the required size for such a conversion to be carried out.

Issues had been identified in relation to access to amenity space and parking provision. The ground floor would have access to amenity space, but there was no access to the amenity space from the first floor flat, other than through the ground floor flat. In relation to parking, the applicant had not demonstrated how access could be provided to two parking spaces at the site. For these reasons and due to the location of the bin store, the proposals were considered to be unacceptable and were recommended for refusal.

In relation to required room sizes, officers advised that the national space standards had been adopted in March 2015. The overall size of the flats met the required standard. One of the ground floor bedrooms was below the minimum size. It would be 2.4 metres wide, compared to a required width of 2.75 metres. Officers considered that citing this as a reason for refusal would be likely to be overturned at appeal. Members were encouraged to consider whether the wished to be strict in their application of the room size space standards.

The Chairman stated that, given that the space standards had been adopted by the London Plan, he would wish for the Committee to consider including the size of the room as an additional reason for refusal. Members agreed that the required minimum width of 2.75 metres should be upheld. Officers proposed that it would be preferable to include reference to the room sizes as part of the reference to amenity space within reason for refusal number 1, rather than including room size as a separate refusal reason. This was due to concern that including room size as a separate refusal reason might not be defensible at any appeal. It was agreed that specific reference would be


|  | RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and <br> informatives set out in the officer's report. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39. | 10 WEST COMMON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 5313/APP/2016/260 (Agenda Item 13) <br> Creation of additional habitable roofspace to include a front dormer, enlargement <br> of rear dormer with Juliette balcony, 1 rear rooflight and alterations to elevations. |

Officers introduced the report which was for the installation of one front dormer and the enlargement of an existing rear dormer. The enlargement of the dormer was considered to be acceptable as it was relatively small in proportion to the roof. Front dormers were normally only permitted where they were in keeping with the character of the road as was the case for road that the application site was located on. The proposals were considered to be acceptable and the application was recommended for approval.

Concerns were raised with regard to the step up and step down of the dormers and how they might vary in comparison to the technical guidance. Officers advised that the current guidance was that dormers should be subordinate to the roof of the property and a key characteristic was that they should be set in from the side. It was therefore considered that the proposals complied with the guidance.

A Member raised concerns in relation to the architectural merit of the proposed dimensions of the dormers. Officers advised that the proposed dormers were considered to match the existing street scene as other properties contained similar dormers.

Concerns were also raised that the plans could allow overlooking neighbouring gardens. Officers advised that permission for Juliet balconies at the site had previously been refused in 2008. Officers advised that the current proposals were not considered to be objectionable because they did not provide a platform for seating. Previous appeal decisions had demonstrated that Juliet balconies were permitted developments. The distance of the dwelling from neighbouring properties was also such that overlooking was not considered to be problematic.

Overall, Members considered that the proposals were acceptable and that there were no grounds for refusal. The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion from $1 \times 3-$ bed dwelling to $2 \times 3$-bed flats with associated parking and amenity space.

Officers introduced the application, which was for a two storey and part single storey side and rear extensions and their conversion to two, three bedroom flats. It was noted that an application had been approved earlier in 2016 for extensions at the site. The
proposals met all the relevant size specifications. Associated parking spaces were proposed, which were both accessible and usable. The extension would retain a significant separation distance from adjoining properties and would not impede a 45 degree line of sight from the closest first floor window of a neighbouring property. The application was recommended for approval.

Members were referred to the addendum sheet that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. This reflected the Mayor of London's supplementary planning guidance that had been updated in March 2016. This specified that section M of building regulations only applied to new build properties and did not apply to conversions. Therefore, condition 7 of the officer report did not apply and was proposed for deletion.

The Chairman asked whether any steps could be taken to minimise parking difficulties in the area surrounding the application site and asked whether a condition could be added to the approval conditions, in the event that Committee were to approve the application, to specify that no parking permit would be granted to residents of the new flats. Officers advised that the development would provide off street parking that met the Council's standards and that case law cast doubt with regards to whether planning authorities could specify that particular residents would not be eligible for parking permits. It was also noted that the proposals were considered to be well designed, with refuse areas in the correct locations, separate access to each rear garden area and an appropriate layout.

A Member raised concerns with regard to parking difficulties in Gordon Road and the parking that Rabbsfarm Primary School generated.

The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

> RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the deletion of condition number 7 of the report.
41. ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 15)

Resolved: That:

## 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.

2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and
6a of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

| 42. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 16) <br> Resolved: That: <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report <br> was agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the <br> reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for <br> the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the <br> individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to <br> reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals <br> that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by <br> virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority <br> believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the <br> public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and <br> 6a of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to <br> Information) Act 1985 as amended). <br> 43. <br> ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 17) <br> Resolved: That: <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report <br> was agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the <br> reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for <br> the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the <br> individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to <br> reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals <br> that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by <br> virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority <br> believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the <br> public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and <br> 6a of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to <br> Information) Act 1985 as amended). <br>  <br> The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.20 pm. |
| :--- | :--- |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Public Document Pack 

## Minutes

CENTRAL \& SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
28 June 2016

Hilling Don LONDON

Meeting held at Committee Room 5-Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

|  | Committee Members Present: <br> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar AhmadWallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Brian Stead, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Peter Curling and John Oswell <br> LBH Officers Present: <br> Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Meghji Hirani (Planning Team Leader), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Jyoti Mehta (Legal Advisor), Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 44. | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1) <br> Apologies were received from Cllrs Duncan and Khatra, who were substituted by Cllrs Curling and Oswell. |
| 45. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (Agenda Item 2) <br> None. |
| 46. | MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (Agenda Item 4) <br> None. |
| 47. | TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (Agenda Item 5) <br> It was confirmed that items marked Part I would be considered in public, and items marked Part II would be considered in private. |
| 48. | 57 MONEY LANE - 62525/APP/2016/333 (Agenda Item 6) <br> Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum. <br> A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following points: <br> - The petition represented over 50 residents concerned about the proposal. <br> - The area was a flood risk zone, and gardens often flooded due to the proximity of the River Fray, sometimes for several days at a time. The petitioner indicated images of recent flooding which had been submitted to the Committee. The new building would further reduce drainage, and impact houses at a lower level. <br> - The proposal was in a conservation area, and would not be in keeping with nearby properties. The placement of the extension meant that gaps between houses would be greatly reduced, and look more like terracing. |

- The application sought permission for a double garage, linked to the applicant's business activities and would in fact encourage more cars. Parking was already highly problematic, and a residents permit system was being sought.

In response to a Member question, the proximity of a water as seen from a bird's-eyeview was indicated to the Committee. The petitioner noted that though there was a culvert, water simply lay on top of this and did not flow away.

A Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following points:

- The application is for a substantial development, and was to occupy an area currently used as a soakaway. This was highly problematic in an area deemed at the highest risk of flooding.
- Flooding had occurred even in the past few days, and due to a high water table did not flow away. The flood risk assessments highlighted a new soakaway at the same level as the river, which would be ineffective in heavy rain.
- Council policy had previously not supported development in areas where flooding had been less likely.

A Member clarified that the proposed extension was to be built on an area of grass, and that the new soakaway was placed at a lower level. Members discussed concerns relating to flooding evidence, the high water table, and the efficacy of proposed flood alleviation. Members concluded that they lacked sufficient information to make a decision on the application on the basis of concerns regarding flooding.

Members enquired about how the development adhered to conservation guidance, to which officers responded that this was only guidance, and taking all the elements into consideration they had deemed it acceptable. The Chairman noted that there was the precedent for a tall single-storey extension on the property adjacent, and that there was not agreement for refusal on this ground.

Members concluded that there was insufficient information to address the concerns raised about flooding. It was suggested that the application be deferred to allow for further clarification from the Council's Flood and Water Management Officer as to how they reached their view that the flood mitigation measures suggested were acceptable.

A motion for deferral was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

## Resolved:

- That the item was deferred.

49. LORDS BUILDERS MERCHANTS - 43554/APP/2016/916 (Agenda Item 7)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

## Resolved:

- That the application was approved.

|  | Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed. <br> Resolved: <br> - That the application was refused. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 51. | 24 FLORISTON AVENUE - 63065/APP/2016/1302 (Agenda Item 9) <br> Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed. <br> Resolved: <br> - That the application was approved. |
| 52. | LAND AT 186 GROSVENOR CRESCENT - 70396/APP/2016/815 (Agenda Item 10) <br> Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed. <br> Resolved: <br> - That the application was approved. |
| 53. | 141 NORTH HYDE ROAD - 14727/APP/2016/1183 (Agenda Item 11) <br> Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed. <br> Resolved: <br> - That the application was approved. |
| 54. | 40 STATION ROAD, COWLEY - 58093/APP/2016/1583 (Agenda Item 12) <br> Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed. <br> Resolved: <br> - That the application was approved. |
| 55. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 13) <br> Resolved: <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. |


|  | 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended). |
| :---: | :---: |
| 56. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 14) <br> Resolved: <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended). |
| 57. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 15) <br> Resolved: <br> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended). |
| 58. | ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 16) <br> Resolved: |


| 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was <br> agreed. <br> 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it <br> outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing <br> the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <br> This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the <br> identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority <br> proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which <br> requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in <br> withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt <br> information under paragraphs 2 and $6(a)$ of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local <br> Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended). <br> The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm , closed at 7.56 pm. |
| :--- | :--- |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Alex Quayle on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.
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## Agenda Item 6

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

Address $\quad 14$ MOORFIELD ROAD COWLEY
Development: $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conversion of existing dwelling into } 2 \times 2 \text {-bed self contained dwellings with } \\ & \text { associated amenity space }\end{aligned}$
LBH Ref Nos: 69313/APP/2016/1283

Drawing Nos: M PA 06 Rev. A
M PA 04 Rev. A
M PA 05 Rev. A
Flood Risk Assessment

Date Plans Received: 01/04/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 05/04/2016

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 2-bed self contained dwellings with associated amenity space.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in principle given that the principle of additional dwellings within the flood plain would fail to meet the Sequential Test for such development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework as stated in Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies. Furthermore, the proposal fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision which meets the Council's approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety, contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted car parking standards.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

## 1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed additional dwelling within the flood plain would fail to meet the Sequential Test for such development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and has not provided evidence of a site search demonstrating that this is the only suitable site and has failed to assess the associated safety implications for persons at risk. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies OE7 and OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2015), the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance.

## 2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision which meets the Council's approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking, in an area where such
parking is at a premium, to the detriment of public and highway safety and is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), the Councils adopted car parking standards and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

## INFORMATIVES

## $1 \quad$ 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).

## $2 \quad 153 \quad$ 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.
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.
H4 Mix of housing units
OE7 Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures
OE8 Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures
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
LPP 3.3 (2015) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4 (2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5 (2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8 (2015) Housing Choice
LPP 5.12 (2015) Flood risk management
LPP 5.13 (2015) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.15 (2015) Water use and supplies
LPP 7.2 (2015) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4 (2015) Local character
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6 NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design
NPPF10 NPPF - Meeting challenge of climate change flooding costal

## 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), 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

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. The Council's supports pre-application discussions.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the eastern side of Moorfield Road and is occupied by a detached recently extended property. To the front of the property is a small paved area. At the rear there is a substantial garden (44 metres in length) which backs onto the designated Metropolitan Green Belt and a Nature Conservation Site of Borough Grade II of Local Importance.

No. 16, the neighbouring dwelling to the north is one of a terrace of three Victorian cottages, each with an L-shaped footprint and set within a narrow plot. The neighbouring property to the south (No. 12) is one of a pair of unaltered semi-detached inter-war period dwellings.

The surrounding area is primarily residential in character comprising of a mix of housing types including several bungalows, semi-detached and terraced two-storey dwellings. The application site thus forms part of the Developed Area of the Borough as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan. Most of the site and the road lies within Flood Zones $2 / 3$ of the River Pinn which flows to the south.

The site is also located within an area covered by an Article 4 Direction that removes permitted development rights for the conversion of residential properties to Houses in Multiple Occupation without planning consent.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of existing dwelling into $2 \times 2$ bed self contained dwellings with associated amenity space.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

69313/APP/2013/1907 14 Moorfield Road Cowley
$2 \times$ single storey side extensions (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision: 27-08-2013 Refused Appeal: 23-05-2014 Allowed

69313/APP/2014/1561 14 Moorfield Road Cowley
Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a gym/store (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision: 02-07-2014 Approved

69313/APP/2014/2213 14 Moorfield Road Cowley
$2 x$ two storey, 3-bed semi detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space to include the installation of bin stores to sides involving demolition of existing bungalow.

Decision: 29-01-2015 Refused

69313/APP/2015/3137 14 Moorfield Road Cowley
First floor extension to side and alterations to elevations
Decision: 06-01-2016 Approved

69313/APP/2015/669 14 Moorfield Road Cowley
Raising of roof to create first floor
Decision: 21-04-2015 Approved

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

The following planning history is considered to be of relevance to this application:-
69313/APP/2015/3137 - First floor extension to side and alterations to elevations. Approved and recently implemented.

69313/APP/2015/669 for the raising of the roof to create first floor accommodation was approved by Committee and has been implemented.

69313/APP/2014/2213) $2 \times$ two storey, 3-bed semi detached dwellings with associated parking - refused 30-01-2015 for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed additional dwellings within the flood plain would fail to meet the Sequential Test for such development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and would also be likely to impede the flow of flood water and reduce the flood plain storage capacity of the River Pinn, increasing the risk of local flooding with associated safety implications for persons at risk. In particular the use of flood voids in the design of the dwellings is not considered to be an acceptable form of flood mitigation. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies
(November 2012), Policies OE7 and OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) and Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2011).
2. The proposals do not include features to ensure that the accommodation is accessible to disabled and wheelchair bound persons. As such the proposal fails to meet all of the Lifetime Homes criteria and is thus contrary to Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (July 2011), to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.
3. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that sufficient off street parking provision which meets the Council's approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings will be provided, due to the size of the proposed parking spaces. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking, in an area where such parking is at a premium, to the detriment of public and highway safety and is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), the Council's adopted car parking standards and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

34264/APP/2012/1322-3x two storey, 3-bed terrace dwellings with habitable roofspace including associated parking and amenity space - refused 05-09-2012).

## 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.EM6 (2012) Flood Risk Management
Part 2 Policies:
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.
H4 Mix of housing units
OE7 Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures

OE8 Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures
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
LPP 3.3 (2015) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4 (2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5 (2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8 (2015) Housing Choice
LPP 5.12 (2015) Flood risk management
LPP 5.13 (2015) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.15 (2015) Water use and supplies
LPP 7.2 (2015) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4 (2015) Local character
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6 NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design
NPPF10 NPPF - Meeting challenge of climate change flooding costal

## 5. Advertisement and Site Notice

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

## 6. Consultations

## External Consultees

8 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 7.4.16 and a site notice was displayed to the front of the site which expired on 9.5.16.

Three responses and a petition have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. Inadequate parking.
2. Flood risk.
3. Over-development.
4. If the application is approved a condition should be imposed to secure the removal of permitted development rights.

## Internal Consultees

Floodwater Management Officer:
I object to the proposed development, as no justification has been provided as to why this development should be sited in an area with a high probability of flooding - Flood Zone3b, 3a and
flood Zone 2. The Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment has not demonstrated that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

Fluvial Flood Flood Risk

## Sequential Test

No justification has been provided as to why this development should be sited in an area with a high probability of flooding.

The site is shown to be within flood zone 3 and the National Planning Policy Framework on page 23 states:
'Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere'

The Council needs to be assured that if they are placing new development in areas of flood risk, then there must be an appropriate reason. This development will introduce a new dwelling, into an area with a high probability of flooding.

The Council has to be able to accept that the benefits of the development outweigh this risk by determining there is no available land at a lower risk of flooding. It is for the applicant to satisfy the Council as to why this new house should be located in this area. Without suitable evidence the Council should look to alternative sites at a lower risk to fulfil its housing needs. The majority of the Borough is outside of flood zones 2 and 3, including its main centres. The Council's housing land studies suggest that there are many locations across the Borough not at risk of flooding.

To overcome the objection the applicant will need to demonstrate that there is clear justification for developing this area ahead of sites at a lower risk of flooding. This being the only site owned, is not suitable justification for putting people and property at risk of flooding.

## Exception Test

The applicant must demonstrate that flood risk can be suitably mitigated in accordance with the NPPF and Policy EM6 of the Local Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework states:

For the Exception Test to be passed:

- it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared; and
- a site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

Both elements of the test will have to be passed for development to be allocated or permitted.
A site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted dated 30th May 2016 produced by Three Counties Flood Risk Assessments. This confirms the site is at risk from fluvial flooding. However makes no detailed assessment of the risks to the site, or from the proposed development, or makes any recommendations to mitigate those risks which have been taken account of within the planning proposals.

The FRA refers to modelled levels but does not include them in the assessment.
The FRA uses a screen shot of the Environment Agency Website to demonstrate risk, which is clearly marked not to be used for a site specific flood risk assessment.

The National Planning Policy Framework also states that it should be demonstrated:
'development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including by emergency planning; and it gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems. 21

This proposal separating the dwelling into a second property on this site introduces separate residents into an area of significant risk. People returning to their homes may be inclined to navigate flood waters, or seek to retrieve flooded property (e.g. a vehicle) placing themselves at risk, and putting added burden on emergency services, and there is no assessment of the access and escape routes within this application.

The proposals have not considered flood resistance, as proposed finished floor levels of the development appear to be at ground level, meaning residents and their property would be at risk from flooding into the property.

Surface Water
Note: The development should also demonstrate the use of methods to minimise the use of potable water, including water saving measures and equipment, water collection facilities to capture excess rainwater. As well as the use of sustainable drainage methods on the site.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

I object to the proposed development as the application does not demonstrate that it is appropriate in location and that flood risk is suitably mitigated as required by Policy EM6 in Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies (Nov 2012), Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2015), National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Statement 25 Technical Note.

Landscape Officer: No objection subject to Landscape Conditions.
Access Officer: No objection

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The application site is located within Flood Zone 3a, 3b and 2 (Functional Floodplain of the nearby River Pinn). According to table 2 of the Planning Practice Guidance 'residential development is defined as more vulnerable use. In Table 3 more vulnerable development is not permitted in Flood Zone 3b. For these reasons the principle of additional dwellings in this location is unacceptable. The proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies OE7 and OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2015), the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

The London Plan (2015) in Table 3.2 suggests that an appropriate residential density for this site which has a PTAL score of 2 and a suburban setting would range from 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare ( $\mathrm{hr} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and 40-80 units per hectare ( $\mathrm{u} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) for units with a
typical size of 3.1-3.7 habitable rooms per unit (hr/u). The Council's HDAS: Residential Layouts further advises that larger rooms over 20sqm and capable of subdivision should be counted as 2 rooms.

The scheme equates to a density of $22 \mathrm{u} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $100 \mathrm{hr} / \mathrm{ha}$ which is below with the Mayor's guidance. However, density guidelines are of limited use on small infill sites as it will be more important to ensure that the scheme successfully harmonises with its neighbours whilst still affording appropriate living conditions for its future occupants. This is dealt with in other relevant sections of this report.

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

Not applicable to this application.

### 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) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. Furthermore policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development which would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

The proposal does not involve any extensions to the already extended building. External alterations include the bricking up of one first floor rear facing window, the insertion of an additional rear facing first floor window to serve a landing and the addition of a further entrance door to the front. The alterations are not considered to have a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the site or the surrounding area in compliance with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seeks to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents in a number of ways. The effect of the siting, bulk and proximity of a new building on the outlook and residential amenity of these adjoining occupiers are considered under Policy BE20, whilst potential impacts on daylight/sunlight (Policy BE21) and privacy (Policy BE24) are also assessed.

Paragraph 4.9 of the SPD, HDAS: Residential Layouts further advises that all residential developments and amenity spaces should receive adequate daylight and sunlight and that new development should be designed to minimise the negative impact of overbearing and overshadowing. It goes on to advise that 'where a two storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible domination'. Generally, 15 m will be the minimum acceptable distance between buildings. Furthermore a minimum of 21 m overlooking distance should be maintained.

The proposal does not involve any extensions to the extended dwelling. The alteration to the first floor fenestration are not considered to give rise to an unacceptable loss of light, outlook or privacy to occupants of adjacent dwellings. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development in
compliance with Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

On 25 March 2015, the Government introduced new technical housing standards in England, which comprise of new additional 'optional' Building Regulations on water and access, and a nationally described space standard (referred to as "the new national technical standards"). These new standards came into effect on 1 October 2015. The Mayor of London has adopted the new national technical standards through a minor alteration to The London Plan.

The Housing Standards (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) March 2016 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. A two bedroom (4 person) dwelling is required to provide an internal floor area of 79 m 2 . At an internal floor area of 88 m 2 and 117 m 2 respectively, the proposal would comply with the Housing Standards.

The proposal would provide substantial private rear gardens of 350 square metres which would be in excess of the required level of outdoor amenity space in accordance with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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

The application site is located in an area which has a PTAL value of 2 (poor) which indicates the level of reliance on private vehicles for trip making. The original dwelling is served by two off street parking spaces, one within the garage and one on a driveway to the side. The current proposal indicates that a new fire wall would be erected within the integral garage, which would reduce the width of this parking space to 2.75 m (rather than the 3 m wide space originally approved which complied with the Council's parking standards). The second space on the side driveway would measure 2.5 m in width. Only one of the parking spaces for the proposed two dwelling units would therefore comply with the Council's parking standards. It is considered that the provision of just one parking spaces to serve 2 x two bedroom properties, where the requirement is for 2 spaces per dwelling, would result in an unacceptable increased demand for on street parking in the locality, where there is already a high demand for such parking.

The proposed development, therefore fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision which meets the councils approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety and is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Councils adopted car parking standards.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

These issues are covered in other sections of the report.

### 7.12 Disabled access

A previous scheme on this site (reference 69313/APP/2014/2213) for $2 x$ two storey, 3-bed semi detached dwellings was refused (in part) because the proposals did not include features to ensure that the accommodation is accessible to disabled and wheelchair bound persons. This previous design was however very different to that currently under consideration as it had a raised floor level and a void below the building to mitigate against flooding.

The Council's Access Officer has not raised any objection to the current proposal which does not have a raised floor level.

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

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

Saved policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate.

No trees or other landscape features of merit will be affected by the proposal. The Council's Landscape Officer has raised no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of landscape conditions to secure additional landscaping at the site. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with Policy BE38 of the Hilligndon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

Provision for the siting of suitable refuse storage facilities could be made the subject of conditions if the application was considered acceptable in all other respects.

### 7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The site falls within Flood Zone 3b (Functional Floodplain of the nearby River Pinn. According to table 2 of the Planning Practice Guidance 'residential development is defined as more vulnerable use. In Table 3 more vulnerable development is not permitted in Flood Zone 3b.

Policy EM6 of the Local Plan requires that all proposals for new development within Flood Zones 3 should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment that provides evidence of the Sequential Test for such development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy OE7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan states that in areas liable to flooding, planning permission will not be granted for new development without flood protection measures (in consultation with the Environment Agency). In addition, permission will not be granted for development which would result in an increased flood risk due to additional surface water run off unless attenuation measures (Policy OE8).

A flood risk assessment has been submitted throughout the course of the application which shows that the site is at risk from fluvial flooding. However, it makes no detailed assessment of the risks to the site, or from the proposed development, or makes any recommendations to mitigate those risks which have been taken account of within the planning proposals. No evidence has been provided that such development could not take place elsewhere outside of the flood plain or that it can otherwise be treated as an exception and therefore the proposal fails to meet this general test. The Council has to be able to accept that the benefits of the development outweigh this risk by determining there is no available land at a lower risk of flooding. It is for the applicant to satisfy the Council as to why a new development should be located in this area. Without suitable evidence the Council should look to alternative sites at a lower risk to fulfil its housing needs. The majority of the Borough is outside of flood zones 2 and 3 , including its main centres. The Council's housing land studies suggest that there are many locations across the Borough not at risk of flooding.

To overcome the objection the applicant would need to demonstrate that there is clear justification for developing this area ahead of sites at a lower risk of flooding. The Floodwater management Officer has further advised that the submitted Flood Risk

Assessment does not meet the requirements of a site specific flood risk assessment and does not include a detailed assessment of the risk to and from the site. It also does not demonstrate that the proposal does not increase the flood risk to the surrounding area and in accordance with the requirements of the exception test reduce that risk as well as managing the flood risk to the property.

The applicant has not provided any evidence of a Sequential Test as required by the National Planning Policy Framework and has not provided evidence of a site search demonstrating that this is the only suitable site. The proposal has also failed to assess the associated safety implications for persons at risk. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies OE7 and OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2015), the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance.

### 7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The comments received are addressed in the sections above.

### 7.20 Planning obligations

The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule was adopted on 1st August 2014. The additional habitable floor space created will be chargeable at $£ 95$ per square metre.

On the 1st April 2012 the Mayoral Community Structure Levy came into force. The London Borough of Hillingdon falls within Charging Zone 2, therefore, a flat rate fee of $£ 35$ per square metre would be required for each net additional square metre added to the site as part of the development.
7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.
7.22 Other Issues

No other issues raised.

## 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
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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 proposal is considered unacceptable in principle given that the principle of additional dwellings within the flood plain would fail to meet the Sequential Test for such development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework as stated in Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies. Furthermore, the proposal fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision which meets the councils approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety, contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Councils adopted car parking standards

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

# 11. Reference Documents <br> Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) <br> Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) <br> The London Plan (2015) <br> The Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016) <br> Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) <br> Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts <br> Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon <br> National Planning Policy Framework 
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## Agenda Item 7

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

```
Address EASYHOTEL HEATHROW BRICKFIELD LANE HARLINGTON
Development: Change of use from Use Class B1 (former mini cab/chauffeurs office) to Use
    Class C1 (Hotel) (Retrospective)
LBH Ref Nos: 18/APP/2016/1416
Drawing Nos: T406-0
    T406-11
    Location Plan (1:1250)
    T406-07
    T406-08
    T406-09
    Technical Transport Note
    Covering Letter/Statement (Ref: A093244/SM/sm)
```

Date Plans Received: 11/04/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 20/04/2016

## 1. SUMMARY

The proposal seeks retrospective change of use of a former mini/cab chauffeurs office to hotel use. There is no specific planning permission or Certificate of Lawfulness relating to the building or its former use, although there is evidence held by and accepted in writing by the Council that the building is lawful by reason of the passing of time and that the former use was taking place more than 10 years ago, but has now ceased. Given this position, it is reasonable to consider the acceptability of the change of use. The site is within the Green Belt and re-use of buildings can be considered to be not inappropriate provided they are of permanent and substantial construction and preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. No other harm has been identified. It is considered that the requirements for re-use are met and that planning permission can be granted.
2. RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL subject to the following:

## 1 NONSC Non Standard Condition

Within 3 months of the date of this permission or within a time frame otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the applicant shall carry out and submit details of a landfill gas survey for the ground at the development site. If landfill gas is found the applicant shall install remediation measures to prevent gas ingress to the building which shall be retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The Councils records show that the development site is adjacent to a landfill. A gas survey is required to clarify the gas issues to determine the remedial works which may be required, in accordance with Policy OE11 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012)

## INFORMATIVES

1 I52
Compulsory Informative (1)
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The decision to GRANT 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 GRANT 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.

| OL1 | Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development |
| :---: | :---: |
| OL4 | Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings |
| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| BE13 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene. |
| BE15 | Alterations and extensions to existing buildings |
| BE20 | Daylight and sunlight considerations. |
| BE21 | Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions. |
| BE24 | Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours. |
| T2 | Location of tourist accommodation and conference facilities |
| T4 | Hotels, guest houses and other tourist accommodation - location, amenity and parking requirements |
| LPP 7.16 | (2015) Green Belt |
| NPPF1 | NPPF - Delivering sustainable development |
| NPPF9 | NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land |
| 3159 | 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

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. The Council's supports pre-application discussions.

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to the Easy Hotel, located on Brickfield Lane, Harlington. The application property has been in use as a hotel since planning permission for a change of
use was granted in the 1960's, and has become part of the 'Easy Hotel' franchise over 8 years ago. The application property is two storey with single storey extensions.

The hotel building is located to the eastern side of the application site, with the remainder of the application site laid to hard-standing, providing off-street parking provision for approximately 100 cars. The subject building is in the south-east corner of the site.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the change of use of the building from its previous use as a mini cab/chauffeurs office to hotel use (Use Class C1). The building for which the change of use is sought is single storeyand located in the far south eastern corner of the site. The building was formerly used as a minicab/chauffeurs office prior to being incorporated as part of the hotel. The building has been the subject of internal refurbishment and rearrangement to provide hotel accommodation. This accommodation consists of 11 en-suite bed rooms, a linen room and circulation space.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

18/AC/90/1186 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
Continued use of mini cab business (Appeal against enforcement notice; application for Plannin Permission deemed to have been made pursuant to Section 88 of the Town \& Country Planning Act 1971)

Decision: 06-11-1990 Withdrawn Appeal: 06-11-1990

18/ADV/2008/118 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
1 internally illuminated box sign to the side, 1 externally illuminated wall sign, 1 externally illuminated totem pole advert at the front entrance and 1 externally illuminated canopy sign.

Decision: 21-01-2009 SD

18/APP/2002/250 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
ERECTION OF A WOODEN OFFICE STRUCTURE TO REPLACE A DERELICT PORTACABII (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

Decision: 26-08-2008 NFA

18/APP/2002/457 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
CHANGE OF USE TO CHAUFFEUR OFFICE
Decision: 04-08-2008 NFA

18/APP/2005/522 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY HOTEL WITH LOWER GROUND FLOOR AND CAR PARKIN (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOTEL AND OFFICE)

Decision: 10-05-2005 Refused
18/APP/2006/117 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
ERECTION OF A NEW 74-BEDROOM HOTEL WITH UNDERGROUND CAR PARKING
(INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOTEL BUILDINGS).

Decision: 13-04-2006 Refused Appeal: 25-01-2007 Dismissed
18/APP/2008/513 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY BEDROOM BLOCK TO THE NORTH END OF THE SITE
CONTAINING 15 BEDROOMS, OPERATIONAL AREAS FOR THE HOTEL AND A CENTRAL
COURTYARD AREA TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF A 5M WIND TURBINE ON A 9M
HIGH MAST ADJACENT TO THE CAR PARK (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING
BEDROOM ANNEX).

Decision: 27-10-2008 Withdrawn

18/APP/2016/1414 Easyhotel Heathrow Brickfield Lane Harlington
Rear infill extension (Retrospective)

## Decision:

18/PRC/2015/185 Easyhotel Heathrow Brickfield Lane Harlington
Regularisation of extension to existing hotel
Decision: 19-01-2016 OBJ

18/PRE/2003/92 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
T P PRE-CORRES: REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE

## Decision:

18/PRE/2005/137 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
T P PRE - CORRES: DEVELOPMENT OF SITE

## Decision:

18/X/85/1258
Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
Established use certificate (P)
Decision: 15-10-1987 Refused

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

The building for which the change of use is now sought has been the subject of a number of planning applications:

- 18/APP/2002/250 was a retrospective planning application for the retention of an office building. The Council determined to take 'no further action' in relation to the application and
identified in correspondence dated 26 August 2008, that the building in question was lawful and that the authorised use of the building was as part of the hotel complex (Use Class C1) and invited the submission of an LDC.
- 18/APP/2002/457 was a planning application for the change of use of the building to a chauffeurs office. Again the Council determined to take 'no further action' in relation to the application.
- Subsequent applications relating to the wider hotel site have identified the presence of the building, as a mini-cab office, including a 2006 planning appeal and a planning application in 2008 (Ref:18/APP/2008/513).

Based on the planning history, it is clear therefore that the Council has accepted that the single storey building, the subject of this change of use application, is lawful and has been on the site for in excess of 14 years.

## 4. Planning Policies and Standards

The site is within the Green Belt. Policy EM2 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to maintain the current extent, hierarchy and strategic functions of the Green Belt. Any proposals for development in the Green Belt will be assessed against national and London Plan policies. Saved policy OL1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 endorses both national and London Plan Guidance. Policy OL1 states 'Within the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map, the following predominantly open land uses will be acceptable:

- Agriculture, horticulture, forestry and nature conservation;
- Open air recreational facilities
- Cemeteries

Policy 7.16 of the London Plan states that the Mayor supports the current extent of London's Green Belt and its protection from inappropriate development. The strongest protection should be given to London's Green Belt, in accordance with national guidance.

Paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF give clear policy guidance on the functions the Green Belt performs, its key characteristics, acceptable uses and how its boundaries should be altered. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF states that certain (other) forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. This includes the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.

The main issue is considered to be whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including its effect upon its openness, for the purposes of the NPPF.

## 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.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

## Part 2 Policies:

OL1 Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development
OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
AM14 New development and car parking standards.
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
T2 Location of tourist accommodation and conference facilities
T4 Hotels, guest houses and other tourist accommodation - location, amenity and parking requirements
LPP 7.16 (2015) Green Belt
NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF9 NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land

## 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 consulted on 14/04/2016 and a site notice was displayed from 19/04/2016. One objection was received from the Harlington Conservation Area Advisory Panel as follows:

This hotel has expanded enormously over the years, converting many outbuildings to hotel accommodation, with most of these changes appearing to lack planning permission. The two current applications are the latest in this string of extensions which are all prejudicial to the openness of the Green Belt and could be deemed to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. We therefore hope that permission for these extensions will not be granted. While visiting the site we noted a further recent development. The land that makes up the western portion of the site was originally grass and trees (see aerial photo on p. 3 of 'Infill Building Planning Statement April 2016' submitted with these planning applications) but is now a continuous sheet of concrete used for additional car parking. This appears to be run as an additional business, alongside the hotel, as the parking signs give instructions on how to pay if you are not a hotel resident. This is an additional change of use that is also inappropriate in the Green Belt, so we hope appropriate enforcement action will be taken.

BAA Safeguarding: No objection

## Internal Consultees

Highways Officer: No objection.
Environmental Protection Unit: Advises that the site is close to a former landfill site and requests a precautionary condition.

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The issue of the principle of development is interlinked with the location of the site within the Green Belt and thus is discussed in detail in Section 7.05.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

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

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.04 Airport safeguarding

BAA Safeguarding has no objections

### 7.05 Impact on the green belt

The site is within the Green Belt. Policy EM2 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to maintain the current extent, hierarchy and strategic functions of the Green Belt. Any proposals for development in the Green Belt will be assessed against national and London Plan policies. Saved policy OL1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 endorses both national and London Plan Guidance. Policy OL1 states 'Within the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map, the following predominantly open land uses will be acceptable:

- Agriculture, horticulture, forestry and nature conservation;
- Open air recreational facilities
- Cemeteries

Policy 7.16 of the London Plan states that the Mayor supports the current extent of London's Green Belt and its protection from inappropriate development. The strongest protection should be given to London's Green Belt, in accordance with national guidance.

Paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF give clear policy guidance on the functions the Green Belt performs, its key characteristics, acceptable uses and how its boundaries should be altered. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF states that certain (other) forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. This includes the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.

The main issue is considered to be whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including its effect upon its openness, for the purposes of the NPPF.

Whilst no Certificate of Lawful Existing Development has been obtained, there is considerable evidence that the Council has informally accepted that the building has been present on the site for in excess of four years, that the building has previously been in use as a mini cab/chauffeurs office for a period in excess of 10 years and is of permanent and substantial construction. There is limited information available prior to the change of use, however, the applicant describes the alterations to convert it to hotel use as largely internal in nature. Since the mini cab/chauffeurs office use has now ceased the application for use as part of the hotel is retrospective. In considering this proposal, it is necessary to consider whether the change of use will:

- Preserve the openness of the Green Belt; and
- Not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

Turning to the openness of the Green Belt, it is clear that the change of use will not result in
any increase in physical development from that already present on site. It is retrospective but based on available evidence no external changes as a result of the re-use have impacted on the openness of the Green Belt.

The change of use must also be considered in terms of the nature of the use and whether the change could have any impact in terms of intensity of use. In regard to traffic implications the submitted Transport Note assesses the likely impact on vehicle numbers accessing the site. This concludes that the likely number of traffic movements associated with the hotel use would be no more than that assessed with the former minicab/chauffeurs office.

It is considered that the proposal is not inappropriate development for the purposes of paragraph 90 of the NPPF because it involves the re-use of a building of permanent and substantial construction, is not harmful to the openness of the are and is not at odds with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Given this, it is not necessary to consider whether very special circumstances exist that weigh in favour of the development being permitted. It is, thus considered that the development is acceptable in principle and in terms of its impact on the Green Belt and is thus compliant with Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policy OL1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

The change of use is considered to have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the area.

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

The building in question is remote from any residential neighbours. The proposal is a change of use with no external changes and the development therefore is not considered to result in any harmful impact upon the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of a material loss of outlook, loss of daylight, over-shadowing or over-dominance. The development would therefore be acceptable in respect to Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to this application.

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

The Highways and Traffic Officer has no objections. The site has an extensive open car park. It is controlled by a payment system. The change of use does not result in additional traffic implications. No adverse issues arise and the development is considered to comply with policies AM7 and AM14.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

Urban design issues are discussed in other sections of this report.
With regard to security, there is CCTV on the site, the extension to the hotel can only be reached via the main reception and it backs onto open land where there is a security fence. Thus no adverse issues arise.

### 7.12 Disabled access

The application building is accessed via the main reception where there is level wheelchair accessible access and the extension to the hotel is linked internally and to the same overall standard.

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

Not applicable to this application.
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### 7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

No trees, landscape or ecological considerations arise.

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

The extension utilises the existing hotel facilities and no additional issues are raised.

### 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 objectors comments have been noted. In response, the agent confirms "that having spoken with our client, there are no other uses being operated from the site. Our client has confirmed that all car parking at the site is associated with the use of the hotel."

The site operates as a hotel under the 'Easy Hotel' franchise. The site provides overnight accommodation for customers and if they require it, a "stay, park \& fly" facility. This provides extended parking for customers of the hotel only. This is an ancillary offer and is common place at hotel sites around airports.

### 7.20 Planning obligations

Not applicable to this application.
7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

An objector has raised an issue relating to non-hotel activities operating on the site. The applicant has responded that no other activities are taking place.

If the Committee are mindful to refuse the application, it would remain that the development would be unauthorised. It is anticipated that the applicant will appeal against such a decision. However, the Council would need to consider whether formal enforcement action needs to be taken
7.22 Other Issues

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

Not applicable to this application.

## 10. CONCLUSION

The proposal seeks retrospective change of use of a former mini/cab chauffeurs office to hotel use. There is no specific planning permission or Certificate of Lawfulness relating to the building or its former use, although there is evidence held by and accepted in writing by the Council that the building is lawful by reason of the passing of time and that the former use was taking place more than 10 years ago, but has now ceased. Given this position, it is reasonable to consider the acceptability of the change of use. The site is within the Green Belt and re-use of buildings can be considered to be not inappropriate provided they are of permanent and substantial construction and preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. No other harm has been identified. It is considered that the requirements for re-use are met and that
planning permission can be granted.
11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan; Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
The London Plan (2015)
The London Plan 2015 Minor Alterations Parking Standards (March 2016)
National Planning Policy Framework
Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster
Telephone No: 01895250230


## Agenda Item 8

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

| Address | EASYHOTEL HEATHROW BRICKFIELD LANE HARLINGTON |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Rear infill extension (Retrospective) |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $18 /$ APP/2016/1414 |
|  |  |
| Drawing Nos: | T406-07 |
|  | T406-08 |
|  | T406-09 |
|  | T406-10 |
|  | T406-11 |
|  | Technical Transport Note |
|  | Planning Statement |
|  | Location Plan (1:1250) |

Date Plans Received: 11/04/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 11/04/2016

1. SUMMARY

The proposal is a retrospective application for a rear infill extension. The site is within the Green Belt. The development is considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building which reduces the openness of the Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate development. In such cases 'very special circumstances' must be demonstrated in order to justify a development. No 'very special circumstances' have been demonstrated. It is thus recommended that the application be refused.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:
1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal
The development represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been provided or are evident which either singularly or cumulatively overcome the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Polices OL1 and OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## INFORMATIVES

$1 \quad 152 \quad$ 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
153
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.

| OL1 | Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new <br> development |
| :--- | :--- |
| OL4 | Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings |
| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| BE13 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene. |
| BE15 | Alterations and extensions to existing buildings |
| BE18 | Design considerations - pedestrian security and safety |
| BE20 | Daylight and sunlight considerations. |
| BE21 | Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions. |
| BE24 | Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to <br> neighbours. |
| T2 | Location of tourist accommodation and conference facilities <br> T4 |
|  | Hotels, guest houses and other tourist accommodation - location, |
| LPP 7.16 | amenity and parking requirements |
| (2015) Green Belt |  |
| NPPF1 | NPPF - Delivering sustainable development |
| NPPF7 | NPPF - Requiring good design |
| NPP5 | NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land |

## $3 \quad 159 \quad$ 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

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. The Council's supports pre-application discussions.

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to the Easy Hotel, located on Brickfield Lane, Harlington. The application property has been in use as a hotel since planning permission for a change of
use was granted in the 1960's, and has become part of the 'Easy Hotel' franchise over 8 years ago. The application property is two storey with single storey extensions.

The hotel building is located to the eastern side of the application site, with the remainder of the application site laid to hard-standing, providing off-street parking provision for approximately 100 cars.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

Retrospective planning permission is sought for the infill building which functions as a link block between the hotel buildings on site. The infill building provides 5 en-suite bedrooms and a corridor linking the main hotel to the former mini-cab/chauffeurs office building which also now forms part of the hotel and which is subject of a separate application, also on this agenda.

The building for which retrospective permission is sought is in the south-east part of the site where it adjoins the main hotel building. The infill building is a single storey timber clad building with a flat roof designed to match the adjoining structure to the south. It is rectangular in shape, approximately 14.5 m long $\times 6.5 \mathrm{~m}$ wide $\times 3 \mathrm{~m}$ in height and has a total floor area in the order of 94sq m .

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

18/AC/90/1186 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
Continued use of mini cab business (Appeal against enforcement notice; application for Plannin Permission deemed to have been made pursuant to Section 88 of the Town \& Country Planning Act 1971)

Decision: 06-11-1990 Withdrawn Appeal: 06-11-1990

18/ADV/2008/118 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
1 internally illuminated box sign to the side, 1 externally illuminated wall sign, 1 externally illuminated totem pole advert at the front entrance and 1 externally illuminated canopy sign.

Decision: 21-01-2009 SD

18/APP/2002/250 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
ERECTION OF A WOODEN OFFICE STRUCTURE TO REPLACE A DERELICT PORTACABIr (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

Decision: 26-08-2008 NFA

18/APP/2002/457 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
CHANGE OF USE TO CHAUFFEUR OFFICE
Decision: 04-08-2008 NFA

18/APP/2005/522 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY HOTEL WITH LOWER GROUND FLOOR AND CAR PARKIN (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOTEL AND OFFICE)
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## 18/APP/2006/117 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington

ERECTION OF A NEW 74-BEDROOM HOTEL WITH UNDERGROUND CAR PARKING (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOTEL BUILDINGS).

Decision: 13-04-2006 Refused Appeal: 25-01-2007 Dismissed

## 18/APP/2008/513 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington

 ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY BEDROOM BLOCK TO THE NORTH END OF THE SITE CONTAINING 15 BEDROOMS, OPERATIONAL AREAS FOR THE HOTEL AND A CENTRAL COURTYARD AREA TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF A 5M WIND TURBINE ON A 9M HIGH MAST ADJACENT TO THE CAR PARK (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BEDROOM ANNEX).Decision: 27-10-2008 Withdrawn

18/APP/2016/1416 Easyhotel Heathrow Brickfield Lane Harlington Change of use from Use Class B1 (former mini cab/chauffeurs office) to Use Class C1 (Hotel) (Retrospective)

## Decision:

18/PRC/2015/185 Easyhotel Heathrow Brickfield Lane Harlington
Regularisation of extension to existing hotel
Decision: 19-01-2016 OBJ

18/PRE/2003/92 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
T P PRE-CORRES: REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE

## Decision:

18/PRE/2005/137 Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
T P PRE - CORRES: DEVELOPMENT OF SITE
Decision:

18/W/84/0810
Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
Householder dev. (small extension,garage etc) (P)
Decision: 09-07-1984 Approved

18/X/85/1258
Garth Hotel Brickfield Lane Harlington
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Established use certificate (P)
Decision: 15-10-1987 Refused

## Comment on Relevant Planning History 18/APP/2008/513

Sought planning permission for single storey block to the north of the application property. This application was withdrawn. This application confirmed the presence of outbuildings on the part of the site subject to the current application but gave no specific details.

18/APP/2006/117

This application was refused and dismissed at appeal. Within the Inspector's decision letter, paragraph 5 acknowledges that the 'single-storey extensions to the hotel have been on site for so long that they would be likely to obtain a certificate of lawful development'.

This however does not apply to the infill structure for which the applicant has not sought to demonstrate lawfulness. The key issue, however, is that the original building on site has been extended previously. Therefore, whilst the applicant's supporting statement and subsequent discussion indicates that the proposal is limited infill and is therefore appropriate development, the starting point should be, as policy requires, the original building not the current structures less the application proposals.

18/APP/2005/522

This application sought planning permission for a two storey hotel with lower ground floor. This application was refused, however the 'Existing Plans' submitted, indicate the use of a structure as a 'Mini Cab Office'. This building is now subject to a separate application (18/APP/2016/1416) also on this agenda.

18/APP/2002/250

This application sought retrospective planning permission for the erection of a wooden office structure to replace a derelict portacabin. This application was concluded in 2008, which a decision notice being issued which stated; 'it is considered likely that the office structure and fence were erected more than 4 years ago.... Therefore No Further Action will be taken on application 18/APP/2002/250'.

The applicants sought pre-application advice in respect of the current development (Reference 18/PRC/2015/185). The conclusion of this was that it was likely that an application for the proposals now before Committee would be refused.

## 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.T4 (2012) Heathrow Airport
PT1.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains
Part 2 Policies:
OL1 Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development
OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
AM14 New development and car parking standards.
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE18 Design considerations - pedestrian security and safety
BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
T2 Location of tourist accommodation and conference facilities
T4 Hotels, guest houses and other tourist accommodation-location, amenity and parking requirements
LPP 7.16 (2015) Green Belt
NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design
NPPF9 NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land

## 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 consulted on 14/04/2016 and a site notice was displayed from 19/04/2016. One objection was received from the Harlington Conservation Area Advisory Panel as follows:

This hotel has expanded enormously over the years, converting many outbuildings to hotel accommodation, with most of these changes appearing to lack planning permission. The two current applications are the latest in this string of extensions which are all prejudicial to the openness of the Green Belt and could be deemed to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. We therefore hope that permission for these extensions will not be granted. While visiting the site we noted a further recent development. The land that makes up the western portion of the site was originally grass and trees (see aerial photo on p. 3 of 'Infill Building Planning Statement April 2016' submitted with these planning applications) but is now a continuous sheet of concrete used for additional car parking. This appears to be run as an additional business, alongside the hotel, as the
parking signs give instructions on how to pay if you are not a hotel resident. This is an additional change of use that is also inappropriate in the Green Belt, so we hope appropriate enforcement action will be taken.

BAA Safeguarding: No objection

## Internal Consultees

Highways Officer: No objection
Environmental Protection Uniy: No objection

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The issue of the principle of development is interlinked with the location of the site within the Green Belt and thus is discussed in detail in Section 7.05.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

Not applicable to this application.

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

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.04 Airport safeguarding

The BAA Safeguarding Manager has confirmed no objections.

### 7.05 Impact on the green belt

The site is within the Green Belt. Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (November 2012), states that the Council will seek to maintain the current extent, hierarchy and strategic functions of the Green Belt. Any proposals for development in the Green Belt will be assessed against national and London Plan policies. Policy OL1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) endorses both national and London Plan policies. Policy OL1 states:
'Within the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map, the following predominantly open land uses will be acceptable:

- Agriculture, horticulture, forestry and nature conservation;
- Open air recreational facilities
- Cemeteries

Policy OL1 also acknowledges that the scale of buildings within the Green Belt will be kept to a minimum in order to protect the visual amenity of the Green Belt.

Buildings within the Green Belt should accord with Policy OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) states:

The Local Planning Authority will only permit the replacement or extension of buildings within the Green Belt if:
(i) The development would not result in any disproportionate change in the bulk and character of the original building;
(ii) The development would not significantly increase the built up appearance of the site;
(iii) Having regard to the character of the surrounding area the development would not injure the visual amenities of the Green Belt by reason of siting, materials, design, traffic or activities generated.

Policy 7.16 of the London Plan states that the Mayor supports the current extent of

London's Green Belt and, inter-alia, its protection from inappropriate development. The strongest protection should be given to London's Green Belt, in accordance with national guidance.

Paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF give clear policy guidance on the functions the Green Belt performs, its key characteristics, acceptable uses and how its boundaries should be altered. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states, inter-alia, that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The sixth bullet point of paragraph 89 states that one exception to inappropriate development is 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment or previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.'

The applicant has sought to make a case based on a modest increase in floorspace and limited infill compared to that existing on site, whereas the Green Belt policy position is based on an increase from the 'original' building. This matter was considered in the appeal decision referred to in the planning history above and in the applicants supporting statement. In the appeal, both parties agreed that previous extensions could probably be confirmed as established through Certificates of Lawful existing development. This is not the case with the current proposal, hence the planning application seeking to regularise matters. The appeal decision referred to in the planning history suggests that the original building was in the order of 356 m 2 and that there was 1423 m 2 on site at the time. The extension, subject of this application adds another 94sqm. Whilst this would be a modest increase over the existing building, it is a substantial increase over the original building which is the starting point for assessing development in the Green Belt.

As it stood, prior to the construction of the infill extension and informally agreed by both the applicant and the Council in references within the planning history (no Certificate of Lawful Existing Development has been sought), this part of the site contained mobile structures, namely a caravan and portable building. The Council's aerial photograph for the site, dated 2012 appears to indicate individual structures whilst that for 2015 appears to show the subject in-fill building. It is therefore a recent construction.

Both of the former structures would constitute a use of the land as opposed to a permanent building. Temporary buildings are excluded from the definition of previously developed land in the NPPF. Whilst the structures appear to have been there for some time, they have not been established as a lawful use of the land.

It is concluded that the development is a disproportionate addition for which 'very special circumstances would be needed in order to justify the development. Since the applicant has sought to advance a case that the development is not inappropriate 'very special circumstances' have not been sought to be demonstrated in any structured way.

In terms of the visual amenities of the Green Belt, it is acknowledged that the application site is situated in a position which is not visible from the street scene or any public place, or is in close proximity to surrounding residential or other properties. It is largely hidden by a 2 metre high wooden fence.

The essential characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness and permanence. The applicant refers to 'perceived' openness and refers to the limited visibility and presence of a
fence. 'Openness' is not a function of visibility but of reduction in the amount of open Green Belt land and there is no policy reference either at NPPF or local policy level to perceived openness. In this regard, in terms of openness the location of the extension behind a fence line is not a relevant consideration. Aerial photographs of the site demonstrate that the previous structures on this part of the site were much smaller than the current development and were not linked to the existing buildings. Therefore, in determining this application, little material weight should be given to their presence.

The development does reduce the openness of the Green Belt and this must be viewed in the context of a cumulative reduction in openness as a result of extensions over and above the original building for which permission has not been obtained.

The development is an extension of the existing hotel facilities and shares its services with the main hotel including refuse disposal. The harm associated with this development is to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriate development. The development is inappropriate and in the absence of any 'very special circumstances' being advanced, it is considered that the development is unacceptable in principle and due to its impact on the Green Belt and is thus contrary to Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Polices OL1 and OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
7.07 Impact on the character \& appearance of the area

The development reduces the openness of the Green Belt, which is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt and is discussed in detail in Section 7.05. It cannot be seen from any public highway and is therefore not injurious to the visual amenity of the street scene.

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

The extension to the hotel is not in close proximity to any of the surrounding properties within Brickfield Lane, and the development therefore is not viewed to result in any harmful impact upon the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of a material loss of outlook, loss of daylight, over-shadowing or over-dominance. The development would therefore be acceptable in respect to Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to this application.

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

The Highways and Traffic Officer has no objections. The site has an extensive open car park. It is controlled by a payment system. No adverse issues arise and the development is considered to comply with policy AM14.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

Urban design issues are discussed in other sections of this report.
With regard to security, there is CCTV on the site, the extension can only be reached via the main reception and it backs onto open land where there is a security fence. Thus no adverse issues arise.

### 7.12 Disabled access

The hotel has a level access and internal door suitable for wheelchair access. The extension is linked internally and to the same overall standard.

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

Not applicable to this application.
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### 7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

No trees, landscaping or ecological issues arise.

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

The extension utilises the existing hotel facilities and no additional issues are raised

### 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 objectors comments have been noted. In response, the agent confirms "that having spoken with our client, there are no other uses being operated from the site. Our client has confirmed that all car parking at the site is associated with the use of the hotel."

The site operates as a hotel under the 'Easy Hotel' franchise. The site provides overnight accommodation for customers and if they require it, a "stay, park \& fly" facility. This provides extended parking for customers of the hotel only. This is an ancillary offer and is common place at hotel sites around airports.

### 7.20 Planning obligations

Not applicable to this application.
7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

An objector has raised an issue relating to non-hotel activities operating on the site. The applicant has responded that no other activities are taking place.

If the Committee are mindful to refuse the application, it would remain that the development would be unauthorised. It is anticipated that the applicant will appeal against the decision. However, the Council would need to consider whether formal enforcement action needs to be taken.
7.22 Other Issues

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

Not applicable to this application.

## 10. CONCLUSION

The proposal is a retrospective application for a rear infill extension. The site is within the Green Belt. The development is considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building which reduces the openness of the Green Belt and is therefore inappropriate development. In such cases 'very special circumstances' must be demonstrated in order to justify a development. No 'very special circumstances' have been demonstrated. It is thus recommended that the application be refused.

## 11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan; Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

The London Plan (2015)
The London Plan 2015 Minor Alterations Parking Standards (March 2016)
National Planning Policy Framework
Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster
Telephone No: 01895250230
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## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces



## 1. CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached property located on Long Lane. The external walls of the property are covered by a traditional hipped roof. The area to the front of the property, within the curtilage of the dwelling, is covered in hardstanding and provides space to park 2 vehicles.

The site is located in a developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the change of use of existing outbuilding to rear, from a games room to a bedroom and storage area ancillary to the main dwelling.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

230/APP/2005/2017 128 Long Lane Hillingdon
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION
Decision Date: 16-09-2005 Approved Appeal:
230/APP/2005/40 128 Long Lane Hillingdon
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ATTACHED GARAGE)

Decision Date: 17-02-2005
Refused

## Appeal:

230/APP/2008/1025 128 Long Lane Hillingdon
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY OUTBUILDING TO THE REAR GARDEN FOR USE AS A GAMES ROOM (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT).

Decision Date: 22-05-2008 GPD Appeal:
230/APP/2009/1952 128 Long Lane Hillingdon
Conservatory to rear (Retrospective Application).
Decision Date: 02-11-2009 Refused Appeal:02-JUN-10 Dismissed
230/APP/2015/4518 128 Long Lane Hillingdon
Change of use of existing outbuilding to rear from a games room to a bedroom and storage area ancillary to the main dwelling (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 22-02-2016 Refused Appeal:

## Comment on Planning History

The property had a Certificate of Lawful Development Application, reference number: 230/APP/2015/4518 for a change of use of existing outbuilding to rear from a games room to a bedroom and storage area ancillary to the main dwelling.

The application was refused, as Class E does not permit the erection of outbuildings for use as additional residential accommodation of the sort that would normally be found in a house. This is because, to be an incidental use, it must be a use that is not ordinarily required for day to day domestic existence, such as a games/hobby room or home office. The proposed use to incorporate a bedroom and wash facilities that would provide for additional residential accommodation was not considered incidental to the use of the dwellinghouse.
2. Advertisement and Site Notice
2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 3. Comments on Public Consultations

A total of 4 neighbouring occupiers, were consulted on the application on 21st April 2016. By the close of the consultation period on 12th May 2016, no objections were received.

Ward Councillor: Requests that the application is reported to 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:
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.
HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, 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 visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property.

Paragraph 9.3 of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extensions, in relation to the provision of new outbuildings in the rear garden states:
"bulk, height, proportion, floor space, building materials and details of windows and door are the design criteria that will be considered. The external materials should be similar to the ones used in the rear of the existing house. If a ridged roof is proposed, the ridge should not be higher than 4 m . For all other types of roof, the roof should not be higher than 3 m . Windows must only be placed on the elevation facing the owner's main house and in no other walls".

The existing outbuilding is situated to the rear most part of the applicant's rear garden, and is approximately 8.5 m wide and 5.33 m in depth. The outbuilding has a gable end roof which is approximately 4.5 m in height. The outbuilding has a door and 2 windows on the front elevation. No external changes to the existing outbuilding are proposed.

Paragraph 9.4 of the SPD states:
"The outbuilding must only be used for normal domestic uses related to the residential use of the main house. These uses include parking your car, storing your possessions, use as a children's playroom, green house, garden shed, gym, summerhouse and hobby room, provided it is ancillary to the use of the main house. The outbuilding cannot be used as a separate business unit or as a self contained residential unit, as these could lead to a number of privacy, overlooking, noise and disturbance problems".

The application seeks to change the use of the existing outbuilding from a games/storage room to a bedroom and storage area. The plans show that the outbuilding will be divided into a storage and bedroom and will also include a shower room.

Although the proposal includes both a bedroom and shower room, it is not considered to result in a self contained residential unit, as the outbuilding does not contain a kitchen or living area. Furthermore the outbuilding will not have independent access, as the only access to the outbuilding is via the main dwelling. Given this situation, it would be difficult to argue that the proposed change of use of the existing outbuilding would not be an ancillary
use to the main dwelling, particularly as the main dwelling will be relied upon for cooking and general living purposes. A restrictive condition is recommended to ensure this relationship is maintained and that the use of unit remains as proposed.

The outbuilding is located over 15 m from the rear of the adjoining dwellings and would not result in any undue impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance.

The existing windows and door on the front elevation of the outbuilding will remain in place, and will not overlook into any neighbouring properties, as they face the rear elevation of the main dwelling. Therefore the proposed outbuilding will not cause any issues regarding overlooking or breach of privacy to any neighbouring properties.

Paragraph 4.9 of the SPD states, that "sufficient garden space should be retained as a consequence of an extension. For a 4 or more bedroom house at least 100 square metres of private usable garden space should be retained".

The amount of private rear garden space that will be retained will remain the same, which is approximately $139 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$. Therefore the proposed development complies with the above, as well as Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Having taken everything into consideration, it is recommended that this application be approved.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL subject to the following:

## 1 HO1 Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON
To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2 HO2 Accordance with approved
The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers LON 30/3 and LON 30/4.

REASON
To ensure the development complies with the provisions of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the London Plan (2015).

## 3 NONSC Non Standard Condition

The outbuilding hereby approved shall only be used for the purpose(s) stated on the application form and approved drawings and shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 128 Long Lane, Hillingdon and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation or for any business
purposes. Furthermore, no internal partitioning or sub-division shall take place and no kitchen facilities shall be installed within the building.

## REASON

To avoid any future fragmentation of the curtilage or the creation of a separate residential or business use, so as to protect the amenity of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## 4 NONSC Non Standard Condition

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no further development falling within Class E of Part 1 Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out.

REASON
To avoid an overdevelopment of the site and to protect the amenity of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy BE13, BE15, BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## INFORMATIVES

1 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.

## Standard Informatives

1 The decision to GRANT 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 GRANT 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:
$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { BE13 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { New development must harmonise with the existing street } \\ \text { scene. }\end{array} \\ \text { BE15 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Alterations and extensions to existing buildings }\end{array} \\ \text { BE19 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { New development must improve or complement the character of } \\ \text { the area. }\end{array} \\ \text { BE20 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Daylight and sunlight considerations. }\end{array} \\ \text { BE21 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions. } \\ \text { BE23 }\end{array} \\ \text { Requires the provision of adequate amenity space. }\end{array}\right\}$

3 You are advised this permission is based on the dimensions provided on the approved drawings as numbered above. The development hereby approved must be constructed precisely in accordance with the approved drawings. Any deviation from these drawings requires the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

4 You are advised that if any part of the development hereby permitted encroaches by either its roof, walls, eaves, gutters, or foundations, then a new planning application will have to be submitted. This planning permission is not valid for a development that results in any form of encroachment.

5 Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Building Regulations, the Building Acts and other related legislation. These cover such works as - the demolition of existing buildings, the erection of a new building or structure, the extension or alteration to a building, change of use of buildings, installation of services, underpinning works, and fire safety/means of escape works. Notice of intention to demolish existing buildings must be given to the Council's Building Control Service at least 6 weeks before work starts. A completed application form together with detailed plans must be submitted for approval before any building work is commenced. For further information and advice, contact - Planning, Enviroment and Community Services, Building Control, 3N/01 Civic Centre, Uxbridge (Telephone 01895 250804 / 805 / 808).

6 You have been granted planning permission to build a residential extension. When undertaking demolition and/or building work, please be considerate to your neighbours and do not undertake work in the early morning or late at night or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Furthermore, please ensure that all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved
are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway. You are advised that the Council does have formal powers to control noise and nuisance under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other relevant legislation. For further information and advice, please contact - Environmental Protection Unit, 4W/04, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel. 01895 250190).

7 The Party Wall Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify, and obtain formal agreement from, any adjoining owner, where the building owner proposes to:

- carry out work to an existing party wall;
- build on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
- in some circumstances, carry out groundworks within 6 metres of an adjoining building.
Notification and agreements under this Act are the responsibility of the building owner and are quite separate from Building Regulations, or Planning Controls. The Building Control Service will assume that an applicant has obtained any necessary agreements with the adjoining owner, and nothing said or implied by the Council should be taken as removing the necessity for the building owner to comply fully with the Party Wall Act. Further information and advice is to be found in "the Party Walls etc. Act 1996 - explanatory booklet" published by the ODPM, available free of charge from the Planning, Enviroment and Community Services Reception, Civic Centre, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW.

8 Your attention is drawn to the fact that the planning permission does not override property rights and any ancient rights of light that may exist. This permission does not empower you to enter onto land not in your ownership without the specific consent of the owner. If you require further information or advice, you should consult a solicitor.
$9 \quad$ Nuisance from demolition and construction works is subject to control under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other related legislation. In particular, you should ensure that the following are complied with: -
A) Demolition and construction works should only be carried out between the hours of 08.00 hours and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays Bank and Public Holidays.
B) All noise generated during such works should be controlled in compliance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228: 1984.
C) The elimination of the release of dust or odours that could create a public health nuisance.
D) No bonfires that create dark smoke or nuisance to local residents.

You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Protection Unit, 3S/02, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel. 01895 277401) or to seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the normal working hours set out in $(A)$ above, and by means that would minimise disturbance to
adjoining premises.
You are advised that care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to avoid spillage of mud, soil or related building materials onto the pavement or public highway. You are further advised that failure to take appropriate steps to avoid spillage or adequately clear it away could result in action being taken under the Highways Act.

11 To promote the development of sustainable building design and construction methods, you are encouraged to investigate the use of renewable energy resources which do not produce any extra carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, including solar, geothermal and fuel cell systems, and use of high quality insulation.

12 You are advised that care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense. For further information and advice contact - Highways Maintenance Operations, Central Depot - Block K, Harlington Road Depot, 128 Harlington Road, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB3 3EU (Tel: 01895 277524).

Telephone No: 01895250230
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## Agenda Item 10

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

| Address | EURO GARAGES HEATHROW NORTH SHEPISTON LANE HAYES |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Installation of 1 internally illuminated ATM sign |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 17981/ADV/2016/46 |
| Drawing Nos: | Design and Access Statement <br> NM-07-2015-81-01 <br> NM-07-2015-81-02 <br> Location Plan (1:1250) <br> Block Plan (1:500) |
|  |  |

## 1. CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1 Site and Locality

The site lies on the south side of Shepiston Lane opposite Cherry Lane Cemetery and just to the north of the M4 motorway and comprises a petrol filling station and ancillary facilities. The site is within the Green Belt.

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is a retrospective application for the installation of an internally illuminated ATM sign which sits over the ATM which is in a housing for which a separate planning application has been made. The advertisement comprises white internally illuminated lettering on a black background and an ATM surround with blue LED halo illumination.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

17981/APP/2016/1404 Euro Garages Heathrow North Shepiston Lane Hayes Installation of ATM (Restrospective)

Decision Date:

## Appeal:

## Comment on Planning History

A concurrent application for planning permission for the installation of the ATM is also on this agenda (Reference no. 17981/APP/2016/1404).
2. Advertisement and Site Notice
2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable
3. Comments on Public Consultations

1 adjoining neighbour consulted via letter dated 26/04/2016 and a site notice was displayec
on 28/04/2016. No comments or objections received.
Heathrow Aerodrome Safeguarding: No comments received.

## 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
PT1.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

Part 2 Policies:
BE27 Advertisements requiring express consent - size, design and location
BE29 Advertisement displays on business premises
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF9 NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land

## 5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

Policy BE27 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two states that advertisements will only be granted express consent if they are at such a size and designed so they compliment the scale, form and architectural composition of individual buildings, they do not harm the visual amenities of the area, and do not compromise public safety. Policy BE29 states that the local planning authority will seek to limit the number of signs and the size of advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety.

Paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment. Control over outdoor advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Only those advertisements which would clearly have an appreciable impact on a building or on their surroundings should be subject to the local planning authority's detailed assessment. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

With regard to public safety, the advertisement is within the body of the site close to the entrance to the shop and paying area. Its purpose is to draw attention to the ATM. The proposal will have no impact on the local highway network. It is located in an area separated from car parking and circulation by bollards. It would not interfere with pedestrian movement. There are no other implications with regard to public safety. Therefore, in this regard, the proposal complies with policies BE27 and BE29 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two.

The sign is relatively small and is well related to the size of the ATM housing. It sits within the body of the site and is located well away from the street. Although there are a number
of other advertisements on the site, this serves a very specific purpose in terms of information and direction. It is low level and softly lit and in the context of the site, has very little impact. It is considered that there would be no significant harm to the character of the area and its impact on the Green Belt would be very limited.

The location, size and low level of illumination means that it is considered that it will not have any adverse impact on public amenity. Therefore the proposal is considered to comply with policies BE27 and BE29 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two.

It is recommended that advertisement consent be given.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

## APPROVAL subject to the following:

## 1 ADVERT1 Standard Condition

i) No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.
ii) No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to:-
(a) Endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);
(b) Obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air or;
(c) Hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.
iii) Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.
iv) Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.
v) Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.
vi) The consent hereby granted shall expire at the end of a period of five years from the date of this consent.

REASON
These requirements are deemed to be attached by Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

## INFORMATIVES

1 The decision to GRANT advertisement consent 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 GRANT advertisement consent 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.

BE27 Advertisements requiring express consent - size, design and location
BE29 Advertisement displays on business premises
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF9 NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land
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), 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.

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster
Telephone No: 01895250230


## Notes: <br> 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:

## Euro Garages Heathrow North Shepiston

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Application Ref: 17981/ADV/2016/46 | Scale: 1:3,500 |  |  |
| Planning Committee: | Date: |  |  |
| Central \& Soutage 87 | July 2016 |  |  |
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## Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | EURO GARAGES HEATHROW NORTH SHEPISTON LANE HAYES |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Installation of ATM (Restrospective) |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 17981/APP/2016/1404 |
| Drawing Nos: $\quad$NM-07-2015-81-01 <br> NM-07-2015-81-02 <br> Location Plan (1:1250) <br> Design and Access Statement <br> Block Plan (1:500) |  |
| Date Plans Received: $\quad$ 11/04/2016 $\quad$ Date(s) of Amendment(s): |  |
| Date Application Valid: 22/04/2016 |  |

## 1. SUMMARY

The proposal is a retrospective application for the installation of an ATM. The site is within the Green Belt. The development is considered not to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and does not materially reduce the openness of the Green Belt or harm its visual amenities. No other harms arise from the development and it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL subject to the following:

## 1 COM4 Accordance with Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be retained in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, number NM-07-2015-81-02.

REASON
To ensure the development complies with the provisions Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the London Plan (2015).

## INFORMATIVES

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

The decision to GRANT 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 GRANT 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. <br> AM13 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people <br> and people with disabilities in development schemes through (where <br> appropriate): - <br> (i) Dial-a-ride and mobility bus services <br> (ii) Shopmobility schemes <br> (iii) Convenient parking spaces <br> (iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street <br> furniture schemes |
|  | New development and car parking standards. |
| Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new |  |
| AM14 | development |
| Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings |  |

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The site lies on the south side of Shepiston Lane opposite Cherry Lane Cemetery and just to the north of the M4 motorway and comprises a petrol filling station and ancillary facilities. The site is within the Green Belt.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is a retrospective proposal for the installation of an ATM. It replaced an existing ATM which was located to the side of the building. The original structure was approximately 1 metre wide by 1 metre deep and 2 metres high. The ATM is housed in a simple metal box structure 2.1 metres high, 1.2 metres wide and 2.2 metres deep and painted in an off-white colour. It sits under the canopy of the main retail and paying area associated with the site. The ATM itself is 0.9 metres from ground level. It is within a pedestrianised area with level access to the ATM. Security bollards have been installed around the machine. These both protect members of the public from vehicular movement and are a security measure against 'ram-raiding'.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

17981/ADV/2016/46 Euro Garages Heathrow North Shepiston Lane Hayes

Installation of 1 internally illuminated ATM sign

## Decision:

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

There is a concurrent application for an illuminated advertisement for the ATM is also on this agenda (Reference No. 17981/ADV/2016/46).

## 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.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

Part 2 Policies:
AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM13 AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people and people witt disabilities in development schemes through (where appropriate): -
(i) Dial-a-ride and mobility bus services
(ii) Shopmobility schemes
(iii) Convenient parking spaces
(iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street furniture schemes

AM14 New development and car parking standards.
OL1 Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development
OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
LDF-AH Accessible Hillingdon, Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010
NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design
NPPF9 NPPF - Protecting Green Belt land
5. Advertisement and Site Notice
5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable
6. Consultations

## External Consultees

1 adjoining neighbour consulted via letter dated 26/04/2016 and a site notice was displayed on

Heathrow Aerodrome Safeguarding: No comments received.

## Internal Consultees

Trees and Landscape Officer: There is a TPO on the land, reference 549. However, no trees are affected by the proposal.

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The principle of extending existing buildings in the Green Belt is acceptable, subject to their impact on the openness of the Green Belt and its visual amenities. These issues are discussed in Section 7.05.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

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

Not applicable to this application.
7.04 Airport safeguarding

No issues arise

### 7.05 Impact on the green belt

The site within the Metropolitan Green Belt as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF give clear policy guidance on the functions the Green Belt performs, its key characteristics, acceptable uses and how its boundaries should be altered. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states, inter-alia, that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate provided that it does not result disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

Policy 7.16 of the London Plan states that the Mayor supports the current extent of London's Green Belt and, inter-alia, its protection from inappropriate development. The strongest protection should be given to London's Green Belt, in accordance with national guidance.

Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that the Council will seek to maintain the current extent, hierarchy and strategic functions of the Green Belt. Any proposals for development in the Green Belt will be assessed against national and London Plan policies.

Policy OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two states that:
The local planning authority will only permit the replacement or extension of buildings within the green belt if:
(i) the development would not result in any disproportionate change in the bulk and character of the original building;
(ii) the development would not significantly increase the built up appearance of the site;
(iii) having regard to the character of the surrounding area the development would not injure the visual amenities of the green belt by reason of siting, materials, design, traffic or activities generated

As stated above, the principle of extending existing buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate development and thus the the main issues for determination are whether the
proposal would result in a disproportionate change in the bulk and character of the original building, whether it would significantly increase the built up appearance of the site and whether it would injure the visual amenities of the Green Belt.

In consideration of theses issues it should be noted that the development replaces a structure measuring 1 metre wide $\times 1$ metre deep $\times 2$ metres high with one which is 1.2 metres wide $\times 2.2$ metres deep $\times 2.1$ metres high. The structure has been increased minimally in terms of its width and height and whilst there is a greater increase in its depth, its location under the canopy of the main building and the fact it has been painted in an offwhite colour to match the building means that its impact on the Green Belt would be very limited. The development is thus, not considered to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and does not materially reduce the openness of the Green Belt or harm its visual amenities.

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

The proposal is a small addition to the building which sits beneath the existing canopy and does not spread the built form beyond the existing developed area of the site. It has very low visual impact when viewed from outside.
7.08 Impact on neighbours

There are no residential neighbours. There is a hotel to the west, the M4 motorway to the south, open land to the east and a cemetery to the north The ATM has an extremely low visual impact and as there are no dwellings in close proximity no adverse impact on residential neighbours will arise.
7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to this application.
7.10 Traffic impact, Car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two considers traffic generation of new development particularly with regard to highway and pedestrian safety. The ATM is part of the overall complex of petrol filling station and facilities. Whilst it can be accessed and used separately from the petrol related facilities, there is a large area of off-street parking and the use is unlikely to have any material impact on local traffic. In terms of pedestrian safety, the ATM is in a part of the site associated with pedestrian activity. Bollards have been provided which separate the ATM from vehicular movement. The ATM has level access which allows for use by people with disabilities. No adverse traffic or pedestrian safety issues arise and the development is considered to comply with policy AM7.

Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two states the need for all development to comply with the Council's adopted parking standards. The ATM is within the body of the site which includes off-street parking. The proposal is not considered to require additional car parking. Whilst it can be separately accessed, it is likely that much of its use will come from motorists purchasing fuel or other goods on the site. No adverse issues arise and the proposal is considered to comply with Policy AM14.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

The ATM and housing is located against the existing main building on the site and under its canopy. It is a simple off-white metal structure with a flat roof. The main building is a modern flat-roofed structure. Its size is limited in relation to the overall scale of development on site and thus its visual impact is considered acceptable. The issues of access and security have been considered in other parts of this report.

### 7.12 Disabled access

There is level access to the ATM which is designed to be accessible to wheelchair users.
7.13 Provision of affordable \& special needs housing

Central \& South Planning Committee - 20th July 2016
PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC \& PRESS

Not applicable to this application.

### 7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

No trees, landscaping or ecological considerations arise

### 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

No consultation responses were received.
7.20 Planning obligations

Not applicable to this application.
7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

This is a retrospective application and in the event of refusal enforcement action would need to be considered.
7.22 Other Issues

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

Not applicable to this application.

## 10. CONCLUSION

The proposal is a retrospective application for installation for an ATM. The site is within the Green Belt. The development is considered not to be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and does not materially reduce the openness of the Green Belt or harm its visual amenities. No other harms arise from the development and it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

## 11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) The London Plan (2015)
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster
Telephone No: 01895250230


## Notes: <br> 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:

## Euro Garages Heathrow North Shepiston

## Planning Application Ref:

 17981/APP/2016/1404Planning Committee:
Central \& Soptage 96
July 2016

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON
Residents Services
Planning Section
Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111

## Agenda Item 12

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

| Address | NANAKSAR PRIMARY SCHOOL SPRINGFIELD ROAD HAYES |
| :---: | :---: |
| Development: | Variation of conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref: 4450/APP/2014/1427 dated 16/06/14 (Provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, substation, car/cycle parking, new access arrangements and ancillary development on existing school site) to extend the use until 31st August 2017. |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 4450/APP/2016/1928 |
| Drawing Nos: | Updated Transport Assessment, prepared by Intermodal Transportation dated May 2016 <br> Travel Plan Update, dated May 2016 <br> P01315-P651 Rev. C (Proposed Site Plan) <br> Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by WML Consulting dated April 2013 <br> L4121/02 (Tree Protection Plan- Temporary Unit) <br> Tree Survey V02, prepared by Ecus dated May 201: <br> Design and Access Statement Rev.B, prepared by Blue Sky dated 04/04/14 <br> P01315-P105 Rev. A (Plans \& Elevations) <br> P01315-P106 Rev. B (Plans \& Elevations) <br> P01315-P107 (Plans \& Elevations) <br> P01315-P108 (Existing \& Proposed Gate Elevations) <br> P01315-P109 (Proposed Sub-Station Plan and Elevations) <br> Preliminary Ground Gas Risk Assessment, prepared by WML Consulting dated 26/07/13 <br> Phase 1 Desk Study and Preliminary Geoenvironmental Assessment, prepared by WML Conuslting dated April 2013 <br> P01315-P650 Rev. A (Site Location Plan) <br> Letter dated 20/05/16 from Cushman \& Wakefield |

Date Plans Received: 20/05/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 31/05/2016

## 1. SUMMARY

Planning permission (ref: 4450/APP/2013/1227) was granted on the 28 June 2013 for the provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, a substation, car and cycle parking, new access arrangements and ancillary development, on land at Guru Nanak Sikh Academy. At that time, temporary planning permission was granted for 12 months.

The temporary units were required to accommodate up to 120 primary school pupils whilst proposals for a new permanent primary school, which would be associated with the existing Guru Nanak Sikh Academy, were progressed. The primary school, which opened in the temporary accommodation in September 2013 is known as Nanaksar Primary School.

Following delays in the progression of a scheme for permanent classroom provision planning permission (ref: 4450/APP/2014/1427) was subsequently granted for the
retention of the accommodation for a further two years, expiring on the 31st August 2016.
This application seeks to vary conditions 1 and 2 of the second planning permission (ref: 4450/APP/2014/1427) to allow the retention of the accommodation for a further year until 31st August 2017. The applicant has advised that there are currently 120 pupils in the temporary accommodation and a further 100 children who occupy other buildings on the wider secondary school site. This was originally intended to be a temporary solution to accommodation needs to serve the primary school until the end of the 2015/2016 academic year. However, due to a variety of issues, the permanent school building will not be progressed within the intended time frame and there is therefore a need to retain the temporary accommodation for a further year.

As part of the Hillingdon Primary Capital Schools Programme the Council has already expanded and/or redeveloped numerous schools across the borough. It has also built three new primary schools. However, notwithstanding this, pressure for school places remains within the Hayes area. Officer's in the Council's Education Team have verbally advised that if the temporary accommodation could not be retained on this site that the Council would need to find places in its existing schools for the current 120 pupils on roll. Accordingly, from an educational perspective, there is a significant need for the accommodation in this location.

The proposal complies with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), London Plan policy 3.18 and UDP policy R10, which seek to encourage the provision of new and/or enhanced educational facilities. Furthermore, it is considered that very special circumstances exist, sufficient to justify an exception to Green Belt policy.

It is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the school site or on the openness of the Green Belt in this location. Furthermore, it is not considered that it would lead to such a significant increase in traffic that refusal could be justified on highway grounds. The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Local Plan and London Plan policies and, accordingly, approval is recommended.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

## APPROVAL subject to the following:

## 1 T4 Temporary Building - Removal and Reinstatement

The building hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 31/08/17.

## REASON

To reflect the end of the academic year and because the building, by reason of its temporary design and its location in the Green Belt is not considered suitable for permanent retention in compliance with Policies OL1, OL2, BE13 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## 2 T6 Temporary Use - Discontinuance

The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued on or before 31/08/17.

## REASON

It is not considered appropriate to grant a permanent permission for the use until its effect on the amenities of the locality has been assessed in compliance with Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) .

## 3 COM4 Accordance with Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers P01315-P650 Rev. A, P01315-P651 Rev. C, P01315-P105 Rev. A, P01315-P106 Rev. B, P01315-P107, P01315-P108, P01315-P109 and L4121/02, as approved by planning permission ref: 4450/APP/2014/1427, and shall thereafter be retained/maintained for as long as the development remains in existence.

REASON
To ensure the development complies with the provisions of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the London Plan (2015).

## 4 COM5 General compliance with supporting documentation

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the following specified supporting plans and/or documents:

Tree Survey (revision V02) prepared by Ecus dated May 2013;
Updated Transport Assessment, prepared by Intermodal Transportation dated May 2016; Travel Plan Update, dated May 2016.

Thereafter the development shall be retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.

REASON
To ensure that the development complies with the objectives the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the London Plan (2015).

## $5 \quad \mathrm{HO} 4 \quad$ Materials

The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those shown on drawing nos. P01315-P105 Rev. A, P01315-P106 Rev. B, P01315-P107 and P01315-P109 and shall thereafter be retained as such.

REASON
To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that the proposed development does not have an adverse effect upon the appearance of the existing building in accordance with Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## 6 COM8 Tree Protection

Fencing to protect the entire root areas/crown spread of trees, hedges and other vegetation to be retained shall be erected prior to the commencement of development. The fencing shall be retained in position until development is completed.

The area within the protective fencing shall remain undisturbed during the course of the works and in particular in these areas:

1. a There shall be no changes in ground levels;
1.b No materials or plant shall be stored;
1.c No buildings or temporary buildings shall be erected or stationed.
1.d No materials or waste shall be burnt; and.
1.e No drain runs or other trenches shall be dug or otherwise created, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON
To ensure that trees and other vegetation can and will be retained on site and not damaged during construction work and to ensure that the development conforms with policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## 7 COM9 Landscaping (car parking \& refuse/cycle storage)

No development approved by this permission shall be carried out otherwise than in accordance with those cycle storage and car parking layout details agreed via planning permission ref: 4450/APP/2014/2725 dated 02/10/14.

## REASON

To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and provide adequate facilities in compliance with policies BE13, BE38 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## 8 NONSC Non Standard Condition

No development approved by this permission shall be carried out otherwise than in accordance with those drop-off/pick-up details and measures agreed via planning permission ref: 4450/APP/2014/2725 dated 02/10/14.

## REASON

In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy AM2 and AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

## $9 \quad$ COM10 Tree to be retained

Trees, hedges and shrubs shown to be retained on the approved plan shall not be damaged, uprooted, felled, lopped or topped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. If any retained tree, hedge or shrub is removed or severely damaged during construction, or is found to be seriously diseased or dying another tree, hedge or shrub shall be planted at the same place or, if planting in the same place would leave the new tree, hedge or shrub susceptible to disease, then the planting should be in a position to be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and shall be of a size and species to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be planted in the first planting season following the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the earlier. Where damage is less severe, a schedule of remedial works necessary to ameliorate the effect of damage by tree surgery, feeding or groundwork shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. New planting should comply with BS 3936 (1992) 'Nursery Stock, Part 1, Specification for Trees and Shrubs' Remedial work should be carried out to BS BS 3998:2010 'Tree work Recommendations' and BS 4428 (1989) 'Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (Excluding Hard Surfaces)'. The agreed work shall be completed in the first planting season following the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the earlier.

## REASON

To ensure that the trees and other vegetation continue to make a valuable contribution to the amenity of the area in accordance with policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and to comply with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

10 N5 Control of noise emission from the site
No development approved by this permission shall be carried out otherwise than in accordance with those noise levels agreed via planning permission ref:

REASON
To safeguard the amenity of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and London Plan (2015) Policy 7.15

## INFORMATIVES

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

The decision to GRANT 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 GRANT 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.

| OL1 | Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new <br> development <br> Green Belt -landscaping improvements |
| :--- | :--- |
| OL2 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene. |
| RE13 | Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of <br> new planting and landscaping in development proposals. <br> Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties <br> and the local area <br> Proposals that would involve the loss of recreational open space <br> Proposals for new meeting halls and buildings for education, social, <br> community and health services <br> Accessibility for elderly people, people with disabilities, women and <br> children |
| OE1 | Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact <br> on congestion and public transport availability and capacity <br> Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments. |
| R10 | Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design <br> of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking <br> facilities |
| R16 AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people |  |
| AM2 | and people with disabilities in development schemes through (where <br> appropriate): - and mobility bus services <br> (i) Dial-a-ride and <br> (ii) Shopmobility schemes |
| AM9 | (iii) Convenient parking spaces <br> (iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street <br> furniture schemes <br> New development and car parking standards. <br> Provision of reserved parking spaces for disabled persons |

LPP 3.18 (2015) Education Facilities
LPP 6.1 (2015) Strategic Approach
LPP 6.3 (2015) Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
LPP 7.16 (2015) Green Belt
LPP 7.2 (2015) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4 (2015) Local character

## $3 \quad$ I1 Building to Approved Drawing

You are advised this permission is based on the dimensions provided on the approved drawings as numbered above. The development hereby approved must be constructed precisely in accordance with the approved drawings. Any deviation from these drawings requires the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

## $4 \quad$ I3 Building Regulations - Demolition and Building Works

Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Building Regulations, the Building Acts and other related legislation. These cover such works as the demolition of existing buildings, the erection of a new building or structure, the extension or alteration to a building, change of use of buildings, installation of services, underpinning works, and fire safety/means of escape works. Notice of intention to demolish existing buildings must be given to the Council's Building Control Service at least 6 weeks before work starts. A completed application form together with detailed plans must be submitted for approval before any building work is commenced. For further information and advice, contact - Residents Services, Building Control, 3N/01 Civic Centre, Uxbridge (Telephone 01895250804 / 805 / 808).

## $5 \quad$ I11 The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994

The development hereby approved may be subject to the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994, which govern health and safety through all stages of a construction project. The regulations require clients (ie. those, including developers, who commision construction projects) to appoint a planning supervisor and principal contractor who are competent and adequately resourced to carry out their health and safety responsibilities. Further information is available from the Health and Safety Executive, Rose Court, 2 Southwark Bridge Road, London, SE1 9HS (telephone 0207556 2100).

## $6 \quad 112 \quad$ Notification to Building Contractors

The applicant/developer should ensure that the site constructor receives copies of all drawings approved and conditions/informatives attached to this planning permission. During building construction the name, address and telephone number of the contractor (including an emergency telephone number) should be clearly displayed on a hoarding visible from outside the site.

## $7 \quad 115 \quad$ Control of Environmental Nuisance from Construction Work

Nuisance from demolition and construction works is subject to control under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other related legislation. In particular, you should ensure that the following are complied with:-
A. Demolition and construction works which are audible at the site boundary shall only be carried out between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
B. All noise generated during such works shall be controlled in compliance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228:2009.
C. Dust emissions shall be controlled in compliance with the Mayor of London's Best Practice Guidance' The Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.
D. No bonfires that create dark smoke or nuisance to local residents.

You are advised to consult the Councils Environmental Protection Unit (www.hillingdon.gov.uk/noise Tel. 01895 250155) or to seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the normal working hours set out in (A) above, and by means that would minimise disturbance to adjoining premises.

## $8 \quad 119 \quad$ Sewerage Connections, Water Pollution etc.

You should contact Thames Water Utilities and the Council's Building Control Service regarding any proposed connection to a public sewer or any other possible impact that the development could have on local foul or surface water sewers, including building over a public sewer. Contact: - The Waste Water Business Manager, Thames Water Utilities plc, Kew Business Centre, Kew Bridge Road, Brentford, Middlesex, TW8 0EE.
Building Control Service - 3N/01, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (tel. 01895250804 / 805 / 808).
$9 \quad$ I34 Building Regulations 'Access to and use of buildings'
Compliance with Building Regulations 'Access to and use of buildings' and Disability Discrimination Act 1995 for commercial and residential development.

You are advised that the scheme is required to comply with either:-

- The Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document Part M 'Access to and use of buildings', or with
- BS 8300:2001 Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people - Code of practice. AMD 15617 2005, AMD 159822005.

These documents (which are for guidance) set minimum standards to allow residents, workers and visitors, regardless of disability, age or gender, to gain access to and within buildings, and to use their facilities and sanitary conveniences.

You may also be required make provisions to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. The Act gives disabled people various rights. Under the Act it is unlawful for employers and persons who provide services to members of the public to discriminate against disabled people by treating them less favourably for any reason related to their disability, or by failing to comply with a duty to provide reasonable adjustments. This duty can require the removal or modification of physical features of buildings provided it is reasonable.

The duty to make reasonable adjustments can be effected by the Building Regulation compliance. For compliance with the DDA please refer to the following guidance: -

- The Disability Discrimination Act 1995. Available to download from www.opsi.gov.uk
- Disability Rights Commission (DRC) Access statements. Achieving an inclusive
environment by ensuring continuity throughout the planning, design and management of building and spaces, 2004. Available to download from www.drc-gb.org.
- Code of practice. Rights of access. Goods, facilities, services and premises. Disability discrimination act 1995, 2002. ISBN 011702860 6. Available to download from www.drc-gb.org.
- Creating an inclusive environment, 2003 \& 2004 - What it means to you. A guide for service providers, 2003. Available to download from www.drc-gb.org.

This is not a comprehensive list of Building Regulations legislation. For further information you should contact Building Control on 01895 250804/5/6.

## 10

The Council will recover from the applicant the cost of highway and footway repairs, including damage to grass verges. Care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense. For further information and advice contact Highways Maintenance Operations, Central Depot - Block K, Harlington Road Depot, 128 Harlington Road, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB3 3EU (Tel: 01895 277524).

## 11

You are advised that the Council's Access Officer has provided the following advice:
a) The Equality Act 2010 seeks to protect people accessing goods, facilities and services from discrimination on the basis of a 'protected characteristic', which includes those with a disability. As part of the Act, service providers are obliged to improve access to and within the structure of their building, particularly in situations wherereasonable adjustment can be incorporated with relative ease. The Act states that service providers should think ahead to take steps to address barriers that impede disabled people.
b) Fixtures, fittings and furnishings, particularly hard materials should be selected to ensure that sound is not adversely reflected. The design of all learning areas should be considerate to the needs of people who are hard of hearing or deaf. Reference should be made to BS 8300:2009, Section 9.1.2, and, BS 223 in selecting an appropriate acoustic absorbency for each surface.
c) Care should be taken to ensure that the internal decoration achieves a Light Reflectance Value (LRV) difference of at least 30 points between floor and walls, ceiling and walls, Including appropriate decor to ensure that doors and door furniture can be easily located by people with reduced vision.
d) Induction loops should be specified to comply with BS 7594 and BS EN 60118-4, and a term contract planned for their maintenance.
e) Care must be taken to ensure that overspill and/or other interference from induction loops in different/adjacent areas does not occur.
f) Flashing beacons/strobe lights linked to the fire alarm should be carefully selected and installed to ensure they remain within the technical thresholds not to adversely affect people with epilepsy.

## 12

You are advised that the proposed pedestrian access gate to the east of the site and close to the Oak tree falls outside the red line application site and, as such, has not been approved planning permission as part of the determination of this application.

You are advised that prior to the submission of an application for permanent development at this site, or at any other site along Beaconsfield Road and/or Springfield Road, that any Transport Assessment submitted in support of that application must include the following:

- Use of speed data to establish the appropriate visibility splay provision at any proposed site access junctions.
- The analysis of speed survey data to determine if traffic calming measures/formal crossings of Springfield Road are necessary for the proposal.
- Consideration of appropriate traffic management measures at the proposal, such as:
the appropriate waiting period in the proposed drop off bays, marshalling of pupil drop-off/ pick-up areas to assist in achieving a quick turn around of vehicles, and the identification of a park and stride point.
- Reassessment of the A4020/Springfield Road signal junction using revised design flows as those used within the current assessment are inappropriate/inaccurate. These flows should be 2018 design flows that are based upon the March 2011 traffic survey and include all relevant committed developments.


## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

Guru Nanak Sikh Academy occupies an approximately 5 hectare irregularly shaped plot located on the southern side of Beaconsfield Road in Hayes. The main school buildings, which vary in height from single-storey to three-storeys, are located towards the north west of the site. A Multi-Use Games Area and playgrounds are located towards the south of the site and to the east of the main school building. Parking is provided along the western boundary. A drop off/pick up point for parents, accessed via Beaconsfield Road, and the school playing field occupy the eastern part of the site.

The school site is bounded to the north by Beaconsfield Road, beyond which are industrial buildings; to the east by Yeading Football Club; and to the south and west by Minet Country Park.

The application site, which forms a part of the wider school site, comprises an area of approximately $1,642 \mathrm{~m} 2$, which formerly accommodated the drop-off/pick-up area and a small part of the playing field.

The entire application site falls within the Green Belt as designated in the Hillingdon Local Plan. Adjoining land to the east, west and south, including that of the main Guru Nanak Sikh Academy site, also falls within the Green Belt. Beaconsfield Road and the area beyond falls within the Springfield Road Industrial and Business Area. The site and surrounding area also falls within the Hayes and West Drayton Corridor.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission (ref: 4450/APP/2013/1227) was granted on the 28 June 2013 for the provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, a substation, car and cycle parking, new access arrangements and ancillary development, on land at Guru Nanak Sikh Academy. At that time, temporary planning permission was granted until 31/08/14.

The temporary units were required to accommodate up to 120 primary school pupils whilst proposals for a new permanent primary school on the site were progressed. The primary school, which opened in the temporary accommodation in September 2013, is known as Nanaksar Primary School.

Following delays in the progression of a scheme for permanent classroom provision planning permission (ref: 4450/APP/2014/1427) was subsequently granted for the retention of the accommodation for a further two years, expiring on the 31st August 2016.

Condition 1 of the latter planning permission states:
"The building hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 31/08/16."

Condition 2 states:
"The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued on or before 31/07/16."
In light of further ongoing delays in the progression of an application for a permanent scheme, this application seeks to vary conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref: 4450/APP/2014/1427 to allow the retention of the buildings for an additional year, expiring 31/08/17.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

4450/APP/2013/1227 Land Adjoining Guru Nanak Sikh Academy Beaconsfield Road Hayes Provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, substation, car/cycle parking, new access arrangements and ancillary development (Amended Plan).

Decision: 28-06-2013 Approved

4450/APP/2014/1427 Land Adjoining Guru Nanak Sikh Academy Beaconsfield Road Hayes
Provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, substation, car/cycle parking, new access arrangements and ancillary development on existing school site.

Decision: 16-06-2014 Approved

4450/APP/2014/2725 Guru Nanak Sikh College Springfield Road Hayes
Details pursuant to conditions 7 (parking and cycle storage), 8 (drop-off/pick-up facility) and 10 (noise levels) of planning permission ref. 4450/APP/2014/1427 (Provision of three temporary modular classroom/administration units, substation, car/cycle parking, new access arrangement and ancillary development on existing school site)

Decision: 02-10-2014 Approved

## Comment on Relevant Planning History

The planning history has been discussed in parts 1 and 3.2 of the report and is summarised above.

## 4. Planning Policies and Standards

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)<br>Policy Statement - Planning for Schools Development (DCLG, 15/08/11)<br>London Plan (July 2011)<br>National Planning Policy Framework<br>Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Hillingdon<br>Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Guidance - Community Safety by Design<br>Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Guidance - Noise<br>Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document - Air Quality<br>Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Guidance - Land Contamination

## 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.CI1 (2012) Community Infrastructure Provision
PT1.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains
Part 2 Policies:
OL1 Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development
OL2 Green Belt -landscaping improvements
BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
R4 Proposals that would involve the loss of recreational open space
R10 Proposals for new meeting halls and buildings for education, social, community and health services
R16 Accessibility for elderly people, people with disabilities, women and children
AM2 Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact on congestion and public transport availability and capacity

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM9 Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
AM13 AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people and people witt disabilities in development schemes through (where appropriate): -
(i) Dial-a-ride and mobility bus services
(ii) Shopmobility schemes
(iii) Convenient parking spaces
(iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street furniture schemes

AM14 New development and car parking standards.
AM15 Provision of reserved parking spaces for disabled persons
LPP 3.18 (2015) Education Facilities
LPP 6.1 (2015) Strategic Approach

LPP 6.3 (2015) Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
LPP 7.16 (2015) Green Belt
LPP 7.2 (2015) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4 (2015) Local character
5. Advertisement and Site Notice
5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 11th July 2016
5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 6. Consultations

## External Consultees

Consultation letters were sent to 16 local owner/occupiers and The Friends of Minet Country Park. Site notices were also posted. No objections were received to these consultations.

METROPOLITAN POLICE: No objections are raised. The school is very low crime and as such, this extension is unlikely to create any problems.

SPORT ENGLAND: No response received.

## Internal Consultees

EDUCATION
Over 100 pupils are on the roll of Nanaksar Primary (in Years $1 \& 2$ ), whom the school is legally obliged to continue to educate until the end of Year 6. Therefore the temporary accommodation is required to keep the school operational. There is a high demand for places in the local area and additional places are forecast to be required in future years.

## TREES/LANDSCAPE OFFICER

No objection.

## HIGHWAY ENGINEER

The application is for an extension of an existing temporary permission providing a 120 place temporary school. No increase in pupil numbers is proposed.

An updated Transport Assessment has been provided which, at the Council's request, includes quantification of existing traffic flows during AM and PM school peak periods at the Uxbridge Road/Springfield Road junction, of the likely traffic attracted by any committed developments and vacant sites in the vicinity of the site, and assessment of the performance of the Uxbridge Road/Springfield Road signal junction. The Transport Assessment also includes a parking beat survey. A comparison of the 2013 and 2016 observed + committed + development flows indicates a reduction in flows and as such no further assessment of this junction was warranted.

Parking beat survey indicates that between 15.15 and 15.30 there were no available public highway spaces, 5 spaces available at goals car park and 48 spaces available at Minet Country Park car park. It should be noted that Guru Nanak primary and secondary schools contribute notably to the parking demand and Nanaksar primary is not the main contributor to the parking demand. Parking demand is eased as the end times of the school day are staggered by 15 minutes at the 3 sites.

As no additional highway impacts have been identified over and above those considered at the previous application no objections are raised on highway grounds.

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

The principle of the development was established in assessing the original planning permission ref: 4450/APP/2013/1227. No physical alterations are proposed to the approved scheme. Therefore, the key consideration in assessing this scheme is whether the retention of the buildings for another year is acceptable in principle.

Policy R10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seeks to encourage the provision of enhanced educational facilities across the borough. This overall objective is reiterated in the London Plan Policy 3.18 which seeks to support development proposals which enhance education and skills provision, including provision of new and enhanced facilities. At national level the DCLG Policy Statement on Planning for Schools Development and the NPPF are particularly supportive of applications which enhance existing schools.

Notwithstanding this, the proposed development falls within the Green Belt. Policy OL1 of the Local Plan: Part 2 defines the types of development considered acceptable within the Green Belt as predominantly open land uses including agriculture, horticulture, forestry, nature conservation, open air recreational activities and cemeteries. It states that planning permission will not be granted for new buildings or changes of use of existing land or buildings which do not fall within these uses.

London Plan (2015) policy 7.16 and the NPPF (2012) confirm that the strongest protection should be given to the Green Belt and that inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Accordingly, the temporary accommodation represents unacceptable development within the Green Belt, and it is necessary to demonstrate that the benefits of retaining the accommodation until August 2017 outweighs the harm to the Green Belt.

The applicant contends that there has been no material change to planning policy since temporary planning permission was granted in June 2014 and therefore, as the proposal was previously considered to be in accordance with planning policy, it should be regarded as continuing to comply. The applicant further argues that the size, scale and height of the buildings are not obtrusive in their location, they are seen in context with the existing school and surrounding large scale developments and that they would have no long term impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Whilst officers do not disagree with these statements, it must however be acknowledged that this is the third time temporary consent has been sought for the buildings, which were originally due to be removed by 31/08/14. Accordingly, careful consideration must nevertheless be given to yet another renewal of the consent, given the sensitive Green Belt location.

Although the applicant verbally discussed the significant need for the development with officers at pre-application stage, limited information in this regard has been submitted in support of this application. It is however noted that the applicant advised on previous applications that within the local catchment area for the school, there is very limited choice of 'good' schools as defined by Ofsted and that both the London Borough of Hillingdon and the adjoining London Borough of Ealing had reported a shortage in primary school places. The applicant also advised that alternative options for the provision had been investigated
but that due to the need to share facilities within the existing Guru Nanak school, this was the only viable option.

The Council's Education Team have advised that despite significant expansion of schools within the locality, and the provision of a new primary school at Lake Farm, that pressures for school places nevertheless remain within this part of the borough with additional places likely to be required in future years. Accordingly, the retention of the accommodation at this site is supported. Notably, there would not be sufficient capacity within existing schools in the borough to accommodate the children currently on roll at Nanaksar Primary School who would need to be relocated if planning permission was refused.

It is considered that the educational need for the accommodation combined with the limited long-term visual impact of the proposed development amounts to a case of very special circumstances sufficient to justify an exception to Green Belt policy in this instance.

It should be noted that the development results in the loss of a small part of the playing field, albeit on a temporary basis. Local Plan policy R4, paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Sport England policies seek to protect existing playing fields and supporting facilities. Sport England have been consulted on this current application but have yet to provide comments. In respect of the original consent for temporary buildings in the same location and scale as proposed, Sport England confirmed that the area of playing field which would be lost could not be regarded as being capable of forming, or forming part of, a playing pitch. Accordingly, no objections were raised by them in this respect. It is considered that those comments are still relevant to the consideration of this application.

The need for the proposed development in this location, the strong policy support for new and enhanced educational facilities and the limited long-term visual impact are considered to amount to a case of very special circumstances sufficient to justify an exception to Green Policy in this instance. Furthermore, Sport England confirmed within the 2013 scheme, that no objections were raised to the small loss of playing field which would occur as a result of the development. Accordingly, there is no objection to the principle of the proposed development, for a further temporary period.

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

Not applicable to this type of development.

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

Not applicable. The site does not fall within an Archaeological Priority Area and there are no Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character or Listed Buildings within the vicinity.

### 7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable. There is no requirement to consult the aerodrome safeguarding authorities on this application.

### 7.05 Impact on the green belt

Guru Nanak Sikh Academy currently comprises school buildings, which range in height from one to three-storeys, playgrounds, car parking, playing fields and ancillary development. It is bounded to the north by Beaconsfield Road, beyond which are large scale industrial buildings, and to the east by Yeading Football Club and its associated stands and clubhouse. The proposed temporary accommodation is largely located within an existing developed part of the site, comprising hardstanding, and located close to the eastern elevation of the main school building. Accordingly, it is seen in context with the wider school site and surrounding large scale buildings.

Minet Country Park bounds the wider school site to the south. Large bunds within that park, which bound the school site, limit views of the school from the wider Green Belt. Any limited views of the proposed units from Minet Country Park are long distance views across the school playing field where the proposed development is seen in context with adjoining developments and the built up industrial area beyond. Accordingly, the size, scale and height of the proposed buildings are not considered to be obtrusive in this location and, given the temporary nature of the development, it is not considered that it has any significant adverse impact on the long-term openness of the Green Belt or the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

### 7.06 Environmental Impact

This was assessed and considered to be acceptable at the time of the previous applications. No changes are proposed which would result in any increased environmental impacts.

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

The proposed development is clearly visible from Beaconsfield Road. However, Beaconsfield Road is predominantly characterised by industrial development to the north, and the Guru Nanak Sikh Academy and Hayes Football Club to the south. The proposed development is viewed in context with the existing school site and surrounding large scale developments and, as such, it is not visually obtrusive in this location. For these reasons, and those discussed in part 7.05 of the report, it is not considered that the proposal has an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the Beaconsfield Road street scene or the surrounding area.

### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

There are no residential properties within the vicinity of the site. It is not considered that the development has any impact on neighbouring commercial and industrial properties over and above the existing school site.

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to this type of development.

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

No alterations are proposed to the site layout, access arrangements, parking or cycle storage provision over that approved under previous consents. Furthermore, this application would not result in any increase in pupils or associated vehicular trips to/from the site over that approved by the original consent in 2013. Nevertheless, the applicant has submitted an updated Transport Assessment in support of the application to provide an up to date analysis of the traffic impacts. They have also submitted a revised Travel Plan.

The Transport Assessment confirms that the temporary school does not result in any significant impact on nearby junction capacity or on the local highway network. The school's Travel Plan assists in mitigating against the impacts of the development on the highway network.

Congestion associated with schools only typically occurs for relatively short periods of time during peak drop-off and pick-up times for the school and traffic disperses relatively quickly. Accordingly, it is not considered that the scheme results in such a significant impact on the surrounding highway network that refusal could be justified.

No alterations are proposed to the car parking layout or access arrangements. Two parking spaces, including one disability standard space, are provided for staff on site. Whilst this parking provision is relatively low, the objective to encourage use of alternative modes of transport to the private car is encouraged. Given the temporary nature of the scheme this
is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
In terms of cycle parking storage for up to 14 bicycles is provided. This complies with Transport for London's Cycle Parking standards which require 1 space to be provided per 10 staff or pupils.

It is not considered that the proposed development would have such a detrimental impact on the local highway network that refusal could be justified and, notably, the Council's Highway Engineer has raised no objections.

### 7.11 Urban design, access and security

Urban design
The size, scale, height and design of the buildings is considered to be acceptable in this location on a temporary basis and it is not considered that they have any significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. However, given the temporary nature of the buildings and the site's Green Belt location, their long term retention in this location is visually undesirable. Suitably worded conditions are recommended to ensure that the buildings are removed at the end of the 2017 academic year.

Security
The Metropolitan Police have confirmed that the school is located in a low crime area and have accordingly raised no objections to the application.

### 7.12 Disabled access

No changes to the implemented consent are proposed in respect of disabled access.
7.13 Provision of affordable \& special needs housing

Not applicable to this type of development.
7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

No changes to the implemented consent are proposed in respect of landscaping.

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

No changes are proposed in this respect from the original planning permission
7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

No changes are proposed in this respect from the original planning permission
7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

No changes are proposed in this respect from the original planning permission.

### 7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

No changes are proposed in this respect from the original planning permission.
7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

None received.
7.20 Planning obligations

Not applicable to this development. As the development is for educational use it would not necessitate a contribution towards the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy.

### 7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.
7.22 Other Issues

None.

## 8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC \& PRESS


#### Abstract

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

Given its temporary nature, no objections are raised to the principle of the development in this location, which it is considered has limited impact on the openness of the wider Green Belt and complies with current policy objectives to enhance educational facilities.

The development is considered to be visually acceptable in this location, although it would not be suitable for permanent retention, and it is not considered that the proposal would result in any additional impact on the surrounding highway network.

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant planning policy and, accordingly, approval is recommended.

## 11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
Policy Statement - Planning for Schools Development (DCLG, 15/08/11)
London Plan (2015)
National Planning Policy Framework
Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Hillingdon
Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Guidance - Community Safety by Design
Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Guidance - Noise
Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document - Air Quality
Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Guidance - Land Contamination
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## Agenda Item 13

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

| Address | 8 BAWTREE ROAD UXBRIDGE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Enlargement of basement to create habitable space and ground floor rear <br> extension |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 18278/APP/2015/4309 |
| Drawing Nos: | Design and Access Statement <br> SKMPD-PA-8BR-001 Rev. C <br> SKMPD-PA-8BR-002 Rev. B <br> SKMPD-PA-8BR-003 Rev. B <br> Site Investigation Report |

Date Plans Received: 24/11/2015 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 24/11/2015

## 1. CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1 Site and Locality

This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling on the south-east side of Bawtree Road. Bawtree Road is a quiet residential cul-de-sac situated within a residential area to the east of Uxbridge Town Centre.

The application property and its adjoining neighbour is one of a pair of identical properties, the front of which are unaltered. The rear of the properties comprise identical two storey 'outriggers' which abut up against each other and at the shared boundary and project across their respective rear elevations. The side return wall abuts onto the rear of each dwelling by approximately 1.5 m from the rear/side elevation edge, the remaining width contains a bedroom window at first floor level and a door opening leading to a ground floor lounge within the main body of the dwelling. There are external steps leading up to this door opening.

There is a single storey extension with a tiled lean-to roof to the rear of the application property and adjoining property no. 10 Bawtree Road that is part of the original building. There is also a 'make-shift' temporary shelter attached to the single storey element of the application property constructed of timber with a perspex roof covering.

The internal floor levels between the main body of the application property and the 'outrigger' are not in alignment and there are internal steps leading down to the rear of the dwelling. There is a difference in internal floor level between the main body of the house and the outrigger of 0.55 metres and a further difference between the outrigger and single storey element of 0.98 metres. The difference in levels between the internal floor level at the front of the house (the main part of the dwelling) and the ground level at the rear of the house is approximately 1.3-1.5 metres.

There is an existing basement beneath the main body of the house, accessed via an internal stairwell, measuring 18 sqm with a floor to ceiling height of 1.7 m .

Given its central Uxbridge location the wider area comprises a diverse mix of residential and non-residential uses (primarily retail and commercial uses associated with Uxbridge Town Centre). The immediate vicinity is residential in character and Bawtree Road comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached residential dwellings.

The application property falls within the 'Developed Area' as outlined within the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (Saved Policies).

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the enlargement of the basement to create habitable space and for the erection of a ground floor rear extension.

The proposed development is seeking to exploit the difference in level to create extra headroom within the existing basement of the property and would also involve lateral excavation from the rear of the application dwelling through to the existing basement and further to the front of the house, and excavating a further depth of 0.32 metres beneath the existing floor level of the basement to increase the floor to ceiling height to 2.4 m . The development proposal would increase the size of the basement from 18sqm to 55 sqm which utilises the full length of the house.

A new entrance would be created to the basement from the rear of the house involving excavation within the rear garden to create a patio area with retaining walls.

The existing single storey rear extension would be demolished and re-erected as a two storey extension from basement level. The proposed extension would re-align internal floor levels by raising the floor levels at the rear of the dwelling at ground floor and first floor, to the floor levels within the main house. The proposed extension would measure 5.3 metres in height and would project across the full width of the rear elevation, and then wrap around the outrigger to in-fill the remaining rear elevation so it is flush with the edge of the side elevation of the main dwelling. The depth of the extension at ground floor varies from 1.94 metres, taken from the rear elevation of the outrigger, to 5.88 metres for the infill section to the side of the outrigger where there are presently French-windows.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

29368/A/88/1948 18 Bawtree Road Uxbridge
Use of prem for Management \& Executive Headhunting \& placement service-Busnss from home (Sect 53 det)

Decision Date: 10-10-1988 GPD Appeal:
Comment on Planning History
There is no planning history relevant to this application proposal.
2. Advertisement and Site Notice
2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 3. Comments on Public Consultations

## EXTERNAL:

Neighbouring properties and the North Uxbridge Residents Association were consulted by letter on 26.11.15. A Site Notice was posted at the site on 02.12.15. On expiration of the consultation nine responses were received, objecting or commenting as follows:

1. The proposed development would result in the possible collapse of the building and damage to the adjoining three period terraced properties.
2. Irreversibly change the outlook of our street.
3. Risk of collapse during excavation with an electricity sub-station approximately two metres from the boundary wall of 8 Bawtree Road and supplies electricity to a large area of Uxbridge, including part of the town centre.
4. The noise and disruption and inconvenience to Bawtree Road during construction.
5. The proposed development would encroach onto free space at the rear 46 Lancaster Road which we own
6. It will affect the house prices of surrounding houses.
7. This plan appears to be over development
8. There are serious errors in the submitted plans, party wall is not shown correctly and wrong scales shown
9. The lack of detailed design drawings to show how our neighbours plan to support/strengthen the whole length of our party wall and internal load bearing walls and lack of detailed design drawings showing how the structural integrity of both numbers 8 and
10 Bawtree Road will be maintained
10. The creation of new habitable space underground at the front of 8 Bawtree Road without any natural light or ventilation contravenes Public Health requirements as the enlarged front basement area could be used by the present or any future owners as bedroom accommodation.
11. The noise of any external fans, ventilation, and air conditioning units needed to ventilate the front rooms of the proposed basement extension.
12. The risk of water ingress to the foundations of our property due to the new sunken patio area
13. Light pollution in our back garden at night from the proposed skylights needed to illuminate the extended basement area.
14. The need to reconstruct the shared sewers which travel across our front and back gardens close to ground level. The new sewer connections from 8 Bawtree Road would have to be much deeper due to the proposal to locate the kitchen at the new lower basement level.
15. Loss of light in the right hand side of our first floor rear bedroom window due to the higher side wall of the proposed rear first floor extension of 8 Bawtree Road.
16. If these plans get planning permission, the resulting works will result in a long period of noise, dust, vibration and inconvenience to us and other local residents.
17. Given recent high profile building collapses (notably the one on 26/11/2015 in Barnes due to the excavation of a bigger basement under a Georgian town house), the Planning Department of the London Borough of Hillingdon needs to carefully consider whether these ancient terrace 1830s Villas in Uxbridge are simply 'too old' to safely accommodate such major underground basement extension work that could jeopardise the structural integrity of the whole block and risk considerable damage to the live electricity substation right next door.
18. If Hillingdon Council approves these plans does it assume any financial responsibility for any future building collapse resulting from the construction works?

South Bucks District Council: No Objection

Scottish and Southern Electric: I confirm that SSE have no objections in principle to the planning permission for the basement development at 8 Bawtree Road, although we would like the applicant to provide a full surveyors report detailing any potential issues that the basement may cause to the integrity of our substation land and any affect this may have on the electricity apparatus on site.

## OFFICER COMMENTS:

The majority of the objections and comments related to the structural integrity of the application dwelling and neighbouring properties and their ability to withstand the construction of the proposed development, in particular the excavation of the basement. This report does not consider or commented upon the structural integrity of the application dwelling as it is not a planning matter.

It should be noted, however, that there have been discussions with the neighbouring resident from No. 10 Bawtree Road regarding concerns about structural matters. The resident was advised to seek further advise and to seek further assurance through the provisions within the Party Wall Act 1996.

Ward Councillor: Requests that the application is reported to committee.
INTERNAL:
Flood and Drainage Management Officer:
The applicants have carried out a desk top study of the site and not a thorough site investigation which would demonstrate what the flood risk not just to but also from the site and the implication that the basement also has on the surrounding area. The report provides data from 1978 to demonstrate there is not a current risk. It also acknowledges that although permeability in clay is low there is often a risk of fissures which result in perch groundwater flowing which can only be discovered by site investigation. On site investigations such as borehole information providing groundwater levels as well as infiltration rates must be undertaken to inform this proposal and mitigation provided as appropriate both below ground for groundwater management and at ground level in managing the water that falls on the site through appropriate sustainable drainage. A detailed drainage plan should be submitted showing the current drainage arrangements and those proposed and how the risk from groundwater when it is found is managed and the appropriate control of surface water on the site. This is particularly important where the groundwater will slope towards the site with a lowered patio as well. A management and maintenance plan should also be provided.

OFFICER COMMENTS:
The applicant submitted details of a Site Investigation Report. However this was found to be inadequate. The applicant was contacted on the 21-06-16 to request a revised report, however no reply has been received to date.

## 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:
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.
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.
HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

## 5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the impact of the development proposal upon the residential amenity of the current occupiers and that of the neighbouring residents. The impact of the development upon the appearance of the host dwelling and its appearance within the street scene, and consideration is also given to the quality of the residential accommodation created.

## - Basement

Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seeks to ensure adequate daylight and sunlight can penetrate into and between properties to safeguard the amenities of existing houses.

The application proposal would enlarge the existing basement from 30.5cu.m to 131.5cu.m and increase the head room of basement to 2.4 m . The proposed development would increase the length of the basement to 13.33 m . The only source for natural light into the basement would come from a lower ground level doorway at the rear of the dwelling. There are no other windows or door opening to allow natural light to penetrate throughout the basement area and there are no plans for an additional light well at the front of the house.

With regard to its size, the proposed development would be capable of residential accommodation. However, it is considered that the quality of the accommodation would be poor due to a lack of natural light penetration into and throughout the room, particularly to the front end of the basement. The proposed development. It is thus considered that the proposal would result in the provision of a habitable room with poor levels of natural/sunlight provision, contrary to Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed extension to the rear of the property is considered to be a two-storey rear extension development and is assessed against the adopted Council guidance set out in Chapter 6 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extension.

Paragraph 6.1 of the SPD states there is a general presumption against two-storey rear extensions where the extension would come close to the shared boundary. Paragraph 6.2 states that two-storey rear extension will only be allowed where there are no significant loss of residential amenity.

The proposed development would comprise a basement and ground floor level rear extension and would replace an existing lean-to ground floor single storey extension. The proposed extension would project 1.90 metres beyond the rear elevation of the existing two-storey outrigger where it abuts onto the shared boundary with no. 10 Bawtree Road, project 5.88 metres along the side elevation. The depth of the proposed extension would extend no further than the existing lean-to extension. The proposed development would have a flat roof covering and measure 5.3 from the basement floor level, which equates to 2.9 metres when measured from ground level. The existing lean-to would reach 3.4 m at its highest point.

Paragraph 6.2 of the SPD seeks to ensure there is no over dominance overshadowing or loss of light or outlook. Extension at first floor level should not extend beyond 45-degree line of sight. The proposed develop would not obstruct a first floor window of the adjoining dwelling but would replace the existing lean-to extension. It would therefore not be considered to be over-dominant or to have an overbearing presence on the adjoining neighbour at No. 10 Bawtree Road. There would be no loss of light or significant change in outlook as a result of the extension. The proposed extension would occupy the location presently occupied by the existing single storey rear lean-to extension and the view from the neighbouring property would be seen at a scale commensurate to the existing structures.

Paragraph 6.4 of the SPD permits two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached properties, on plots sizes greater than 5 metres in width, to extend to 3.6 metres in depth. The proposed extension would project a minimum of 1.98 metres, where it abuts the adjoining neighbouring property No. 10 Bawtree Road, but extend to a maximum of 5.88 metres to infill the side of the outrigger. There is an electricity substation located on the north-west side of the house and the application property is set back from the building line so the proposed extension would be behind the closest neighbouring resident (No. 6 Bawtree Road) located over 12 metres away. The depth of the infill section of the extension exceeds the maximum limit of 3.66 metres but it would not be out of scale with the host property and the bulk would not affect the neighbours on either side of the application property. The proposed development would not result in a loss of residential amenity by reason of its siting, bulk, mass and proximity to neighbours. The proposed development is considered to conform with policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

There are no windows proposed within the side elevation of the proposed extension. It is not considered that the proposed extension would result in overlooking and loss of privacy and would comply with Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed development would be visible within the street scene to views taken from the west of the application dwelling. Paragraph 6.6 of the SPD states that it is desirable that a two-storey extension to a house with a pitched roof should also have a pitched roof as flat roofed extensions will not generally be accepted (para 6.7). The proposed flat roof would be out of character with the Victorian architecture and its longest depth on the western side elevation of the extension would be visible to the street. The proposed development would not be in-keeping with the general appearance of the street scene and would be detrimental to the street setting created by the row of Victorian Villas. The proposed development would not comply with policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extensions.

- Flooding

Due to the proposed development including the excavation of a basement, the fact that the application dwelling is sited on relatively impermeable London Clay, and in order to protect the amenity of current and future occupants of the site it is necessary to ensure that the proposed development would adequately address the risk of flooding from both surface and groundwater, and to demonstrate that adequate measures are in place to deal with surface runoff on site. A Flood Risk assessment was submitted on the 16/02/2016, however this was found to be inadequate. Additional information with respect to flooding was requested however the applicant has not provided adequate information to address the concerns of the Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Officer. While it is accepted that the submitted Flood Risk report does not contain sufficient detail to satisfy the Flood Risk and Drainage Officer that planning permission could be granted without hazard to the amenity of the current and future occupants of the site and the current and future occupants of neighbouring dwellings whilst meeting the relevant SuDS requirements, it remains necessary to assess the proposed development based on the information which has been provided.

Groundwater Flood Risk:
With respect to the groundwater flood risk, the applicants Flood Risk Assessment states:
"From the information present water ingress is not expected to be a significant problem in terms of dewatering issues, etc. during construction. For the longer term condition, seepage entries from fissure flow within the clays and any perched water within the overlying ground should be allowed for in the design of the basement area e.g. provision of drainage cavity/tanking, and also for hydrostatic uplift of the basement subfloor slab".

It is noted that neither the drawings or supporting information provided with the application show any evidence of such features being included or designed into the proposed basement. In the absence of any evidence that the proposed development would include measures to mitigate the impacts of ground water or an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment in a case whereby the applicants own assessment has identified a risk, it is considered that the proposed development would, if implemented, have an adverse impact on the amenity of the current and future occupants of the dwelling.

Surface Water Flood Risk.
Drawing: SKMPD-PA-8BR-001 Rev. C submitted in support of the application show that the works to implement the proposed development would involve altering the ground level to create a sloped surface with the area adjacent to the rear of the dwelling dropping 1.13 m from the existing level. However, no further landscaping details have been provided, while the rear garden of the dwelling currently provides a largely flat surface which would allow
surface water time to infiltrate into the soil or slowly disperse, the application proposes creating a sloped surface which would direct surface water towards the dwelling, and the 0.9 m deep lightwell/patio which would be constructed to serve the extended basement with light, ventilation and means of escape. It is noted that neither details of drainage for the patio area or SuDS compliant landscaping have been provided, therefore having regard to the drawings and documents submitted it is considered that the proposed development would if implemented have an adverse impact on the amenity of the current and future occupants of the dwelling.

- Garden Space

The application property is a 3-bed dwelling. Policy BE23 requires new development to maintain sufficient amenity space for its occupants, and which is usable in terms of its shape and siting. This policy is supported by paragraph 6.18 of the SPD which requires a 3 -bed dwelling to retain at least 60sq. metres of private amenity space. The proposed development would on completion retain approximately 100 sq. metres of rear garden area and is thus considered to comply with policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extensions.

- Parking

London Plan Policy 6.5 sets out a maximum number of spaces for a 3-bed dwelling at 1.5 car parking spaces as a maximum, whereas the Council's policy AM14 requires a maximum of 2 spaces. Car parking within Bawtree Road is permitted on-street and there is no in-curtilage parking. The proposed development would not increase the existing number of bedrooms and the impact on parking is therefore considered to be neutral.

- Objections

This report has not considered the matters related to the structural integrity of the development, which is the main concern of objectors.

Other matters include encroachment onto 'free space,' however, the proposed development is not considered to encroach onto land not within the red-line boundary of the application site. Rebuilding sewers in the event of their collapse during the construction is not considered to be a planning matter.

Concern was expressed around the collapse of the dwelling close to the electricity substation. However, the Statutory undertaker has expressed no such concerns and raised no objection to the scheme, subject to a surveyors report which would be a civil matter.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed basement would result in poor quality accommodation due to a lack of natural light penetrating the room. The proposed extension would be visible within the street scene and due to its flat roof design would not be in-keeping with the architectural composition of the host and neighbouring properties and would appear as a strident feature within the street scene. Furthermore the proposed development would fail to adequately manage the flood risks at the site and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenity of current and future occupants of the dwelling.

# That had an appeal for non-determination not been lodged, the Planning Inspectorate be notified that the application would have been refused for the following reasons: 

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal
The proposed development would fail to adequately manage the surface water and flood risks at the site and would therefore result in an unsatisfactory residential environment for future occupiers contrary to Policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal
The proposed basement lounge and living area, by reason of inadequate provision of windows in relation to the depth of the basement would result in the provision of a habitable room with very poor levels of natural/sunlight to the detriment of the amenities of current and future occupiers contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extension.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal
The proposal by reason of its design and in particular the flat roof and west side elevation represents an incongruous addition and alteration which would not harmonise with the architectural composition and proportions of the original or adjoining dwellings and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extension.

## INFORMATIVES

1 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.

## 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:
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.
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.
HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design \& Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: John Cosgrove
Telephone No: 01895250230
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# Agenda Item 14 

## 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 Central and South Planning Committee area up to 31 March 2016 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 23 June 2016 and updates the information received by Cabinet in March 2016. The attached Appendix 1 provides updated financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the Central and South Planning Committee area up to 31 March 2016, 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 April 2016 to the Planning Committee. Figures shown in bold under the column headed 'Total income as at 31/03/16' 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 30/12/15" and "Total Income as at 31/03/16".
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. The majority of the funds are 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 31 March 2016. 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 June 2016.
Contact Officer: Nikki Wyatt
Telephone No: 01895-558145

Central \& South Planning Committee - 20 July 2016
PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC \& PRESS

| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME /PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | Total income | $\underset{\text { EXPENALIURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT allocated | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMMENT }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31/12115 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 3103/16 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 3103/16 |  |
|  |  | SECTION 278 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PORTFOLIO: PLANNING TRANSPORTATION AND RECYCLING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Botwell | Stockley Park Phase 3 "Trident Site" 37977/W/96/1447 (new permission 37977/APP/2015/1004) | 618,441.14 | 616,222.55 | 17,000.00 | 17,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 601,441.14 | 0.00 | Spend is engineering fees. Development not yet implemented and highways works not started. Funds currently held are for security deposit and fully refundable subject to the due and proper implementation of the Highway works. $£ 2,500$ engineering fees transferred from PT278/27. A further $£ 12,500$ should works commence. Interest added. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline{ }^{2}+278 / 30 / 115 \end{array}$ | Heathrow Villages | Terminal 5, Land at Longford Roundabout, Heathrow s278 10 Jan 02 47853/93/246 | 10,500.00 | 10,500.00 | 5,500.00 | 5.500.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { PT278/34/86A } \\ * 18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Branel | Brunel site3 532/SPP/2001/1858 Highways Works at Junction Hillingdon Hill / Kingston Lane \& Pelican Crossing on Kingston Lane | 392,358.87 | 392,358.87 | 197,448.22 | 197,488.22 | 0.00 | 194,910.65 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PT278/44/87A } \\ & * 20 \end{aligned}$ | Brnel | Brunel s278 16 April 04 <br> 532/SPP/2002/2237 - Traffic Calming on Cleveland Road \& New Entrance on Kingston Lane | 102,018.78 | 102,018.78 | 81,080.74 | 81,080.74 | 0.00 | 20,938.04 | 0.00 | Traffic Calming on Cleveland Road \& roundabout on Kingston Lane. $£ 30,900$ spent on engineering fees. $£ 150 \mathrm{k}$ Refundable securty deposit. $£ 3,200$ for Traffic $\mathbf{D C D}$ project management costs. \&58,962.38 TTS estimate for Pedestrian Crossing on Cleveland Road. Further payments received following receipt of estimate of works to cover secuity/costs. $£ 10,000$ received for improvements to a footpath on the site to be retained a security for Brunel to implement the works and to be transferred to PT84/87B-D. Traffic Calming on Cleveland Road Lane at new entrance to Brunel University now complete. TfL invoice paid. Residual on TfL payment due to VAT not claimed - funds to be held on as contingency for extra ft costs. Interest Accrued. Remedial work completed and signed off in December 2007. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PT278/49/117 } \\ * 23 \end{array}$ | Yeading | Grand Union Village Southall 327/APP/2000/2106 | 77,331.55 | 77,331.55 | 55,222.89 | 55,222.89 | 0.00 | 22,108.66 |  |  |


| CASE ReF. | WARD | SCHEME IPLANNING REFERENCE | al income | total income | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE $\substack{\text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}$ | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMENTS }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PT278/57/140 A | Pinkwell | MOD Records Office Stockley Road <br> Hayes 18399/APP/2004/2284 | AS AT 3103116 ${ }_{\text {419,128.68 }}$ | AS AT 3111215 ${ }_{\text {4 }}^{419,128.68}$ | ${ }_{\text {AS AT 3103116 }}{ }_{\text {325,719.61 }}$ | AS AT 31121125 ${ }_{\text {325,790.61 }}$ | $\frac{\text { To 3103116 }}{0.00}$ | AS AT 3103116 9 93,409.07 | AS AT 31031/6. 0.00 | $£ 188,737.70$ (including $£ 170,027.34$ for Transport For London signals unit) for installation of two sets of traficic signals, one at the entrance to the site the other at Lavender Rise on Stockley Road and $£ 190,686.91$ received in respect of the Council's costs for supervision of the works (to be carried out by the owner). Works complete. Stage 3 road safety audit no await completion of remedial works. Remedial works completed. Additional item of works being sought by officers who are chasing the developer for this. Council's costs of $\pm 205,686.71$ claimed, Tisis invoice for signals at Lavender Rise paid. Funding for additional items of works (removal of right turn lane) and BT cabling received. Design work and public consuitation completed- Removal of right turn liane compliete Sept 09. Scheme in maintenance period awaiting financial completion. |
| PT278/60/1478 | West Drayon | DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton - Highways 2/3012 | 56,816.26 | 56,816.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 56,816.26 | 0.00 | $£ 55,000$ was received towards the total cost of highway work for the purchase and installation of traffic signals at Station for the purchase and installation of traffic signals incidental Road/ Porters Way Junction and any such other in work as identified by the Council to support the development. Funds not spent by February 2014 are to be refunded together with interest accrued. These works to be performed by developer of RAF Porters Way (see PT278/62/148A). be retained as a contingency for these works. |
| PT278/62/149A | Botwell | Hayes Goods Yard 10057/APP/2004/2996\&2999 | 7,000.00 | 7,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,000.00 | 0.00 | The Council's costs due upon lodgement of documents by the developer for the design, administration and supervision of the works to the public highways surrounding the site to be performed by the developer. $£ 5,000$ received as a security works by the developer. deposit for the due and proper execution of the highways |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PT/278/65/182 } \\ { }^{5} 52 \end{array}$ | Heathrow Villages | Longford Roundabout - Fifth Arm, 63369/APP/2007/2294 | 9,521.00 | 9,521.00 | 4,521.00 | 4,521.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | Remaining balance is a security deposit for developer implementation of bus only access to Terminal 5 Heathrow. Spend on supervision costs.Works complete, security to be refunded following maintenance period |
| PT/27874/209C | Yiewsley | Proposed Tesco development, Trout Road, Yiewsley 609/APP/2007/3744 | 120,300.26 | 120,300.26 | 117,300.26 | 117,300.26 | 0.00 | 3,000.00 |  | ees received for design checks for proposed junctionworks and cariageway widening at Trout Road. S278 agreement and technical approval pending. Further fees received \& claimed for inspection works. |
|  | Uxbidge | Former Gas Works site (Kier Park), Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge 3114/APP/2008/2497 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as a security deposit for due and proper execution of highways improvements.S278 agreement. |
| ${ }_{8 T} \mathrm{P}^{1 / 278 / 81 / 249 \mathrm{E}}$ *84 | Tomnfield | Fmr Glenister Hall, 119 Minet Drive, Hayes. 40169/APP/2011/243 | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 0.00 | 4,000.00 | 0.0 | Fees received for design checks and monitoring and <br> supervision. $£ 4,000$ received as a security deposit to ensure highway works are carried out to a satisfactory standard. Fees claimed for design checks \& monitoring |
| PT1278/822723A *87 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Autoguild House (LidI), 121 Cowley Rd, Uxbridge. 7008/APP/2010/2758 | 99,115.00 | 99,115.00 | 7,920.00 | 7,920.00 | 0.00 | 91,195.00 | 0.00 | Fees received and claimed for design checks \& monitoring s278 works. £19,195 received towards upgrading of traffic lights at junction of Cowley Mill Road. $£ 72,000$ received as a security deposit to ensure highways works are carried out to a satisfactory standard. $£ 5,920$ received \& claimed for design checks. |
| ${ }_{{ }^{9} 9}^{P T / 278 / 83 / 283 A}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbidge } \\ & \text { North } \end{aligned}$ | Former RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge 585/APP/2009/2752 | 182,096.00 | 167,096.00 | 150,596.00 | 135,596.00 | 15,000.00 | 31,500.00 |  | $£ 40,000$ received and claimed for design checks\& monitoring of 278 highway works. $£ 31,500$ received as a security deposit to ensure highway works are carried out to a satisfactory standard, $£ 94,596$ received and claimed by ECU towards fees and claimed towards design fees. |
| PT/278/85 ${ }^{\text {93 }}$ | Yiewsley | GSK Stockley Park, 5 Iron Bridge Road. $305 /$ /APP/2012/2/273 | 6,210.00 | 6,210.00 | 1,210.00 | 1,210.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | Fees received and claimed for design checks. $£ 5,000$ received as a security deposit to ensure highway works are carried out to an acceptable standard |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline{ }_{* 111278 / 98 / 314 D} \end{array}$ | Pinkwell | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hyde Park Hayes, Dawley Road, } \\ & \text { Hayes (HPH44 \& 5) } \\ & 40652 / \text { APP/2012/2030 } \end{aligned}$ | 22,500.00 | 22,500.00 | 2,500.00 | 2,500.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Fees received and claimed for design checks \& monitoring of s278 works. $£ 20,000$ received as a returnable security deposit. |
| ${ }_{{ }^{1+118}}^{\mathrm{PT} / 278 / 103370 \mathrm{~A}}$ | Uxbidge | Belmont House (formerly Senato Court ), Belmont Road, Uxbridge 68385/APP/2012/2398 | 56,171.39 | 56,171.39 | 4,936.53 | 4,936.53 | 4,936.53 | 51,234.86 | 0.00 | Funds held as a returnable bond to ensure the satifactory completion of the highway works associated with the development. $£ 4,936.53$ fees claimed for design for design checks. |
|  |  | SECTION 278 SUB - TOTAL | 2,190,508.93 | 2,173,290,34 | 972,955.25 | 957,955.25 | 22,436.53 | 1,217,55.68 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME /PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | total income | $\underset{\text { EXPENATIURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $\underset{\text { TOTAL }}{\text { TXPENDITURE }}$ | 2015 / 2016 | BALANCE OF FUNDS | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMTS }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31033/16 | AS AT 3112/15 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31121/15 | To 3103116 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 3103/16 |  |
| Portrolio Planing transportation and recycling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/0504a *2 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Heathrow } \\ \text { Villages } \end{array}$ | \|BA Word Cargo / 50045A/95/1043 | 339,111.08 | 339,111.08 | 212,469.24 | 212,469.24 | 0.00 | 126,641.84 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PT/05/04b } \\ { }^{2} 2 \end{array}$ | Heathrow Villages | BA Word Cargo / 50045A/95/1043 | 400,331.57 | 400,331.57 | 173,645.35 | 173,645,35 | 0.00 | 232,686.22 | 0.00 | The balance is for improvements to public transport serving London Heathrow. Any scheme supported by these funds should provide a significant benefit to BA employees in the vicinity of Heathrow and the views of the Heathrow Transpor Forum are to be sought in determining any scheme to be funded. See update to PT/05/04a above regarding the remainder of the balance. No time limits. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{PT} / 24 / 55 \\ \text { (see E/08) } \\ \text { *28 } \end{array}$ | Pinkwell | Former Arlington Hotel, Shepiston Lane, Harlington - Highway Works 382/BH/97/0714 | 23,639.34 | 23,639.34 | 8,018.67 | 7,256.54 | 1,966.13 | 15,620.67 |  | Higway I Iprovement Works acocrining to the 3rd Schedule the developer following the date of the Final Account. Works (to right thand turn lane) have been caried out as part of the Haringoton Community School development. Reasonable time for spend has elapsed. OWners permission obtained to complete any outstanding works as required under the agreement. Funds allocated (Cabinet Member decision Issues resolved with the owners of the itete, works to be cond condeted completed March 2016 . Awaiting invoices |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT/37/40B-C } \\ & \text { (see: PPR/29) } \end{aligned}$ | Botwell | Land at Thorn EMI Complex Highways Works \& Environmenta Improvements 1893) Factory 5987/APP/2012/180 (Old Viny | 559,443.43 | 559,443.43 | 378,904.27 | 372,697.36 | 6,888.91 | 180,539.16 | 74,928.07 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT37/40E } \\ & { }^{47} \end{aligned}$ | Botwell | Land at Thorn EMI Complex - Parking 51588/APP/2000/366\&1418 (OI Factory 5987/APP/2012/1838) Factory 5987/APP/2012/1838) | 32,805.42 | 32,805.42 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 32,805.42 | 0.00 |  |
| PTT42141 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Hillages } \end{aligned}$ | Temp Stockpiling at Bedfont Court. 47853/SPP/2003/113 | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,000.00 | 0.00 | $£ 50,000$ for landscape enhancement on specified land around the development. Unexpended funds at 19 June 2006 were to be repaid to the developer. Following consultations with BAA it has been agreed to spend the funds as part of the Colne Valley project. Deed of variation has been secured to remove time limits. |
| PT/54/21C | Botwell | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road Landscaping 6198/BS/98/1343 | 57,000.00 | 57,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 57,000.00 | 0.00 | $£ 50,000$ for Landscaping on adjacent land and $£ 7,000$ for maintenance of the landscaping works. Funds to be held for landscaping in accordance with the agreement subject to Crossrail. No time constraints |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{PT/61/89B} \\ & \text { (see: E//35) } \end{aligned}$ | West Drayton | LHR Training Centre, Stockley Close 51458/97/1537 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | £25,000 for improvements at the junction of Stockley Road \& Stockley Close / Lavender Rise, West Drayton. Scheme provided using TfL funding. Further improvements to area Funds to be held as contingency for any works required to the junction arising out of the MOD development. No time constraints. |


| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | total income | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} \text { BALANCE OF } \\ \text { FUNDS } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMMENTS } \\ \text { (as at mid May 2016) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> E/21) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Uxbridge } \\ \text { North } \end{array}$ | Land at Johnson's Yard (former garage site), Redford Way, Uxbridge Street Lighting 53936/APP/2002/1357 | AS AT 31103116 | AS AT 31/12115 18.893 .88 | AS AT 3100316. 17.871 .38 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AS AT } 31112115 \\ & 17,871.38 \end{aligned}$ | To 3103116 0.00 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AS AT 3103/16 } \\ \hline 1,022.50 \end{array}$ | AS AT 31103116 ${ }_{0}$ | Street lighting according to the agreement drawing. No time constraints. Expenditure due to commencement of project for street Iighting on Redford Way at Johnson's Yard. Columns \& lantems installed and working. Unable to install column in footpath leading to the high Street. Last column installed, footpath leading to the high slecee. Last column instanded, Connection by Southern Electric were programmed for July 07 Columns all connected but require painting. Officers chasing painting contractor to progress. Painting completed - - inal invoices paid. Final balance to be confirmed after closure of $08 / 09$ financial year accounts. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT/80/112 (formerly } \\ & \hline \text { PT278(05) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbidge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Union Park, Packet Boat Lane, site ref: 1197 (various applications) | 47,774.85 | 47,774.85 | 2,228.56 | 2,228.56 | 0.00 | 45,546.29 | 0.00 | Not time constraints. Officers looking into project for spend of balance at iunction of Packet Boat Lane \& $\&$ cowly High Street Cabinet Member for PRT concerned with affect of proposal and bind raag bend heading owal held until sight lines are resolved. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { PT/82/1144 (formery } \\ \text { PT278/23) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Uxbidge } \\ \text { South } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Waterloo Road, Uxbridge - Highway Works / 332BD/99/2069 | 13,169.44 | 13,169.44 | 11,577.00 | 11,577.00 | 0.00 | 1,592.44 | 0.00 | Highway Works for alternative traffic management on Waterloo Road. No time limits. Cabinet Member for Planning \& Transportation has approved use of funds to extend the Uxbridge South Parking Management Scheme approved Waterloo Road from the Parking Revenue Account to be recharged to this case for next quarter. Recharcharge completed. |
| PT84/87B-D <br> 278144) (Formerly part of PT278/44) | Brnel | Brunel s106 16 April 04 532/SPP/2002/2237 | 27,614.47 | 27,614.47 | 15,164.48 | 15,164.48 | 0.00 | 12,449.99 | 0.00 | $£ 3,000+$ interest for monitoring of landscape management plan ( 87 B ) $£ 10,000+$ interest for monitoring of green travel plan ( 878 B), $£ 10,000+$ interest for monitoring of green trave and public transport obligations $(87 D)$, and $£ 200+$ interest initial payment associated with footpath works to be undertaken by Councii (87C). Engineers inspected site to ascertain whether works are required $\&$ whether further payments are due late Jan 2006. Officers chasing Brunel to provide a disabled ramp from the back of the privately owned footway at Hillingdon Hill. Interest accrued. $£ 10 \mathrm{k}$ plus interest received for improvements (including lighting) to the footpath alongside the River Pinn likking Sitite 2 ' to Uxbridge Road. Footpath works complete, security deposit plus interest returned. |
| PT/88/1400 *38 | Pinkwell | MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, Hayes - Prologis Park P04 | 754,743.82 | 754,743.82 | 578,271.96 | 450,090.96 | 128,181.00 | 176,471.86 | 0.00 | Funds received as the public transport contribution to the level of public transport to and from the area of the development site. Funds allocated towards the extension of Memmber Decision 29/05/2012) TMO approved. TfL, bus shelter installed on site. Spend towards implementation of yellow lines to allow bus to run. DOV now completed to extend time limit to spend funds to March 2017. Bus extension operational from end of Sept $2012 . £ 24,756$ paid towards the provision of bus stop on the Prologis site. Payment to TFL for first year of operation $12 / 13$. $£ 33,513$ further TFL costs. Payment to TfL for second year of operation 13/14. Payment to TFL for third year of operation $14 / 15$. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT/18/140F } \\ & * 46 \end{aligned}$ | Pinkwell | MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, Hayes - Parking 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 73,774.40 | 73,774.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 73,774.40 | 73,774.40 |  |
| PT/101/170A | Botwell | $\begin{aligned} & 11-21 \text { Clayton Road, Hayes } \\ & 56840 / \text { PP P/ } 2004 / 630 \end{aligned}$ | 30,527.21 | 30,527.21 | 12,974.24 | 12,974.24 | 0.00 | 17,552.97 | 10,00.00 | Funds received for parking management in the area. Funds held to be used in combination with those at case ref. PT/37/40E should any scheme be required. Funds not spent by 31 August 2014 are to be refunded. $£ 13,000$ from this contribution allocated towards the implementation of a parking management scheme in Blyth Road, Clarendon Road \& Clayton Road (Cabinet Member Decision 16/03/2012). Scheme completed April 2012, $£ 10,000$ can be retained |


| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | EXPENDITURE | EXPENDITURE | $\stackrel{2015 / 2016}{\text { EXPENDITURE }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \hline \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMTS }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PT/102/161D | Yiewsley | Honeywell Site, Trout Road Yiewsley 335/APP/2002/2754 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AS AT 31/03/166 } \\ & 77,151.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \text { AS AT 31/12/15 } \\ \hline 77,151.50 \end{array}$ | AS AT 3103/16 $\quad 68$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { AS AT } 31121215 \\ \hline 6,889.23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { To } 31 / 03 / 16 \\ \hline 1,054.72 \end{array}$ | AS AT 31003146 $8,703.34$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AS AT 31033116 } \\ 8,703.34 \end{array}$ | Funds received towards public transport and community facilities initiatives in the West Orayton area. Funds to be spent by september 2014. Funds allocated towards public transport intitiatives in the West Drayton area to include bus stop accessibility and enhancement of the pedestrian link along Tavistock Road to West Drayton Station and bus interchange (Cabinet Member Decision 22/04/2014). Scheme completed September 2014, £10,000 can be retained towards other schemes related to the development. Outstanding invoice paid this quarter. |
| PT/103/174A | Heathrow Villages | Terminal 2, Heathrow 62360/APP/2006/2942 | 100,000.00 | 100,000.00 | 97,997.19 | 97,187.10 | 24,581.26 | 2,002.81 | 0.00 | Contribution received for the West Drayton to Heathrow Cycle Scheme. Funds not spent by 16 November 2015 are to be repaid. Funds allocated towards the implementatin of a traffic calming scheme on Hatch Lane (which forms part of the route) Cabinet Member Decision 117/12013. Scheme completed July 2013. Funds reallocated towards the second phase of the scheme in Holloway Lane (Cabinet Member Decision 10/03/2014). Scheme substantially completed August 2014, additional works completed 2015. Outstanding invoice Scheme closed. |
| PT/104/147H | West Drayton | DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton 45658/APP/2002/3012 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received for the installation and maintenance of CCTV cameras on the site as specified in the relevant planning permission. Cameras to be installed by the developer. Funds to be retained as security. No time constraints. |
| PT/106/149E | Botwell | Hayes Goods Yard 10057/APP/2005/2996 \& 2999 | 119,402.15 | 119,402.15 | 199,402.15 | 114,084.13 | 74,819.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| PT/108/155E | West Drayton | Former RAF Porters, West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 | 1,003.90 | 1,003.90 | 1,003.90 | 1,003.90 | 1,003.90 | 0.00 |  | Funds received to provide a local walking bus scheme. Funds to be spent within 3 years of receipt (Jan 2012). Funds allocated towards the development of a walking bus sch expired, contribution retumed to developer. |
| PT/110/1988 *61 | Uxbridge | Former Gas Works Site (Kier Park) at Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge - Bond 3114/APP/2008/2497 | 14,240.00 | 14,240.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14,240.00 | 0.00 | Travel Plan Bond received to ensure compliance by the owner for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the travel plan. To be refunded after 10 years. |
| PTT/11/204A *63 | Uxbridge | 26198/APP/2008/2338 <br> 106, Oxford Road, Uxbridge. | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Travel Plan Bond received to ensure compliance by the tennant of its monitoring and reporting obligations in accordance with the travel plan. Returnable |
| PTT/13/198C | Uxbidge | Former Gas Works Site (Kier Park) at Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge Public Transport 3114/APP/2008/2497 | 24,410.43 | 24,410.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24,410.43 | 24,410.43 | Contribution towards the provision of public transport improvements in the vicinity of the land. Funds to be spen within 7 years of receipt (Nov 2016). |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{PT} / 114 / 209 \mathrm{~A} \\ * 67 \end{array}$ | Yiewsley | Tesco, Trout Road, Yiewsley 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | Travel Plan Bond received to ensure compliance by the owner for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the Travel Plan. To be refunded five years following first occupation. |
| PTT/15/2098 | Yiewsley | Tesco, Trout Road, Yiewsley 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 4,850.00 | 4,850.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,850.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received for the purpose of the purpose of setting up a car club. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt Trout Road (Cabinet Member Decision 7/02/2014). |
| PTT/16/210A | Botwell | Hayes stadium, Judge Heath Lane, Hayes. $49996 / / A P P / 2008 / 3561$ | 30,140.58 | 30,140.58 | 30,140.58 | 30,140.58 | 11,408.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of upgrading two bus shelters in the vicinity of the development. Funds to be spen witihn 5 years of receipt (March 2015). Further $£ 104.58$ received as indexation payment. Funds allocated to bus stop upgrades (Cabinet Member Decision 4/12/14). Scheme complete. |


| CASE ReF. | WARD | SCHEME /PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMTS }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 3103316 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 3103/16 |  |
| PT/1912090 | Yieusley | Tesco, Trout Road, Yiewsley 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 31,874.14 | 31,874.14 | 7,655.00 | 7,655.0 | 0.00 | 24,219.14 | 0.0 | Funds received for the purpose of the provision of 3 upgraded or replacement bus shelters within the vicinity of the site. Further $£ 874.14$ received as indexation payment. $£ 7,665$ allocated towards bus stop improvements in Yiewsley High Road (Cabinet Member Decision 7/02/2014). Scheme bus shelters (Cabinet Member Decision 19/02/2016). Awaiting invoices. |
| PTT/21/242A | West Drayton | Drayton Garden Village (fmr NATS site), Porters Way, West Drayton. 5107/APP/2009/2348 | 34,000.00 | 34,000.00 | 34,000.00 | 34,000.00 | 34,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | Funds received towards the cost of providing new and improved bus stops/sheteress in the eviciity of the evevopment. No time limit on spend. Funds scheme (Cabion sod towards bus stop complete. |
| PTT/122/248A | Uxbridge | 97 Oxford Road, Highbridge Park, Uxbridge. $38074 / A P P / 2008 / 1418$ | 54,486.29 | 54,486.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 54,486.29 | 0.00 | Contribution re within the vicinity of the land. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receitot (July 2016) Funds allocated towards phase 2of Uxbritige gateway scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 17/1212015) |
| PT/124/261 | West Drayton | Land at Stockley Close Estate, West Drayton. 56244/APP/2003/1437 | 60,000.00 | 60,000.00 | 45,441.10 | 6,755.44 | 38,685.66 | 14,558.90 |  | Contribution received towards providing accessibility improvements including public transport in the vicinity of the land. Funds to be committed within 3 years of receipt (Dec 2014). Funds committed towards accessibility improvements to bus stops on Lavender Rise and towpath improvements between Stockley Road and West Drayton Station (Cabinet member Decision 17/10/2014). $£ 6,755.44$ spent towards Sept 2015. Scheme substantially complete March 2016. access to bus stops 14/15. Towpath works programmed for |
| PTT/125/242C | West Drayton | Drayton Garden Village (fmr NATS site), Porters Way, West Drayton. 5107/APP/2009/2348 | 369,910.54 | 369,910.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 369,910.54 | 369,910.54 |  of the development ssee legal arreement for further details). No time imits or spend. as the Phase 4 payment. |
| PT/126/242D *82 | West Drayton | Drayton Garden Village (fmr NATS site), Porters Way, West Drayton. 5107/APP/2009/2348 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Travel plan bond received to ensure compliance by the owner of its monitoring and reporting obligations. To be refunded after 10 years |
| PTT1281276A | Tomffield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes. 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 22,155.20 | 22,155.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22,155.20 | 22,155.20 | Contribution received towards the provisison of public transpor infastucture in the vicinity of the site. Measures considered include upgrade to bus stops, improvements to bus services and cycle ways (see agreement for further de be spent within 7 years of feceipt $971(12019)$. |
| PTT/129277A | Heathrow Villages | The Portal, Scylla Rd, Heathrow Airport. 50270/APP/2011/1422 | 20,579.41 | 20,579.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,579.41 | 0.00 | Funds received towards co-ordinating and monitoring the green travel plan associated with the site. No time limits for spend. |
| PT/13012778 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Villages } \end{aligned}$ | The Portal, Scylla Rd, Heathrow Airport. 50270/APP/2011/1422 | 40,965.69 | 40,965.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40,965.69 |  | Contribution received towards off stit highway works to the Cunds house Roundabout, Heathrow. Not time limits for spend <br>  |
| PT/131/273B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Autoguild House (LidI), 121 Cowley Rd, Uxbridge. 7008/APP/2010/2758 | 5,000.00 | 5.000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as the Travel Plan bond to be used by the Council to cover the Council's expenses in monitioring period. Balance to obe refunded after 10 years (2022). |
| PT/1321499 * ${ }^{\text {88 }}$ | Botwell | Hayes Goods Yard (High Point) 10057/APP/2005/2996 \& 2999 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | Travel Plan bond received to ensure the completion by the owner of 3 travel surveys. $£ 5,000$ to be returned on completion of each survey. |
| PT/133/149K | Botwell | 10057/APP/2005/2996 \& 2999 <br> Hayes Goods Yard (High Point) | 62,500.00 | 62,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 62,500.00 | 62,500.00 | Contribution received towards the establishment of parking management areas within the area no further than 800 m from the boundary of the site. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Nov 2019) |
| PT/ $/ 34 / 149 \mathrm{~L}$ | Botwell | Hayes Goods Yard (High Point) 10057/APP/2005/2996 \& 2999 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,500.00 | 0.00 |  |
| PTT/135/198E | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbidge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Fmr Gas works, Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge (Kier Park) 3114/APP/2012/2881 | 5,000.00 | 5,00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,00.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the implementation of directional signage on Cowey Mill Road and junction with St witihn 7 years of receipt (March 2020). |


| CASE ReF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | total income | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | BALANCE <br> $\substack{\text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}$ | $\underset{\text { COMMENTS }}{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PTT/136/297A | Heathrow <br> Villages | Fmr Technicolor Site, 276 Bath Rd, Sipson, West Drayton 35293/APP/2009/1938 | AS AT 31/03/16 <br> 34,541.66 | $\frac{\text { AS AT } 31 / 12115}{34,541.66}$ | AS AT 31103116 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | AS AT 31/12/15 ${ }_{0}$ | To 3103116 0.00 | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} 34,541.66 \end{array}$ | AS AT 3103/16 | Contribution received towards the cost of upgrading the bus stops and the installation of drop kerbing/ tactile paving to site. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (May 2020). enable pedestian access over Bath Road in the vicinity of the |
| PTT/137/300A | Tounfield | Fmr Powergen Site, North Hyde Gardens, Hayes 3226/APP/2012/2185 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.0 | Funds received as the "TFL Feasibility Contribution" to be used by TLL to cary outa feasibility study into capacity and improvement options for the Parkway and Bulls Bridge Roundabout. No time limits for spend. |
| $\mathrm{PT} / 138 / 300 \mathrm{~B}$ <br> *102 | Tomffield | Fmr Powergen Site, North Hyde Gardens, Hayes 3226/APP/2012/2185 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.0 | Contribution received to be used by TfL to carry out required improvement works to the junction at The Parkway and Bulls Bridge Roundabout. No time limits |
| PT/1391300C | Tomffield | Fmr Powergen Site, North Hyde Gardens, Hayes 13226/APP/2012/2185 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | .00.00 | 15,000.00 | Contribution received towards improvements to the grand Union Canal frontage within the vicinity of Bulls Bridge. No time limits. |
| PTT/40/315A | Pinkwell | Asda Unit 4 Westlands Estate, Millington Road, Hayes 32157/APP/2011/872 ( | 458,800.00 | 458,800.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 458,800.00 | 458,800.00 | Contribution to be used towards (but not limited to) the provision of footway and public realm improvements between the land and Hayes Town Centre. No time limits for spend. |
| PT/141/3158 | Pinkwell | Asda Unit 4 Westlands Estate, Millington Road, Hayes 32157/APP/2011/872 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of a new bus stop outside the store and "real time " bus travel information (see agreement for details). No time limits for spend |
| PTT/44/198H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Former Gas Works site (Kier Park) Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge 3114/APP/2012/2881 | 40,635.00 | 40,635.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40,635.00 | 40,635.00 | Funds received as the "reduced public transp to be applied towards the hopper bus service or other public transport links relating to the site (see legal agreemnt). Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt ( May 2021). |
| PTT/455198] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Former Gas Works Site (Kier Park) at Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge 3114/APP/2008/2497 | 20,317.00 | 20,317.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,317.00 | 20,317.00 | Contribution receivd towards the provision or improvement of cycling in the vicinity of the site in accordance with the Council's adopted cycleway strategy. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (May 2021) |
| PT/146/198K | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { Southe } \end{aligned}$ | Former Gas Works Site (Kier Park) at Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge 3114/APP/2008/2497 | 66,031.00 | 66,031.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 66,031.00 |  | Funds received towards the reconstruction of the footway and kerbing on both sides of Cowley Mill Road between the site access and Cowley Road, together with minor improvements to the footway and kerbing on the eastern side of Waterloo Road. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (May Funds allocated towards footpath scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 01/03/2016). |
| PTT/49/325C | West Drayton | Stockley Close Units 1623 \& 1685 51458/APP/2013/2973 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | Funds received as the travel plan contribution. For use by the Council to co-ordinate and monitor the Occupier Green Trave Plans (see agreement for specific terms of 2019). spent within 5 years of receipt (December 201 |
| PTT/150/344 | Uxbridge <br> South | Building 63, Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge <br> 56862/APP/2014/170 | 45,000.00 | 45,000.00 | 11,855.00 | 0.00 | 11,855.00 | 33,145.00 | 33,145.00 | Contribution to used by the Council to offset the shortfall in enery savings and enable the Council to make annual energy carbon savings elsewhere in the Authority's area. Funds to b spent within 5 years of receipt (July 2020). £11,500 used towards Compass Theatre scheme as part of end of year financing Subject to Cabinet Member approval. |
| PT/151/345A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ | Charter Place, Vine Street, Uxbridge 30675/APP/2014/1345 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | Contribution received towards improvement of the area from the High Street through to Windsor Street to Charter Place (see agreement for details). No time limits for spend |
| PT152/334B | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Uxbridge } \\ \text { South } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Building 63, Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge <br> 562/APP/2014/170 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | Funds received as the travel plan contribution. For use by the Council to co-ordinate and monitor the Occupier Green Travel returned at the end of the monitoring period |
| PT/153/345B | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { South } \\ & \text { Uxbridge } \end{aligned}$ | Charter Place, Vine Street, Uxbridge 30675/APP/2014/1345 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | Funds received as the travel plan bond, to be used to ensure that the obligations outlined in the approve travel plan are satisfactorily carried out |
| PTT/15/283D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ukotidge } \\ & \text { Northe } \end{aligned}$ | Former RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge. 585/ APP 2009/2752 | 63,366.34 | 63,366.34 | 0.00 | , | 0.00 | 63,366.34 | 63,366.34 | Contribution received as the first of two instaiments toward the provision of bus stops serving the development, in line with the S106 Planning Obligations SPD 2008. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (Oct 2025). |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 |  |
| PT/156/40G | Botwell | Land at Thorn EMI Complex (Old Vinyl Factory). <br> 51588/APP/2000/1827 <br> \&5987/APP/2012/1838 | 50,722.94 | 50,722.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,722.94 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards TFL Bulls Bridge Roundabout Study, as specified in the agreement. TFL to confim the need for the study within a year of receipt (Nov 2016) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT/157/355A } \\ & { }^{*} 119 \end{aligned}$ | Botwell | Formr EMI Site, Dawley Rd, Hayes 8294/APP/2015/1406 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as the travel plan bond to ensure that the obligations contained in the approved travel plan are satisfactorily carried out. Any remaining funds to be retumed 10 years from occupation. |
|  | Heathrow Villages | 272-276 Bath Rd, Hayes 464/APP/2014/2886 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as the travel plan bond to ensure that the obligations contained in the approved travel plan are satisfactorily carried out. Any remaining funds to be returned at the end of the monitoring period ( 10 years from occupation). |
| PT/159/372A | Yiewsley | Phase 3, Stockley Park, Stockley  <br> Road. 37977/APP/2015/1004 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 | contribution received to fund a flood attentuation feasibility study for packet Boat Lane (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023). |
| PT/160/354C * 124 | Botwell | Land on west side of Dawley Road, Hayes (EC House) <br> 38065/APP/2014/2143 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as the travel plan bond to ensure that the obligations contained in the approved travel plan are satisfactorily carried out. Any remaining funds to be returned at the end of the monitoring period (10 years from occupation). |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PT/161/373 } \\ & { }^{*} 125 \end{aligned}$ | Townfield | Airlink House, 18-22 Pump Lane, <br> Hayes 5505/APP/2015/1546 | 4,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as the travel plan bond to ensure that the obligations contained in the approved travel plan are satisfactorily carried out. Any remaining funds to be returned at the end of the monitoring period ( 10 years from occupation). |
| PT/162/249G | Townfield | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Fmr Glenister Hall, } 114 \text { Minet Drive, } \\ \text { Hayes } \\ \text { 40169/APP/2011/243 }\end{array}$ | 2,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,500.00 | 2,500.00 | Funds received towards the implementation of passing bays in Hunters Grove (if required). See agreement for details. |
| PT/163/401 | Botwell | Old Vinyl Factory, Blyth Rd, Hayes. 51588/APP/2000/1827 \& 5987/APP/2012/1838 | 20,390.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,390.78 | 20,390.78 | Contribution received towards the cost of upgrading the bus stops on Clarenden Road and providing Legible London signage in the vicinity of the site. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (March 2023) |
| PT/164/374A | Botwell | Global Academy. Old Vinyl Factory, Blyth Road, Hayes. 5505/APP/2015/1546 | 120,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 120,000.00 | 120,000.00 | Contribution to be used by TFL towards bus service improvements made necessary by the development, namely additional bus service provision on specified route serving the development and related infrastructure. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (March 2023). |
|  | Botwell | Global Academy. Old Vinyl Factory, Blyth Road, Hayes. 5505/APP/2015/1546 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received as the travel plan bond to ensure that the obligations contained in the approved travel plan are satisfactorily carried out. Any remaining funds to be returned at the end of the monitoring period (10 years from occupation). |
| PT/166/359B | Yiewsley | 26-36 Horton Rd, Yiewsley 3507/APP/2013/2327 | 50,500.00 | 50,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,500.00 | 50,500.00 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provison of CCTV; provison of lighting; closure/gating of paths and links; safety improvements to public transport interchanges ; facilities and car parks; enhanced night bus networks to and from major new facilities and leisure uses within the Authorit's area (see agreement for details). Spend within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023). |
|  |  | PLANNING TRANSPORTATION \& RECYCLING SUB - TOTAL | 4,851,803.46 | 4,639,912.68 | 1,827,068.23 | 1,633,690.49 | 334,444.56 | 3,024,735.23 | 1,615,577.76 |  |
|  |  | PLANNING TRANSPORTATION \& RECYCLING TOTAL | 7,042,312.39 | 6,813,203.02 | 2,800,023.48 | 2,591,645.74 | 356,881.09 | 4,242,288.91 | 1,615,577.76 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | total income | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { Total }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | $\underset{\text { COMMENTS }}{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31103/16 | AS AT 31/1215 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 3112/15 | To 3103316 | AS AT 3103316 | AS AT 3103316 |  |
| EYL/107/201A | Bamhill | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 360, Uxbridge Road, Hayes. } \\ & 7517 / \text { APP/2007/188 } \end{aligned}$ | 77,414.00 | 77,414.00 | 77,414.00 | 42,399.00 | 35,015.00 | ${ }^{\text {ASAT }} 103000$ | 0.00 |  |
| EYL/118/214B | Uxbridge | Hillingdon House Farm. 2543/APP/2005/870 | 1,090,166.31 | 1,090,166.31 | 741,313.09 | 741,313.09 | 0.00 | 348,853.22 |  | $£ 256,399.34$ received as first instalment towards the cos providing nursery ( $£ 64,099)$, primary $(£ 110,251.72)$ and secondary ( $£ 2,047)$ school places within the London of Hillingdon. First contribution to be spent before April 2017. Primary contribution $(£ 110,251.72$ ) allocated and spent towards expansion at Whitehall Schor school expansion programme). Cabinet Member decisis 1 of the 6/12/2011. Second instalment (£268,681.94) received. Second contribution to be spent before Oct 2018 . Final instament $(£ 565,085)$ received. Final contribution to be spent before Jan 2019. $£ 631,061$ allocated and spent to expansion at 24/01/2014). Remaining funds earmarked towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary School Expansion programme, subject to Cabinet Memb approval. |
| EYL/199216 | Charville | 119 to 137 Charville Lane, Hayes. 38290/APP/2006/2501 | 56,316.00 | 56,316.00 | 27,139.00 | 27,139.00 | 0.00 | 29,177.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards additional or improved education nursery,primary and secondary child yield arising from the development. No time limits. Primary and nursery components allocated and spent towards primary schoo expansion Grange Park School as part of phase 1 of the school expansion programme ( Cabinet Member decision 6/12/2011), as part of the Council's Secondary School Expansion programme, subject to Cabinet Member approval. |
| EYL/1321232 | Hillingdon | 23, Sweetcroft Lane, Hillingdon. 8816/APP/2004/3045 | 42,280.88 | 42,280.88 | 22,573.00 | 22,573.00 | 0.00 | 19,707.88 |  |  |
| EYL/40/2096 | Yiewsley | Tesco. Trout Road, Yiewsley 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 231,454.55 | 231,454.55 | 69,612.21 | 36,971.13 | 32,641.08 | 161,842.34 |  |  |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME /PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \hline \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EYL/158/242B | West Drayton | West Drayton Village (north site) off Porters Way, West Drayton 5107/APP/2009/2348 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { AS AT 31/03/16 } \\ 4,162,355.83 \end{array}$ | AS AT 31121215 | $\begin{gathered} \text { AS AT } 31003116 \\ 4,162,355.83 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\text {AS AT 31/12/15 }}^{\text {3,000,000.00 }}$ | $\frac{\text { To 31103116 }}{1,162,355.83}$ | AS AT 31033166 | AS AT 3103/16 ${ }_{\text {l }}$ |  |
| EYL/165/267B | Botwell | Fmr Ram PH, Dawley Rd, Hayes 22769/APP/2010/1239 | 60,915.00 | 60,915.00 | 27,341.00 | 27,341.00 | 0.00 | 33,574.00 |  | Contribution received towards the provision of education facilities and places as detailed in the agreement. Funds to be split as follows; nursery $£ 7,185$, : primary $£ 20,156$; secondary $£ 33,574$. No time limits for spend. $£ 20,156$ allocated and spent towards expansion at Wood End Primary School as part of Phase 2 of the Primary Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/2013). $£ 7,185$ allocated and spent towards expansion at Rosedale Primary School as part of the 19/03/2015). Remaining funds allocated towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary 29/03/2016). School Expansion programme (Cabinet Member Decision 29/03/2016). |
| EYL/169/276C | Tomffield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes. 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 1,158,24.50 | 1,158,24.50 | 762,750.86 | 762,750.86 | 0.00 | 395,494.64 | 0.00 |  |
| EYL2113/332 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Hillingdon } \\ \text { East } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 43 and land rear of 35-47 Snowden Avenue. Hillingdon <br> 6231/APP/2012/3075 | 15,932.00 | 15,932.00 | 15,932.00 | 15,932.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards additional or improved educational facilities within a 3 mile radius of the site to accommodate the nursery and primarent anding from the at Hillingdon Primary School as part of the Primary Expansion Programme. (Cabinet Member Decision 07/07/2015) |
| EYL/214/3A | Yiewsley | 39 High Street , Yiewsley 24485/APP/2013/138 | 94,188.38 | 94,188.38 | 94,188.38 | 94,188.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards providing educationa improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. Funds spent towards expansion at Rabbs Farm Primary School as part of the 07/07/2015). Primary Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision $07 / 07 / 2015$ ) |
| EYL/215/34 | Pinkwell | 43-44 Fairey Ave, Hayes 69055/APP/2014/37 | 14,118.00 | 14,118.00 | 14,118.00 | 14,118.00 | 0.00 | 00 | 0 | Contribution received towards providing educationa mprovemenis or facilities in the Authortit's area to onclude new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. Funds spent towards expansion at Pinkwell Primary School as part of the Primary Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 07/07/2015) |
| EYL219/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { South } \end{aligned}$ <br> South | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \text { St John's Road, Uxbridge } \\ & \text { 1581/APP/2012/2444 } \end{aligned}$ | 47,71 | 47,714.00 | 00 | .00 | 0.00 | 47,714.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards providing educational <br>  accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces ssee agreement tor deatiss No time linits for spend. Funds allocated towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary School Expansion programme (Cabinet Member Decision 29/03/2016). |


| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | Total income | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMMENTS } \\ \text { (as at mid May 2016) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EYL/220/30 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { North } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \& 6 \mathrm{a} \text { High Street, Uxbridge } \\ & 1538 / \text { PPP/2011/2003 } \end{aligned}$ | AS AT 31103116 | AS AT 31112115 9 | AS AT 31103116 ${ }_{0.00}$ | AS AT 31/12/15 0.00 | $\frac{\text { To 3103316 }}{0.00}$ | AS AT 3103116 ${ }_{\text {9,133.00 }}$ | AS AT 3103116 0.00 | 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. Funds allocated towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary 29/03/2016). School Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 29/03/2016). |
| EYL/225/374 | North Uxbridge | Honeycroft Day Centre, Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge 6046/APP/2013/1834 | 44,835.90 | 44,835.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 44,833.90 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards providing educational of the A40; to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and extema leisure spaces (see agreement for details). Funds to be spentcommitted within 7 years of receipt (May 2022). Funds allocated towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary School Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 29/03/2016). |
| EYU227/388C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { North } \end{aligned}$ | Lancaster \& Hermitage Centre, 68164/APP/2011/271 Lancaster Road, Uxbridge | 40,922.25 | 40,922.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40,922.25 | 0.00 | Contribution reecived towards sprvididing education, educational improvements or failitites in the Authorit's area to include new school facilities; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvemenis and expansion of playground and external leisurese spaces ssee agreement tor detailss No time ilinits for spend. Funds allocated towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary School Expansion Programme (cabinet Member Decison 29/03/2016) |
| EY\/228/35 | Bamhill | Land lying south of Shakespeare Ave (Scout Hut), Hayes 16910/APP/2012/2612 \& 16910/APP/2014/2274 | 66,660.00 | 66,660.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 66,660.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards providing education, educationa improvements or facilities in the Authorit's area to include new accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces (see agreement for details) No time limits for spend. Funds allocated towards Abbotsfield School as part of the Council's Secondary School Expansion Programme (Cabinet Member Decisio 29/03/2016). |
| EYL/2301283C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbidge } \\ & \text { North } \end{aligned}$ | Former RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge. 585/ APP 2009/2752 | 2,545,734.13 | 2,545,734.13 | 2,545,734.13 | 0.00 | 2,545,734.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received as the first instalment towards providing education, educational improvements or facilities in the education, educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's area to include new school facilities: improve to existing school facilities to accommodate extra children; improvements and expansion of playground and extemal leisure spaces. Contribution to be spent within 10 years of receipt (Oct 2025). Funds spent towards Council's School Expansion Programme as part of end of year financing. Subject to formal approval. |
| EYI/231/366A | Yiewsley | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Packet Boat House, Packet Boat } \\ & \text { Lane Cow. Hoy } \\ & \text { 20545/APP/2012/2848 } \end{aligned}$ | 59,368.17 | 59,368.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59,368.17 | 59,368.17 | Contribution received to be used by the Council towards providing education; educational improvements or facilities, in the Authorit'ys area to include new school facilites a existing school facilities to accor extra childre; improvement and expansion of playground and extemal leisure spaces (see agreeement for details). No time limits for spend. |
| EYL/233/359A | Yiewsley | 26-36 Horton Rd, Yiewsley 3507/APP/2013/2327 | 147,530.70 | 147,530.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 147,530.70 | 147,530.70 | Contribution received to be used by the Council towards providing education; educational improvements or facilities, in the Authorit'ys area to include new school facilites; improvements to existing school facilities to accommodate extra childre; improvement and expansion of playground and extemal leisure spaces (see agreeement for details). Spend within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023.) |
|  |  | EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE SUB - TOTAL | 9,965,284.60 | 9,965,284.60 | 8,560,471.50 | 4,784,725.46 | 3,775,746.04 | 1,404,813.10 | 206,898.87 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: COMMUNITY, COMMERCE AND REGENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| CASE ReF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}}{ }$ | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PPR/47/26A (formerly PT/56/26A) | Botwell | Trident Site, Phase 3 Stockley Park - Hayes Hub/H50 \& Botwell Common Road Zebra Crossing 37977/P/94/335 | AS AT 3110316 ${ }_{\text {2,601,600.00 }}$ | AS AT 31121/15 | AS AT 3103116 $1,808.071 .42$ | AS AT 31121115 ${ }_{\text {1,808,071.42 }}$ | To 3103316 0.00 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AS AT 3103/16 } \\ \hline 793,528.58 \end{array}$ | AS AT 31103116 0.00 | See Cabinet report 18 December 2003. Balance allocated to Hayes \& Harlington Station Improvements and associated interchange initiatives. Project on-hold due to design issues. Officers investigating altemative improvements to area around the station. No time limits. Funds earmarked towards improvements to the public transport interchange and public Centre Scheme. realm improvements as part of the Crossrail/Hayes Town |
| PPR499174C | Heathrow Villages | Terminal 2, Heathrow 62360/APP/2006/2942 | 350,000.00 | 350,000.00 | 346,721.80 | 300,400.00 | 46,321.80 | 3,278.20 | 3,677.00 |  |
| PPR/491174 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Villages } \end{aligned}$ | Terminal 2, Heathrow Airport. 62360/APP/2006/2942 | 531,426.00 | 531,426.00 | 450,000.00 | 450,000.00 |  | 81,426.00 |  | Funds received towards the Local Labour Strategy, as defined in the agreement. No time limits. A total of $£ 450,000$ due to be received under this agreement has been allocated towards the Heathrow Academy Programme (Cabinet Member de 19/11/12). Total of $£ 261,000$ paid towards Academy Programme 2012/13. Further $£ 270,246$ received towards the Programme. |
| PPR/52/149G | Botwell | Former Hayes Goodsyard site. 10057/APP/2005/2996\&299 | 75,360.00 | 75,360.00 | 75,220.72 | 75,220.72 | 2,300.90 | 139.28 |  | Funds received towards improvements to open space to the canal towpath opposite the site. Any remainder to be expended a Cente as 7 yed (May 2016) the develop. Fu. Fun not spent witihn 7 years (May 2016) to be returned. Funds allocated towards Westem View canal side improvement scheme (Cabinet Member decision 22/7/2011). Scheme b on site Oct 2011 and now substantially complete. Scheme complete. |
| PPR/53/149H | Botwell | Former Hayes Goodsyard site. 10057/APP/2005/2996\&299 | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 0.00 | 4,000.00 |  | $£ 2,000$ received towards the maintenance and operation by the Council of the station approach cameras. Funds spent towards operation of station cameras $09 / 10$. Further $£ 4,000$ received as 2nd \& 3rd annual instalments. |
| PPR/56/198D | Uxbridge | Former Gas Works site (Kier Park), Cowley Mill Road, Uxbridge 114/APP/2008/2497 | 12,205.22 | 12,205.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,205.22 | 12,205.22 | Contribution towards the employment training initiatives promoted by the Council to encourage employment in the vicinity of the land. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Nov 2016). |
| PPR/601209E | Yiewsley | Tesco, Trout Road Yiewsley. 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 37,186.49 | 37,186.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37,186.49 |  | Contribution received for the purposes of providing additiona CCTV facilities and/or additional safety measures witihn the vicinity of the site. Funds to be spent witinn 5 years of receip (March 2016). Further $£ 2,186.49$ received as indexation has now expired. Alternative schemes being investigated, with a view to approaching the developer for a DOV. |
| PPR/611247 | Tommield | Former Hayes Sports and Social Club 143 Church Road, Hayes. 65797/APP/2010/1176 | 7,663.99 | 7,663.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,663.99 |  | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by the provision of a onstruction work place co-ordinator witihn the Authority's Area. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (June 2021) Funds allocated towards the services of a Construction Workplace Co-ordinator within the Borough (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13). |
| PPR/631248B | Uxbidge | 97 Oxior Rooad, Highbridge Park, Uxxridge 3807/APP/2008/1418 | 21,794.51 | 21,794.51 | 21,794.51 | 12,600.00 | 9,194.51 | 0.00 |  | Contribution received towards the purpose of providing construction training schemes for Hillingdon. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (July 2016). Funds allocate towards the services of a Construction Workplace Co-ordinato within the Borough (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13) $£ 11,820$ spent towards Construction Workplace Co-ordinator $2014 / 15$. Balance spent towards Construction Workplace Co-ordinator 2015/16. |


| CASE ReF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | Total income | $\underset{\substack{\text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE }}}{\text { Tin }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | BALANCE OF FUNDS | $\underset{\substack{\text { BPLLANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}}{ }$ | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { comment }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PPR/64/262C | Charville | Former Hayes End Library, Uxbridge Road, Hayes. $9301 /$ APP/2010/2231 | $\text { AS AT } 311031166$ | AS AT 31112115 9 | AS AT 31033116 0.00 | AS AT 31121215 ${ }^{0.00}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { To 31103/166 } \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | AS AT 31103116 ${ }_{\text {9,360.44 }}$ | AS AT 31030316 |  |
| PPR/66/265B | Heathrow <br> Villages | Former Longford House, 420 Bath Road, Longford (Premier Inn). 2985/APP/2009/680 \& 2985/APP/2010/2988 985/APP/2010/2988 | 39,826.13 | 39,826.13 | 9,950.39 | 0.00 | 9,950.39 | 29,875.74 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and the provision Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (Nov 2016). Funds allocated towards the services of a Construction Workplace Co ordinator within the Borough (Cabinet Member Decision 19/3/13). $£ 9, \mathbf{2 3 6}$ spent twards work place co- ordinator pos 2015/16. |
| PPR/677265C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Villages } \end{aligned}$ | Former Longford House, 420 Bath Road, Longford (Premier Inn). 2985/APPP/2010/2988 2985/APP/2010/2988 | 9,236.85 | 9,236.85 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,236.85 | 9,236.85 | Contribution received to be used for the provision of approved training schemes in the hospitality \& leisure industry (see legal receipt (Nov 2016). |
| PPR/68/265 | Heathrow Villages | Former Longford House, 420 Bath Road, Longford (Premier Inn) 2985/APP/2009/680 \& 2985/APP/2010/2988 | 53,289.47 | 53,289.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 53,289.47 | 53,289.47 |  |
| PPR/6992760 | Tomnfield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 54,107.14 | 54,107.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 54,107.14 | 37,433.86 | First instalment ( $£ 21,111,11$ ) towards improvements to local community facilities within the Authority's area. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (July 2019). £16,322 received as second instalment towards the same purpose (spend July 2020). Final instalment $£ 16,673.28$ received this quarter (spend by February 2022). Earmarked towards phase 2 of Townfield community centre. |
| PPR/70/267C | Botwell | Fmr Ram PH, Dawley Rd, Hayes 22769/APP/2010/1239 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 3,742.97 | 3,742.97 | 0.00 | 6,257.03 | 6,257.03 | Funds to be used for the purpose of improving community faciities in the vicinity of the development. No time limits for spend. Funds allocated towards upgrading cinema equipmeni Scheme complete, contribution not required, funds to be reallocated. |
| PPR/71/277C | Heathrow Villages | Airport 50270/APP/2011/1422 <br> The Portal, Scylla Rd, Heathrow Airport 50270/APP/2011/1422 | 20,579.41 | 20,579.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,579.41 | 20,579.41 | Contribution received towards sublic realm improvements in the vicinityof the develoomentinduding. CCTV footpath safety, safer town centres, public transport interchange facilities (see agreement for detaids). Further contribution received towards the same purpose. No time linits fors spend |
| PPR/721277D | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Heathrow } \\ \text { Villages } \end{array}$ | The Portal, Scylla Rd, Heathrow Airport. 50270/APP/2011/1422 | 51,609.49 | 51,609.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 51,609.49 | 51,609.49 | Contribution received towards training persons within the locality of the development for jobs of a nature to be carried out within the development. Further contribution received towards the same pupose. No time limits for spend |
| PPR/75/291A | West Drayton | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fmr Swan PH, Swan Road, West } \\ & \text { Drayton. } \quad 68248 / \mathrm{APP/2011/3013} \end{aligned}$ | 13,699.22 | 13,699.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13,699.22 | 13,699.22 | 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. No time limits. |
| PPR/88/198F | Uxbidge | Fmr Gasworks Site, Cowley Mill Road (Kier Park), Uxbridge. 3114/AP/2012/2881 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | Contribution received towards employment and training initiatives promoted by the Council in association with Uxoridge College or any other approved provider. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (March 2020). |
| PPR/8002978 | Heathrow Villages | Fmr Technicolor Site, 276 Bath Rd, Sipson. 35293/APP/2009/1938 | 46,055.55 | 46,055.55 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 46,055.55 | 46,055.55 | Funds received towards public realm improvement works to be delivered within the vicinity of the land. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (May 2020) |
| PPR/81/81/297C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Villages } \end{aligned}$ | Fmr Technicolor Site, 271 Bath Rd, Sipson. 35293/APP/1938 | 16,695.14 | 16,695.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16,695.14 | 16,695.14 | Contribution received towards the provision of training in the hospitality and leisure industry (see agreement for further details) |
| PPRR/87/303C | Botwell | 70 Wood End Green Rd, Hayes 5791/APP2012/408 | 7,731.96 | 7,731.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,731.96 | 7,731.96 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place coordinator within the Authority's Area. No time limits. |
| PPR/85/306B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hillingdon } \\ & \text { East } \end{aligned}$ | Fmr Knights of Hillingdon, Uxbridge 15407/APP/2009/1838 | 7,875.62 | 7.875.62 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 7,875.62 | 7,87.62 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place co- ordinator serving the locality of the development. No time ordinator serving the locality of the development. No tim limits. |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME/PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | Total income | EXPENDITURE | EXPENDITURE | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | BALANCE OF FUNDS | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { COMMENTS }}{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31103116 | AS AT 31/12115 | AS AT 3103316 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 3103116 | AS AT 31103116 | AS AT 31033116 |  |
| PPR/86/3098 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Uxbridge } \\ \text { South } \end{array}$ | Former Dagenham Motors, Junction t Johns Rd \& Cowley Mill Rd 188/APP/2008/3309 | 17,190.00 | 17,190.00 |  |  |  | 17,190.00 | 17,190.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training schemes in the Borough. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Oct 2020) |
| PPR/88/325A | West Drayton | Stockley Close Units 1623 \& 1685 51458/APP/2013/2973 | 20,713.00 | 20,713.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,713.00 | 20,713.00 |  |
| PPR/89/329B | Townfield | Land at Pronto Industrial Estate, 585 591 Uxbridge Road, Hayes 4404/APP/2008/355 4404/APP/2008/3558 | 35,813.52 | 35,813.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 35,813.52 | 35,813.52 | Contribution received towards the costs of providing construction training schemes within the London Borough of Hiliingdon. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (July 2024). |
| PPR/92/333B | Yiensley | 39 High Road, Yiewsley 24485/APP/2013/138 | 22,543.13 | 22,543.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22,543.13 | 22,543.13 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the provision of a construction work place colimits. limits. |
| PPR/93/333C | Yiewsley | 39 High Road, Yiewsley 24485/APP/2013/138 | 25,010.10 | 25,010.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,010.10 | 25,010.10 | Contribution received as the "public realm contribution" towards the provision of CCTV, lighting, closure/gating of paths and links, safety improvements to public transport networks to and from major new facilities and leisure uses within the authority's area. No time limits for spend. |
| PPR/96/3478 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \begin{array}{l} \text { Notrth } \\ \text { Uxbridge } \end{array} \end{array}$ | Honeycroft Day Centre, Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge 6046/APP/2013/1834 | 24,335.69 | 24,335.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24,335.69 | 24,335.69 | Contribution received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recoognised providers andor the provision of a construcion work place cospent committed within 7 years of receipt (May 2022). |
| PPR/97/314C | Pinkwell | Hyde Park Hayes, Dawley Road, Hayes (HPH4 \& 5) 40652/APP/2012/2030 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 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. |
| PPR/99/344C | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { South } \\ \text { Uxbridge } \end{array}$ | Building 63, Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge 56862/APP/2014/170 | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 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 |
| PPR/101/348D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbidge } \\ & \text { Northe } \end{aligned}$ | Lancaster \& Hermitage Centre, Lancaster Road, Uxbridge 68164/APP/2011/2711 | 3,331.89 | 3,331.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,331.89 | 3,331.89 | 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. |
| PPR/102/354A | Botwell | Land on west Side of Dawley Road, Hayes (E C House). <br> 38065/APP/2014/2143 | 9,644.70 | 9,644.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,644.70 | 9,644.70 | Funds received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the Authority's area. Funds to be spent witihn 7 years of receipt (Sept 2022) |
| PPR/103/356B | Yiensley | Packet Boat House, Packet Boat Lane, Cowley 20545/APP/2012/2848 | 31,792.72 | 31,792.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31,792.72 | 31,792.72 | 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 limit for spend. |
| PPR/104/355B | Botwell | Formr EMI Site, Dawley Rd, Hayes 8294/APP/2015/1406 | 82,800.00 | 82,800.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 82,800.00 | 82,800.00 | received towards investment in local energy efficiency and carbon reduction measures within the Autority's area. Spend within 7 years of receipt (Nov 2022) |
| PPR/105/355C | Botwell | Formr EMI Site, Dawley Rd, Hayes 8294/APP/2015/1406 | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 | Funds received towards the provision of a construction work place co-ordinator. Funds to be spend within 7 years of receipt (Nov 2022). |
| PPR/106/360A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Villages } \end{aligned}$ | Fmr Unitair Centre, Great South West Rd, Feltham, 49559/APP/2014/334 | 9,984.00 | 9,984.00 | 0.00 | 00 | 0.00 | 9,984.00 | 9,984.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing construction training courses delivered by recognised providers and/or the Authority's area. No time limit for spend. provision of a construction work place co- Authority's area. No time |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME/PLANNING REFERENCE | Total income | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { COMMENTS }}{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PPR/108/371B | Heathrow Villages | 272-276 Bath Rd, Hayes | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { AS AT } 31103116 \\ 19,600.00 \end{array}$ | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 3103316. 0.00 | AS AT 311121/15 0.00 | To 31/03/16 0.00 | AS AT 31103116 ${ }^{19,600.00}$ | AS AT 3103316 | 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 limit for spend. |
| PPR/109/37 | Townfield | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hayes Gate House, Uxbridge Road, } \\ & \text { Hayes } \\ & \text { 2385/APP/2013/2523 } \end{aligned}$ | 138,774.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 138,774.29 | 138,774.29 | 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. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (Jan 2021). |
| PPR/110/372B | Yiewsley | Phase 3, Stockley Park, Stockley 37977/APP/2015/1004 Road. | 9,600.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,600.00 | . 00 | Funds receieved as the "Phase 1 " payment towards the provision of a construction workplace coordinator within the Authority's area. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023). |
| PPR/111/379A | Townfield | 1911/APP/2012/3185 <br> 1-3 Uxbridge Rd, Hayes. | 99,175.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 99,175.00 | 99,175.00 | construction work place co-ordinator within the Authority's area. Funds to be spend within 7 years of receipt (March 2023) |
| PPR/1131274C | Botwell | Global Academy. Old Vinyl Factory, Blyth Road, Hayes. 5505/APP/2015/1546 | 9,600.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 | Funds received towards the provision work place co-ordinator within the Authority's area. Funds to be spend within 7 years of receipt (March 2023). |
|  |  | COMMUNITY, COMMERCE \& REGENERATION TOTAL | 4,577,610.67 | 4,30,861.38 | 2,717,501.81 | 2,652,035.11 | 67,767.60 | 1,860,108.86 | 880,653.86 |  |
| PORTFOLO: CENTRAL SERVICES, CULTURE \& HERITAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSL/13/219A | Yeading | Rear of Syney Court,Perth Avenue, Hayes. 65936/APP/2010/883 | 414.00 | 414.00 | 414.00 | 0.00 | 414.00 | 0.00 |  | Funds received towards the provision or improvement to library facilities and or library books within the Borough. No time limits. Allocated and spent towards eBooks scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 22/12/15) |
| CSLIT14220 | Tommfield | Trescott House, Hayes 36261/APP/2010/215 | 1,599.00 | 1,599.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,599.00 | 1,599.00 | Funds received towards additional or improved library facilities in the vicinity of the site. No time limits. |
| CSL/21/209F | Yiewsley | Tesco, Trout Road, Yiewsley 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 66,988.81 | 66,988.81 | 66,988.81 | 15,935.07 | 66,988.81 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received for the purpose of improving existing community faciities within the Yiewsley area. Funds to be spent by March 2016 . Further $£ 3,938.8$ received as ment inking payment. $£ 38,125$ allocated towards improvements to Yiewsley \& West Drayton Community Centre (Cabinet Member Decision 24/88/15). Remaining $£ 28,863$ allocated and spent 19/02/2016). scheme, (Cabinet Member Approval |
| CSL/241244A | Tomffield | 505 to 509 Uxbridge Road, Hayes. 9912/APP/2009/1907 | 2,150.96 | 2,150.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,150.96 | 2,150.96 | Funds received towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books within LBH. Funds to be spent by June 2018. |
| CSLI251249A | Tomffield | Fmr Glenister Hall, Minet Drive, Hayes. 40169/APP/2011/243 | 4,167.60 | 4,167.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,167.60 | 4,167.60 | Funds received towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books within LBH. No time limits |
| CSL2661298 | Tomffield | Fmr Glenister Hall, Minet Drive, Hayes. 40169/APP/2011/243 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of necessary capacity enhancements at the Townfield Community Centre. No time limit for spend. |
| CSL2772100 | Botwell | Hayes Stadium, Judge Heath Lane Hayes. 49996/APP/2008/3561 | 13,813.07 | 13,813.07 | 12,664.00 | 12,664.00 | 0.00 | 1,149.07 | 1,149.07 | Contribution received towards the provision of library facilities in the borough of Hillingdon. Funds to be spent within 5 year of receipt (Sept 2016). Further $£ 1,328.07$ received as index linking payment. $£ 12,664$ from this contribution allocated to Library. (Cabinet Member Decision 16/8/13). |
| CSL288/22A | Charville | Former Hayes End Library, Uxbridge Road. Hayes. $9301 / \mathrm{APP} / 2010 / 2231$ | 555.53 | 555.53 | 555.53 | 0.00 | 555.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision to library facilities and/or library books in Hillingdon. No time (Cabinet Member Decision 22/12/2015). |
| CSL301267A | Botwell | Fmr Ram PH, Dawley Rd, Hayes 22769/APP/2010/1239 | ${ }^{644.23}$ | ${ }^{644.23}$ | ${ }^{644.23}$ | 0.00 | ${ }^{644.23}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of library facilities in the borough of Hillingdon. No time limits. Allocated and spent towa |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2015 / 2016}{\text { EXPENDITURE }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { BALANCE } \\ \hline \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMTS }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT $311031 / 16$ | AS AT 311/2115 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31/121/5 ${ }_{0}$ | To 3103/16 | AS AT 3103116 ${ }_{\text {10,7194 }}$ | AS AT 3103316 ${ }^{10,771.94}$ |  |
| CSL/31/276B | Townfield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes. 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 10,771.94 | 10,771.94 |  |  |  | 10,771.94 | 10,771.94 | Contribution received towards the provision of library books and/or library books within the Authority's area. Funds to be spent by July 2019 |
| CSL/321278A | Botwell | 6-12 Clayton Road, Hayes 62528/APP/2009/2502 | 528.08 | 528.08 | 528.08 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 528.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision or improvement of No time limits for spend. Allocated and spent towards <br> eBooks scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 2211212015). |
| CSL/33/284B | Yiewsley | Former Honeywell site, Trout Road, West Drayton (live/work units). 335/APP/2010/1615 | 529.85 | 529.85 | 529.85 | 0.00 | 529.85 | 0.00 | 0.0 | Contribution towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books within the Authority's area. No scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 22/12/2015). |
| CSL/341291B | West Drayton | Fmr Swan PH, Swan Road, West Drayton. $68248 /$ APP/2011/3013 | 575.00 | 575.00 | 575.00 | 0.00 | 575.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of library facilities ent towards eBooks scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 22/12/2015). |
| CSL/391303D | Botwell | 5791/APP20121408 <br> 70 Wood End Green Rd, Hayes 5791/APP20121408 | 1,459.67 | 1,459.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,459.67 | 1,459.67 | Contribution towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend |
| CSLI40/304B | Yeading | Fmr Tasman House, 111 Maple Road <br> Hayes 38097/APP/2012/3168 | ${ }^{684.48}$ | 684.48 | 684.48 | 0.00 | ${ }^{684.48}$ | 0.00 |  | Contribution towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books within the Authority's area. No facilities and/or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits. Allocated and spent towards eBooks scheme (Cabinet Member Decision 22/12/2015). |
| CSL441306C | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Hillingdon } \\ \text { East } \end{array}$ | Fmr Knights of Hillingdon, Uxbridge 15407/APP/2009/1838 | 493.40 | 493.40 | 493.40 | 0.00 | 493.40 | 0.00 |  | Contribution received towards the provision of library books within the authority's area. No time limits. Allocated and 22/12/2015). |
| CSL4441242F | West Drayton | Drayton Garden Village (fmr NATS site),Porters Way, West Drayton 5107/APP/2009/2348 | 34,000.00 | 34,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34,000.00 | 34,000.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of or improvement to library facilities and/or library books in Hillingdon. No time limits |
| CSL4661313 | Charville | 51065/APP/2009/546 <br> The Grange, Pine Place, Hayes | 392.00 | 392.00 | 392.00 | 0.00 | 392.00 | 0.00 |  | Contribution received towards the provision of or improvement <br> to ibrany facilities and/or library books in Hillingdon. No time <br> (Cabinet Member Decision 22/12/2015). |
| CSL499/329C | Tomnfield | Land at Pronto Industrial Estate, 585 591 Uxbridge Road, Hayes 4404/APP/2013/1650 4404/APP/2008/3558 | 1,764.67 | 1,764.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,764.67 | 1,764.67 | Contribution towards the cost of providing library facilities and other associated intiatives within the London Borough of Hillingdon. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (July 2024). |
| CSL50/3290 | Tomnfield | Land at Pronto Industrial Estate, 585 591 Uxbridge Road, Hayes 4404/APP/2013/165 PP/2008/3558 | 11,875.30 | 11,875.30 | 11,875.30 | 11,875.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards community facilities to be provided within the London Borough of Hillingdon. Funds to be spent witihn 10 years of receipt (July 2024). Funds spent as part of end of year financing towards Hayes End Library redevelopment scheme to provide a new improved library. (Cabinet Member Decison 07/07/2015) |
| CSL52/333D | Yiewsley | 39 High Street, Yiewsley 24485/APP/2013/138 | 1,321.00 | 1,321.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,321.00 | 1,321.00 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provision of improvement to library facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend |
| CSL55/347C | Nort Uxbridge | Honeycroft Day Centre, Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge <br> 6046/APP/2013/1834 | 1,291.11 | 1,291.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,291.11 | 1,291.11 | 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 |
| CSL57/348E | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Ukoridge } \\ \text { North } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Lancaster \& Hermitage Centre, Lancaster Road, Uxbridge 68164/APP/2011/271 | ${ }^{805.36}$ | ${ }^{805.36}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | ${ }^{805.36}$ | 80.36 | 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. |
| CSL599283E | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { North } \end{aligned}$ | Former RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge. $585 /$ APP/ 2009/2752 | 21,122.11 | 21,122.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 21,122.11 | 21,122.11 | Contribution received as the first instalment to be used by the Council towards the provision of or improvement to librany facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (Oct 2025) to be spent within 10 years of receipt (Oct 2025) |
| CSL/61/356D | Yiewsley |  | 1,591.97 | 1,591.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,591.97 | 1,591.97 | Contribution to be used by the Council towards the provision o or improvement to library facilities and /or library books within the Authority's area. No time limits for spend |
| CSL/62/359C | Yiewsley | 26-36 Horton Rd, Yiewsley 3507/APP/201312327 | 2,994.68 | 2,694.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,694.68 | 2,694.68 | 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. Spend witihn 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023 ) |


| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { BALANCE } \\ \text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}}{ }$ | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 3111215 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31112115 | To 3103/16 | AS AT 31031/6 | AS AT 31033116 |  |
|  |  | CENTRAL SERVICES, CULTURE \& heritage - total | 202,233.82 | 202,233.82 | 96,344.68 | 40,474.37 | 71,805.38 | 105,889.14 | 85,889.14 |  |
| PORTFOLIO: FINANCE PROPERTY \& BUSINESS SERVIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/02118 | West Drayton | Old Mill House, Thorney Mill Road, West Drayton 41706c/91/1904 | 59,556.42 | 59,556.42 | 52,577.45 | 52,577.45 | 0.00 | 6,978.97 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { E/17/126D } \\ (\text { see: PT/56 \& } \\ \text { PPR/18) } \end{array}$ | Botwell | Trident Site, Phase 3 Stockley Park - Lake Farm \& Botwell Green Play Area 37977/P/94/335 | 1,323,400.00 | 1,323,400.00 | 1,323,40.00 | 1,323,37.96 | 1,728.67 | 0.00 |  | Balance for Lake Farm. Friends of Lake Farm now agreed scope of works. Engineering Consultancy have been track. Botwell 18 December 2003. Planning permission for skate park granted. No time limits for spend. Skate Park project completed July 2013. Balance towards seating. Scheme |
| E/26/93 <br> (Formerly PT/33) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Villages } \end{aligned}$ | H.S.A Land, Bath Road 41687S/98/16 | 12,396.46 | 12,396.46 | 12,396.46 | 9,812.37 | 1,304.34 | 0.00 |  | Available for Envirommental Improvements in Bath Rd area. <br>  Interest accrued. No time constraints. Spend towards tree planting. Scheme complete. |
| E/28/71 <br> (Formerly PT/40) | Botwell | Land at Hendrick Lovell, S.W of Dawley Road, Hayes 43554/C/92/787 | 12,692.00 | 12,692.00 | 267.81 | 267.81 | 0.00 | 12,424.19 |  | Landscaping works (12.69K). Limited to specific area of land Delays caused by land being in Stockley Park Consortium ownership. Green Spaces team is looking into the potential a scheme within the parameters of the legal agreement. Site overgrown preventing planting trees in preferred location. The trees officer has suggested two locations on the site where they could be planted instead. Officers currently considering feasibility. No time constraints. |
| ${ }_{\mid \text {E/32/01 }}^{\text {(Formerly PT/43/01) }}$ | Tomffield | Sainsbury Minet Site - Grapes | 1,008,500.00 | 1,008,50.00 | 1,008,186.10 | 1,008,186.10 | 2,235.00 | 313.90 |  | The balance has been included in s106 dated 10 May 2004 for Lombardy Retail Park, Coldharbour Lane for the Council to the funds for the following specified improvements: (see agreement for details). Sainsbury has given approval footpath scheme in Lombardy Park. Playground, lighting and foot works completed 2011. Unspent funds to be repaid January 2011. Remaining balan Lombardy playground. |
| E/38/153B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heathrow } \\ & \text { Hillages } \end{aligned}$ | Polar Park, Bath Road, <br> Harmonsenth <br> B1437 | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 7,764.09 | 7,764.09 | 0.00 | 2,235.91 | 0.00 | Funds received towards Air Quality initiatives within the vivinity of the site. No time constraints. Funds allocated towards two monitoring stations in vicinity of the site (Cabinet Member monitoing. Decision 22/6/12010). $£ 7,764.09$ spent towards air quality monitoring |
| E/42/140J | Pinkwell | MOD Records Office Stockley Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 104,308.09 | 104,308.09 | 104,120.23 | 104,120.23 | 0.00 | 187.86 |  | To be applied towards the provision and maintenance of open space and recreational facilities within the area of the site, $£ 22,000$ alocated to Bourne Park Playing Fields. Bialance allocated to Pinkwell Drainge works to the Bourne Park Playing Fields are now complete. Funds not spent including interest within 7 years of receipt (January 2014) are to be repaid. Path works completed now complete. |
| E/4911798 | Botwell | 555-559 \& r/o 51-553 Uxbridge Road, Hayes planning ref. | 33,912.00 | 33,912.00 | 17,755.00 | 17,755.00 | 0.00 | 16,157.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards improvement to the open spac facilities at Rosedale Park adjoining the land. No time limits Spend towards improvements to Park Pavilion. |
| E/51/186C | Yiewsley | 92-104, High St., Yiewsley 59189/APP/2005/3476 | 60,616.20 | 60,616.20 | 60,616.20 | 60,616.20 | 22,544.99 | 0.00 |  | Funds received towards open space improvements at Yiewsley Recreation Ground. Funds unspent at 20/04/2015 to be returned. Spend towards footpath works completed Dec 09 Remaining funds to be spent towards play builder scheme. Completed June 2010. Remaining balance allocated towards the installation of a skate board park at Yiewsley Recreation Ground. (Cabinet Member Decision 24/03/2015). Scheme complete. |

FINANCIAL UPDATE ON SECTION 106 AND 278 AGREEMENTS AT 31 March 2016 (Central South)

| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 3103/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 |  |
| E/53/192B | Uxbridge | 126/127, Waterloo Road Uxbridge 2325/APP/2006/3452 | 20,913.64 | 20,913.64 | 20,913.64 | 11,271.70 | 9,641.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards provision of public open space in the locality of the site. Officers lookng at a programme of improvements to Rockingham Recreation Ground. No time limits. Funds to be spent towards playbuilder scheme, due to commence spring 2010. Playbuilder scheme completed August 2010. Remaining balance allocated and spent towards a new playground at Rockingham Recreation Ground (Cabinet Member Decision 29/03/2016). Scheme complete April 2016. |
| E/54/194D | Uxbridge | Frays Adult Education Centre, Harefield Road, Uxbridge. 18732/APP/2006/1217 | 44,509.05 | 44,509.05 | 44,509.05 | 41,536.22 | 2,972.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of open space facilities witihn the Borough of Hillingdon. No time limits. Funds allocated to Hillingdon Court Park (reconstruction of the bowling green). Cabinet Member decision 20/7/09. Scheme completed October 09. Remaining balance to be reallocated. Remaining balance allocated and spent towards a new playground at Rockingham Recreation Ground (Cabinet Member Decision 29/03/2016). Scheme complete April 2016. |
| E/59/155F | West Drayton | Former RAF - Porters Way, West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 9,291.00 | 9,291.00 | 0.00 | 10,709.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the maintenance of play facilities at Stockley Recreation Ground (Mulbery Parade). Funds to be spent by Dec 2012. $£ 10,415$ allocated towards costs incurred in maintaining the playground (Cabinet Member Decision 7/11/2012). Developer has agreed that the remaining balance can be retained and spent towards the continued maintenance of the play equipment (letter received June 2015). |
| E/67/209H | Yiewsley | Tesco, Trout Road, Yiewsley. 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 35,742.27 | 35,742.27 | 35,742.27 | 35,742.27 | 35,742.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received for the purposes of expanding the exisiting facilities at Yiewsley Recreation Ground. Funds to be spent by March 2016. Further $£ 2,101.57$ received as indexation payment. Contribution allocated towards the installation of a skate Board Park at Yiewsley Recreation Ground. (Cabinet Member Decision 24/03/2015). Scheme complete. |
| E/69/246B | Botwell | 561\& 563 Uxbridge Road, Hayes. 63060/APP/2007/1385 | 20,175.83 | 20,175.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,175.83 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of improving Rosedale Park which adjoins the land. No time limit on spend. |
| E/73/265E | Heathrow <br> Villages | Former Longford House, 420 Bath Road, Longford (Premier Inn). 2985/APP/2009/680 \& 2985/APP/2010/2988 | 26,644.74 | 26,644.74 | 26,644.74 | 26,644.74 | 13,935.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received for the monitoring and implementation of air quality management measures on the land on or in the vicinity of the development. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receip (Nov 2016). Funds allocated towards the Borough Air Quality Monitoring Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 09/07/2014). Spend towards operation of air quality monitoring stations in the borough. |
| E/74/271 | Tounfield | Fmr Airlink House, Land to the north of Pump Lane, Hayes. <br> 5505/APP/2010/2455 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards initiatives to improve air quality in the Authority's Area. See legal agreement for further details. No time limits for spend. Funds allocated towards the Borough Air Quality Monitoring Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 09/07/2014). |
| E/75/272 | Heathrow Villages | White Hart PH, Bath Rd, Harlington. 4129/APP/2011/453 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards initiatives to improve air quality in the Authority's Area. See legal agreement for further details. No time limits for spend. Funds allocated towards the Borough Air Quality Monitoring Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 09/07/2014.) Spend towards operation of air quality monitoring stations in the borough. |
| E/76/276E | Tounfield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes. 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 199,656.76 | 199,656.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 199,656.76 | 199,656.76 | First instalment $(£ 64,740)$ of a contribution received towards improvements to local recreation and sports facilities within the vicinity of the land. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (July 2019). £66,741 received as the second instalment towards the same purpose (spend July 2020). Final instalment £68,174 received (spend by Feb 2022). |
| E/77/276F | Tounfield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 27,018.91 | 27,018.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27,018.91 | 27,018.91 | First instalment ( $£ 8,761$ ) of a contribution recevied towards air quality improvements in the Authority's area including, measures to reduce emissions, tree planting, use of cleaner fuels and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (July 2019). £9,031 received as the second instalment towards the same purpose (spend by July 2020). Final instalment received this quarter (spend Feb 2022). |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME /PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | Total income | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE $\substack{\text { SPENDABLE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}$ | $\underset{\text { COMMENTS }}{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E791277E | Heathrow <br> Villages | The Porral Scylla Rd, Heathrow Airport | $\text { AS AT } 31103116$ | $\text { AS AT } 31112115$ | $\text { AS AT } 311031166$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AS AT } 31112115 \\ & 22,942.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline \text { To } 31 / 03 / 16 \\ \hline 25,804.75 \end{array}$ | $\frac{\text { AS AT 31031/16 }}{0.00}$ | AS AT 3103/16. ${ }_{\text {0, }}$ | Contribution received towards air quality improvements in the Authority's area including, measures to reduce emissions, planting, use of cleaner fuels and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). Further contribution towards the sam purpose. No time limit for spend. Funds allocated towards the Borough Air Quality Monitoring Programme (Cabinet Member quality monitoring stations in the borough. |
| E/80/249F | Tomnfield | Glenister Hall, 119 Minet Drive, Hayes 40169/APP/2011/243 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision and maintenance of junior football pitches/ refurbishment of cricket wicket at Grassy meadows (see agreement for details). No time limits Grassy meadows (see agreement for details). No time limits |
| E/1821288B | Yiewsley | Versatile House, Bentinck Road, Yiewsley 59436/APP/2010/721 | 12,717.00 | 12,717.00 | 12,347.24 | 12,347.24 | 12,347.24 | 369.76 | 0.00 |  |
| E/83/1986 | Uxbidge | Fmr Gasworks Site, Cowley Mill Road Uxbridge (Kier Park). <br> (2012/288 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 5,945.92 | 0.00 | 5,945.92 | 9,054.08 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards undertaking an assessment of air quality within the vicinity of the site. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (March 2020). Funds allocated towards Borough Air Quality Monitoring Programme (Cabinet Member Decision 09/07/2014). $£ 5,945$ spent towards the operation of air quality monitoring stations in the Borough. |
| E/842997 | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Heathrow } \\ \text { Villages } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Fmr Technicolor Site, 271 Bath Rd, Sipson. 35293/APP/1938 | 17,270.83 | 17,270.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17,270.83 | 17,270.83 | Funds received to be used by Hillingdon Council towards initiatives to improve air quality within LBH. Funds to be spent witihn 7 years of receipt (May 2020) |
| E/85/3000 | Tomnfield | Fmr Powergen Site, North Hyde Gardens, Hayes 3226/APP/2012/2185 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | Contribution received to be used towards reducing emissions,tree \& other planting, venicle restricions, use of strategy (see legal agreement for details). No time limits. |
| E/87/314A | Pinkwell | Building 5, Hyde Park Hayes Millington Road, Hayes 45753/APP/2012/2029 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 |  |
| E/88/314B | Pinkwell | Building 5, Hyde Park Hayes Millington Road, Hayes 45753/APP/2012/2029 | 59,160.00 | 59,160.00 | 59,160.00 | 21,945.00 | 37,215.00 | 0.00 | 37,215.00 | Funds received as the "carbon offsetting contibution" to be used by the Council to ensure the shorltavi of carbon dioxide savings generated on-site is met by allowing energy efficient measure (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 5 years of receiept (Dec 2018). £21,945 allocated towards the installation of solar panels at PIne Community Centre (Cabinet installation of solar panels at PIne Community Centre (Cab Member Decision 10/212015). Scheme complete. $£ 37,215$ used towards Compass Theatre scheme as part of end of year financing. Subject to Cabinet Member approval. |
| E/891/15C | Pinkwell | Asda Unit 3 Westlands Estate, Millington Rd, Hayes 32157/APP/2011/872 | 26,323.47 | 26,323.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 26,323.47 | 26,323.47 | Contribution received as the "air quality contribution", to be used by the Council towards air quality monitoring in the Authority's area. No time limits for spend |
| E/900/325 | West Drayton | Stockley Close Units 1623 \& 1685 25760/APP/2013/3632 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 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 (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 5 year of receipt (April 2019). |
| E/92/333E | Yiewsley | 39 High Street, Yiewsley 24485/APP/2013/138 | 6,262.53 | 6,262.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,262.53 | 6,262.53 | 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 (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 5 year of receipt (April 2019). |
| E/93/326 | Pinkwell | Prologis Park, Stockley Road, Hayes 18399/APP/2013/3449 | 21,789.00 | 21,789.00 | 0.00 | .00 | 0.00 | 21,789.00 | 21,789.00 | Contribution received as the "allowable solutions" (energy) contribution. Funds to be used towards local carbon emissions reduction initiatives in the London Borough of Hillingdon. No time limit for spend |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | total income | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { TOTAL }}{\text { EXPENDITURE }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{2015 / 2016}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE <br> $\substack{\text { SPENDABE NOT } \\ \text { ALLOCATED }}$ | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 3103316 | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 3103316 | AS AT 3112/15 | To 31103/16 | AS AT 3103316 | AS AT 3103116 |  |
| E/94/338B | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Uxbridge } \\ \text { South } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37 St John's Road, Uxbridge } \\ & \text { 15811/APP/2012/2444 } \end{aligned}$ | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 0.0 | 5 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of environmental and Britain site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation as made necessary by the development. No time linits for spend. |
| E/95/34] | South Uxbridge | Building 63, Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge <br> 56862/APP/2014/170 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 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 (July 2020). |
| E/96/344E | South Uxbridge | Building 63, Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge <br> 56862/APP/2014/170 | 5,750.00 | 5,750.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,750.00 | 5,750.00 | Contribution received towards the maintenance of the footpath works as shown on a plan attached to the agreement. Funds to be spent within 5 years of receipt (July 2020). |
| E/97/344F | South Uxbridge | Building 63, Phase 500, Riverside Way, Uxbridge 56862/APP/2014/170 | 5,000.00 | 5.00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.00.00 | 5,000.00 | Contribution received towards the cost of tree works to trees sited in the adjoining nature reseve. Funds to be spent witihn 5 years of receipt (July 2020). |
| E/98/354B | Botwell | Land on west Side of Dawley Road Hayes (EC House). 38065/APP/2014/2143 | 12,558.21 | 12,558.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,558.21 | 12,558.21 | 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 he power; environmental management and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 7 year of receipt (Sept 2022). |
| E1100/40H | Botwell | Land at Thorn EMI Complex (Old Vinyl Factory). 51588/APP/2000/1827 \&5987/APP/2012/1838 | 25,361.47 | 25,361.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,361.47 | 25,361.47 | Contribution received towards initiatives to improve air quality witihn the Authorit'ys area. Funds to be spent witihn 7 years of receipt (Nov 2022) |
| E101/355D | Botwell | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Formr EMI Site, Dawle Rd, Hayes }} ^{82944 / \mathrm{APP} / 2015 / 1406}$ | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,500.00 | 12,500.00 | 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 (Nov 2022). |
| E/102/360B | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Heathrow } \\ \text { Villages } \end{array}$ | Fmr Unitair Centre, Great South West Rd, Feltham, 49559/APP/2014/334 | 26,000.00 | 26,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 26,000.00 | 26,000.00 | 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 he power; environmental management and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). No time limit for spend. |
| E/103/359D | Yiewsley | 26-36 Hotton Rd, Yiewsley 3507/APP/2013/2327 | 12,625.00 | 12,625.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,625.00 | 12,625.00 | 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 combin power; environmental management and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023). |
| E/104/371C | Heathrow Villages | ${ }^{2722-276 \text { Bath Rd, } \text {, Hayes }}$ | 25,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | Funds to be used towards initiatives to improve air quality in the Authority's Area including (but not limited to): use low fuel technology; tree and other cleaner fuels; use of combined heat \& power; environmental management and air quality strategy (see agreement for details). No time limit for spend. |
| E105/378B | Townfield | Hayes Gate House, Uxbridge Road, Hayes 2385/APP/2013/2523 | 12,625.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,625.00 | 12,625.00 | 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 (Jan 2021). |


| CASE ReF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL Income | $\underset{\text { EXPENAL }}{\text { TOTURE }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITURE }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDITURE | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | $\underset{\text { COMMENTS }}{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E/106/732C | Yiewsley | Phase 3, Stockley Park, Stockley 37977/APP/2015/1004 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AS AT 3103/16 } \\ 50,000.00 \end{array}$ | AS AT 311121215 ${ }^{0.00}$ | AS AT 3103116 0.00 | AS AT 311/21/15 0.00 | To 3103316 0.00 | AS AT 31103316 ${ }_{\text {50,00.00 }}$ | AS AT 3103116 | Funds to be used towards initiatives to improve air quality in the Authority's Area including (but not limited to): use o 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 b spent within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023). |
| E/107/356C | Yiensley | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Packet Boat House, Packet Boat } \\ & \text { (Lane, Cowey } \\ & \text { 20545/PPP/2012/2848 } \end{aligned}$ | 450 | 15,450.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4550.00 | 5,450.00 | Contribution received towards the maintenance and provison of open space: the maintenance and provision of children's <br>  time linit for spend. |
|  |  | FINANCE PROPERTY \& BUSINESS SERVICES SUB -TOTAL | 3,564,739.63 | 3,477,114.63 | 2,852,411.95 | 2,791,191.05 | 196,428.51 | 712,297.68 | 645,906.18 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PORTFOLIO: SOCIIL SERVICES, HOUSING, HEALTH \& WELLBEING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [H/8/186D ${ }^{\text {* } 54}$ | Yieusley | 92-105, High St., Yiewsley 59189/APP/2005/3476 | 15,615.26 | 15,615.26 | 15,615.26 | 15,615.26 | 15,615.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing additional primary heath facilties in the Borough. Funds not spent by 200002/2015 must be eeturned. Funds allocated towards phases 2-5 of the etsA extenson (abinet Mmber Aproval 25/022012015). Funds transferred to NHS Property Sevices, April 2015. |
| H/10/1900 *56 | Uxbridge | Armstrong House \& The Pavilions. 4374/APP/2006/252 | 43,577.59 | 43,577.59 | 43,577.59 | 43,577.59 | 43,577.59 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution neceived towards primary health care facilities in the borough. Funds not spent by July 2015 are to be eretumed to the developer. Funds allocated towards capacity improvements at Uxoridge Health Centre (Cabinet Member 2015). |
| H13/194E *59 | Uxbridge | Frays Adult Education Centre, Harefield Road, Uxbridge. 18732/APP/2006/1217 | 12,426.75 | 12,426.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,426.75 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the provision of healthcare facilities in the Borough. No time limits. |
| H/18/219C ${ }^{7} 70$ | Yeading | Land rear of Sydney Court, Perth Avenue, Hayes <br> 5593/6APP/200992629 | 3,902.00 | 3,902.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,902.00 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilites in the Authorities Area. No time limits. $£ 1,800$ earmarked towards conversion of existing office space to an additional consulting room at the Pine Surgery, Hayes, subject to formal approval. |
| H/23/209K ${ }^{\text {77 }}$ | Yiewsley | Tesco, Trout Road,Yiewsley 60929/APP/2007/3744 | 37,836.35 | 37,723.04 | 37,836.35 | 0.00 | 37,836.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Contribution received towards the provision of local health senvice infrastructure in the Yiewsley West Drayton, Cowley senvice infrastructure in the Yiewsey, West Drayton, Comley area. Funds to be used by the Council towards an eligible scheme by March 2016. Further $£ 2,218.04$ received as indexation payment for the contribution. Contribution allocated towards clinical improvements at Otterfield Medical Centre (Cabinet Member Decision 15/0212016) Funds transferred to HCCG (February 2016). |
| H2771262D * 80 | Charville | Former Hayes End Library, Uxbridge Road, Hayes. 9301/APP/2010/2231 | 5,233.36 | 5,233.36 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,233.36 | 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. |
| H/3012766 * 85 | Townfield | Fmr Hayes FC, Church Road, Hayes 4327/APP/2009/2737 | 104,319.06 | 104,319.06 | 68,698.26 | 68,698.26 | 0.00 | 35,620.80 | 0.00 |  |
| H/32/284C ${ }^{\text {89 }}$ | Yiewsley | 335/APP/2010/1615 e/work units) <br> Former Honeywell site, Trout Road, | 5,280.23 | 5,280.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,280.23 | 0.00 | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to ceased patient numbers, new health services at loca level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits for spend. |


| CASE Ref. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | Total income | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITLURE }}{\text { Tot }}$ | $\underset{\text { EXPENDITLURE }}{\text { Tot }}$ | $2015 / 2016$ EXPENDTURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BALANCE OF } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\text { (as at mid May 2016) }}{\text { COMMENTS }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H/33/291C *91 | West Drayton | Fmr Swan PH, Swan Road, West <br> Draytoon. <br> $68248 / A P P / 2011 / 3013$ | AS AT 3103116. ${ }_{5,416.75}$ | AS AT 31/12115 5 | AS AT 31103/16. ${ }_{0}$ | AS AT 311/21/15 0.00 | To 3103316 ${ }_{0.00}$ | AS AT 31103116 5 | AS AT 31030316 |  |
| H139/304C *97 | Yeading | Fmr Tasman House, 111 Maple Road, <br> Hayes <br> 38097/APP/2012/3168 | 6,448.10 | 6,448.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,448.10 |  | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health premises to increased patient numbers, new health services at loca level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. Funds to be spent within 7 years of receipt (August 2020). |
| H/401/3060 *98 | Hillindon East | Fmr Knights of Hillingdon, Uxbridge 15407/APP/2009/1838 | 4,645.60 | 4,645.60 | 4,645.60 | 4,645.60 | 4,645.60 | 0.00 |  | Contribution received towards the cost of providing health facilities in the Authority's area including expansion of health ased patient numbers, new health services at local level, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a heaith facility caused by the . No time limits. Funds allocated towards capacity Decison 12/06/2015). Funds transferred to HCCG (July 2015). |
| H/41/3098 "99 | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Uubridge } \\ \text { South } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Former Dagenham Motors, Junction of St Johns Rd \& Cowley Mill Rd Uxbridge $188 /$ /PP/ $2008 / 3309$ | 12,046.96 | 12,046.96 | 12,046.96 | 12,046.96 | 12,046.96 | 0.00 |  | Contribution received towards the cost of providing health care facilities within the London Borough of Hillingdon as解 years of receipt (Oct 2020). Funds allocated towards capacity improvements at Uxbridge Health Centre (Cabinet Member Decision 12/06/2015). Funds transferred to HCCG (July 2015). |
| H/42/242G *100 | West Drayton | West Drayton Garden Village (north site) off Porters Way, West Drayton 5107/APP/2009/2348 | 337,574.00 | 377,574.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 377,574.00 |  | Contribution received towards providing additional primar health care facilities in the West Drayton area including; expansion of existing premises to provide additional facilities and services to meet increased patient numbers, new health details). No time Imits |
| H/47/329E *106 | Tomffield | Land at Pronto Industrial Estate, 585591 Uxbridge Road, Hayes 4404/APP/2008/3558 - | 14,066.23 | 14,066.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14,066.23 |  | Contribution received towards the cost of providing healthcare facilities in the London Borough of Hillingdon. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (July 2024). |
| H/491/233B *108 | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Uxbridge } \\ \text { North } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Former RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge 585/APP/2009/2752 | 624,507.94 | 624,507.94 | 177,358.31 | 177,358.31 | 177,358.31 | 447,149.63 |  | Contribution received towards the provison of healthcare facinies serving the development, in line with the S106 Planning Obligations SPD 2008. Funds to be spent within 10 years of receipt (August 2024). £177,358 from this Uxbridge 12/06/2015). Funds transferred to HCCG (July 2015). |
| H150/333F *109 | Yiewsley | 39 High street, Yiewsley 24485/APP/2013138 | 12,444.41 | 12,444.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,444.41 |  | Funds received towards the cost of providing health facilities meet increaseased patient tumbers, new health senvicesas at olocal level, any new wacilites reauired to compensate for the loss a health facaility caused by the development. No time linits. |
| H/55/347 *114 | North Uxbridge | Honeycroft Day Centre, Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge <br> 6046/APP/2013/1834 | 12,162.78 | 12,162.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,162.78 |  | 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 a health facility caused by the development. Funds to spent/committed within 7 years of receipt (May 2022) |
| H/56/348A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { North } \\ & \text { Uxbridge } \end{aligned}$ | Lancaster \& Hemitage Centre, 68164/APP/2011/271 Lancaster Road, Uxbridge | 390,564.64 | 390,564.64 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 390,564.64 | 390,564.64 | Contribution reecived to be used by the Council to provide subsidised housing available through a Registered Social generally vaiabale ont the open marke. No time linits tor send I Idex link ing received spend. Index linking received |
| H/58/3488 * 117 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uxbridge } \\ & \text { North } \end{aligned}$ | Lancaster \& Hermitage Centre 68164/APP/2011/271 Lancaster Road, Uxbridge | 7,587.72 | 7,587.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,587.72 |  |  meet increased patient numbers. new health senicest at ocal Tevel, any new facilities required to compensate for the loss of a health facility caused by the development. No time limits |


| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | total income | TOTAL INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 |  |
| H/59/356E *120 | Yiewsley | Packet Boat House, Packet Boat Lane, Cowley 20545/APP/2012/2848 | 14,997.03 | 14,997.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14,997.03 | 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/60/359E *121 | Yiewsley | 26-36 Horton Rd, Yiewsley 3507/APP/2013/2327 | 25,273.45 | 25,273.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25,273.45 | 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. Spend within 7 years of receipt (Jan 2023). |
|  |  | SOCIAL SERVICES HEALTH \& HOUSING SUB-TOTAL | 1,695,926.21 | 1,695,812.90 | 359,778.33 | 321,941.98 | 291,080.07 | 1,336,147.88 | 390,564.64 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SECTION 106 SUB - TOTAL | 24,857,598.39 | 24,281,220.01 | 16,413,606.50 | 12,224,058.46 | 4,737,272.16 | 8,443,991.89 | 3,825,490.45 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | GRAND TOTAL ALL SCHEMES | 27,048,107.32 | 26,454,510.35 | 17,386,561.75 | 13,182,013.71 | 4,759,708.69 | 9,661,545.57 | 3,825,490.45 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The balance of funds remaining must be spent on works as set out in each individual agreement. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bold and strike-through text indicates key changes since the Cabinet report for the previous quarter's figures. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bold figures indicate changes in income and expenditure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income figures for schemes within shaded cells indicate where funds are held in interest bearing accounts. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *16: PT278/27 | £601,441.14 is to be held as a returnable security deposit for the highways (orks (to be later refunded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *18: PT278/34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *20: PT278144 | $£ 20,938.04$ includes a returnable security deposit for the highway works (to be later refunded) plus interst. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{22}$ : PT278/30 | E5,000.00 is to be held as a returnable security deposit for the highway works (to ee later refunded) ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *23: PT278449 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *28:PT/24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *38:PT/88/140C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *66:PT/88/140F | $£ 7$ ¢3,774.40 there has not been any petitions for parking schemes in the area. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *47:PT37/40E | $£ 32,805.42$ there has not been any pettions for parking schemes in the area. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *51:PT278/62/149A | $£ 5,000.00$ is to be held as a returnable security deposit for the highway works (to be later refunded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *52:PT/277865 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *54:H8/186D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *56:H110/1900 | $£ 12,426.75$ funds have been received to provide health care services in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *59:113/194E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *6:PT127876 | ¢ $£ 5,000.00$ is to be held as a returnable security deposit for highway works (to be later refunded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *61:PT/1 10/198B | £14,240.00 is to be held has a returnable deposit for the implementation of the travel plan (to be later refunded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *63:PT/111/205A | $£ 20,000.00$ is to be held as a returnable deposit for the implementation of the travel plan (later to be refunded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *67 PT/1 14/209A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *70:H118/219C | £3,902.00 funds have been received to provide Health Care services in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *5 H/23/209K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *80:H27/1262D | £5,233.36 funds have been received to provide Health Care services in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *82:PT/126/242D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *84:PT/2788181/249E | £4,000.00 funds received as a security deposit to ensure proper execeution of works (to be effunded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *85:H301276G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *87:PT/278782/273 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *88:PT/ $/ 32 / 149 \mathrm{~J}$ | £15,000.00 funds to be held as a returnable deposit for the implementation of the travel plan (to be later refunded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *89:H132284C | £5, 280.23 funds received to provide health care failities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *90:PT/278883/292 | £31,500.00 funds to be held as a returnable deposit for highways works (to be later refunded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *91:H/33/291C | £5,416.75 funds received to provide heath care facilities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{* 93} \mathrm{P}$ PT/278/85 | £5,000.00 funds to be held as a returable deposit for highways works (to be later refunded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *94-H/366/299D | $£ 9,001.79$ funds received to provide health care facilities in the borough. $£ 6,448.10$ funds received to provide health care facilities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *97: H/399/304C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *98:H400/306D | ${ }^{£} 0$. | funds received to provide health care facilities in | the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *99:H41/309D | E0.00 funds received to provide heath care facilities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *100:H/42/242G | £337,574.00 funds received to provide health care failities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *101: PT/137/300A | £ $£ 10,000.00$ funds to be used by TL f for trafic study yat Bull S Brigge roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *102: PT/138/300B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *106: H/47/329E | £14,066.23 funds received to provide heath care facilities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *108: H/49/283B | $£ 447,149.63$ funds received to provide health care facilities in the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *109: H500/33F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *111:PT/278/98/339 | $£ 12,444.41$ funds received to provide heath care facilities in the borough.$£ 20,000.00$ funds to be held as a returnable deposit for highways works (to be later refunded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

FINANCIAL UPDATE ON SECTION 106 AND 278 AGREEMENTS AT 31 March 2016 (Central South)

| CASE REF. | WARD | SCHEME / PLANNING REFERENCE | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL INCOME | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | TOTAL EXPENDITURE | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2015 / 2016 \\ \text { EXPENDITURE } \end{gathered}$ | BALANCE OF FUNDS | BALANCE SPENDABLE NOT ALLOCATED | COMMENTS (as at mid May 2016) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/12/15 | To 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 | AS AT 31/03/16 |  |
| *113: H/53/346D | £8,434. | funds received to provide health care facilities in | the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *114: H55/347D | £12,162. | funds received to provide heath care facilities in | the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *117: $\mathrm{H} / 58 / 348 \mathrm{~B}$ | £7,587. | funds received to provide heath care facilities in | the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *118: PT/278/103/370A | £51,234. | is to be held as a returnable security deposit for | the highway works to be | er refunded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *119: PT/157/355A | £20,000. | funds to be held as a returnable deposit for the | mplementation of the trav | plan (to be later refunded) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *120: H/59/356E | £14,997. | funds received to provide heath care facilities in | the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *121: H/60/359E | £25,273. | funds received to provide heath care facilities in | the borough. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *123: PT/158/371A | £20,000. | funds to be held as a returnable deposit for | he implementation of th | ravel plan (to be later re |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *124: PT/160/354C | £20,000. | funds to be held as a returnable deposit for | he implementation of the | ravel plan (to be later re |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *125: PT/161/373 | £4,000. | funds to be held as a returnable deposit for | he implementation of th | ravel plan (to be later re |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *126: PT//64/374A | $\begin{array}{r} £ 20,000.0 \\ £ 2,804,778.9 \end{array}$ | funds to be held as a returnable deposit for | he implementation of the | ravel plan (to be later r |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\left.\begin{array}{cccccc} & \text { total bal } & \text { spendable unalloci unspendable } & \text { allocated (live/not live) } \\ \text { Dec figs } & 17,185,623.74 & 7,296,471.14 & 3,255,886.44 & 6,633,266.16\end{array}\right]$

- $4,545,859.53$


| PT/52/73 | Former Magnatex Site, Bath Road Residents Parking Scheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *45 | 108501/97/2005 | 3,520 | 3,520 |  | 3,520 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/54/21C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road Landscaping 6198/BS/98/1343 | 57,000 | 57,000 |  | 57,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/54/21D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road - HGV Signage 6198/BS/98/1343 | 39,739 | 39739 |  | 39,739 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/56/26A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PPR/18 | Trident Site, Phase 3 Stockley Park Hayes Hub/H50 \& Botwell Common |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& E/17) | Road Zebra Crossing 37977/P/94/335 | 2,676,600 | 2,601,600 | 75,000 | 2,601,600 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/57/27C <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/18) | Carmichael Close, Ruislip - Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *34 | Works / 55898/APP/2000/2736 | 13,882 | 13,882 |  | 13,882 |  | 12,511 | 12,511 |  |  |
| PT/61/89B | LHR Training Centre, Stockley Close / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: E/35) | 51458/97/1537 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/65/74A (see EYL/40, | Land at Johnson's Yard (former garage site), Redford Way, Uxbridge - Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/20 \& E/21) | Lighting 53936/APP/2002/1357 | 18,863 | 18,863 |  | 18,863 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/66/51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (See also | White Hart Public House, 1186 Uxbridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/08) | Road, Hayes 10852/APP/2003/2196 | 5,261 | 5,261 |  | 5,261 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/67/95A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Formerly | Land At Royal Lane Hillingdon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/30/95A) | 56265/APP/2001/1103 - Landscaping | 3,440 | 3,440 |  | 3,440 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Land at Sanderson Site and Braybourn - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/68/96A | Tramway feasibility, resident parking scheme / 35347/APP/2000/1294 \& 1296 | 42,925 | 42,925 |  | 42,925 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/69/97A | Land at West Drayton Depot Stockley Road West Drayton - Landscaping |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: E/22) | 2760/APP/2003/2816 | 5,463 | 5,463 |  | 5,463 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/70/98A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: EYL/46 \& | Land at Toolmasters site Hillingdon - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/23) | Traffic Calming 3048/APP/2003/552 UB1 Vine Street Uxbridge | 25,590 | 25,590 |  | 25,590 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/71/99 | 11005/AG/97/360 | 250,000 | 250,000 |  | 250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/72/88B <br>  | Land at Hales Yard Springwell Lane, Harefield 21895/APP/2003/763\&764 - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/47) | Highways | 41,720 | 41,720 |  | 41,720 |  |  | 695 | (695) |  |
| PT/73/88C (see: PT/72 \& | Land at Hales Yard, Springwell Lane, Harefield 21895/APP/2003/763\&764 - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/47) | Towpath | 9,840 | 9,840 |  | 9,840 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Land at 64 Ducks Hill Road Northwood/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/76/119 | 26900L/99/1077 | 34,213 | 34,213 |  | 34,213 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grand Union Village, Ruislip Road, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/77/123 | Southall/ 327/APP/2000/2 106 | 49,588 | 49,588 |  | 49,588 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/78/10B (See also |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT278/55) | 35347/APP/2000/1294 \& 1296 | 27.201 | 27,201 |  | 27,201 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/79/108A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (formerly | Larchmont, Ladygate Lane, Ruislip. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT278/41) | 14633/APP/2002/203 | 74,594 | 74,594 |  | 74,594 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/80/112 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (formerly <br> PT278/05) | Grand Union Park, Packet Boat Lane, site ref: 1197 (various applications) | 46,418 | 46,418 |  | 46,418 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/82/114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (formerly | Waterloo Road, Uxbridge - Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT278/23) | Works / 332BD/99/2069 | 12,785 | 12,785 |  | 12,785 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT84/878-D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| of PT278/44) | Brunel s106 16 April 04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 532/SPP/2002/2237 | 14,396 | 14,396 |  | 14,396 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, Hayes - Offsite Footpath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/88/140 B | ( ${ }^{\text {Hayes - Offsite Footpath }}$ (1839/PPP/2004/2284 | 3,127 | 3,127 |  | 3,127 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/88/140C | Hayes - Public Transport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 488,717 | 488,717 |  | 488,717 |  | 488,717 | 488,717 |  |  |
| PT/88/140F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * 46 | Hayes - Parking 18399/APP/2004/2284 <br> 3 Reginald Road, Northwood | 70,516 | 70,516 |  | 70,516 |  | 70,516 | 70,516 |  |  |
| PT/91/142A | 58866/APP/2005/1087 | 1,018 | 1,018 |  | 1,018 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $5,7,7 \mathrm{a}$ \& 10 Westlands Industrial Estate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/92/154 | 1902/APP/2005/2370 | 40,290 | 40,290 |  | 40,290 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/93/147C | 45658/APP/2002/3012 | 20,046 | 20,046 |  | 20,046 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Drayton - Cycle Network |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/93/147D | 45658/APP/2002/3012 | 32,073 | 32,073 |  | 32,073 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Former Honeywell Site, Trout Road, West Drayton - Footpath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/95/161A | 335/APP/2002/2754 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 26-38 Windsor Street (Westcombe | 15,010 | 15,010 |  | 15,010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/96/164 | House), Uxbridge 13544/APP/2005/31 | 10,500 | 10,500 |  | 10,500 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Colham House Taxi Rank Relocation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/97 | 27298/APP/2006/875 | 15,000 | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |  |  |  |  | 15,000 |
|  | Colham House Footpath Re-Paving |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/98 | 27298/APP/2006/875 Colham House Kerb Alignment | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  |  |  | 40,000 |
|  | Colham House Kerb Alignment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/99 | 27298/APP/2006/875 | 5,000 | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  |  |  | 5,000 |
| PT/100 | Colham House Side Alley Re-surfacing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 27298/APP/2006/875 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  |  | 10,000 |
| PT/101 | 11-21 Clayton Road, Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Honeywell Site, Trout Road Yiewsley | 30,066 | 30,066 |  | 30,066 |  |  |  |  | 30,066 |
| PT/102 | 335/APP/2002/2754 | 151,948 | 151,948 |  | 151,948 |  |  |  |  | 151,948 |
|  | West Drayton to Heathrow Cycle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| CSL/1/13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (formerly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/15/13) |  | 1,433,000 | 1,433,000 |  | 1,433,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton - Community Facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSL/2/147E | 45658/APP/2002/3012 | 243,005 | 243,005 |  | 243,005 |  |  |  |  | 243,005 |



|  | EDUCATION, YOUTH AND LEISURE <br> SUB - TOTAL | 6,120,274 | 6,044,107 | 76,167 | 6,044,107 |  |  | 1,523,377 | 1,220,408 | 302,969 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The Chimes - Uxbridge Initiative / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/02/39C | 42966/AH/96//1862 | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/05/33 | Blunts Field Training Programme, Bath Road / 45488/G/98/2296 | 66,778 | 66,778 |  | 66,778 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/07/15A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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 Small business Units /43562/F99/2018 150,570 150,50 150,570 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abbess Warehouse, Hayes / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *8 | 49614B/96/110 | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/10/16 | Land At Masterdrive Unit, Printing House Lane, Hayes / 45736/APP/2000/2577 | 86,195 | 86,195 |  | 86,195 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/13/19C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | County Court Site, 114 High Street, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PT/51, | Uxbridge - Uxbridge TC Improvements / | 15.803 | 15803 |  | 15,803 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/15/21B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PT/54 \& | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road - Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/13) <br> PPR/24/05 | TC Partnership / 6198/BS/98/1343 | 131,081 | 131,081 |  | 131,081 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Denbridge Industrial Estate, Oxford |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{* 35}^{\text {PPR/24/05 }}$ | 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 <br> Land at junction of Hayes Bypass, | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/32/50 <br> (Formerly | Uxbridge Road \& Coldarabour Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 | 5,000 | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | MOD Records Office Stockley Road, Hayes 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 78,171 | 78,171 |  | 78,171 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/34/140D | Polar Park, Bath Road, Harmondsworth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/36/153A | 2964/APP/2002/1436 \&1437 | 13,250 | 13,250 |  | 13,250 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Horton Close, West Drayton $46871 / \mathrm{APP} / 2006 / 1037$ |  |  |  | 4,200 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/37/159 | DERA Site, Kingston Lane, West Drayton - Town Centre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Drayton - Town Centre 45658/APP/2002/3012 | 67,153 | 67,153 |  | 67,153 | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/40/147G | 9-15, Harefield Road, Uxbridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/41/167 | 59532/APP/2005/2401 | 8,500 | 8,500 |  | 8,500 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Hayes Goods Yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/42 | 10057/APP/2004/2996 \& 2999 <br> Colham House, Uxbridge, Training | 78,939 | 78,939 |  | 78,939 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| PPR/43 | 27298/APP/2006/875 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Honeywell Site, Trout Rd., Yiewsley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/44 | 335/APP/2002/2754 <br>  | 18,229 | 18,229 |  | 18,229 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | regeneration sub - total | 1,121,336 | 1,121,336 |  | 1,121,336 | 30,000 | 30,000 |  |  |  |
| E/02/18 | Old Mill House, Thorney Mill Road, West |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Drayton / 41706C/91/1904 <br> BT Site, Willow Tree Lane, Yeading - | 59,556 | 59,556 |  | 59,556 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} / 06 / 2 \mathrm{~A} \\ & \mathrm{E} / 09 / 11 \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | Play Ground Works | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (see: PT/48 \& } \\ & \text { EYL/01) } \end{aligned}$ | 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) | Former EMI Site, Dawley Road / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6198/BS/98/1343 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/17/26D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PT/65, <br> EYL/40 \& E/20) | Land at Johnson's Yard - Uxbridge TC CCTV 53936/APP/2002/1357 | 5,370 | 5,370 |  | 5,370 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/22/97B | Land at West Drayton Depot Stockley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (see: PT/69) | Road West Drayton - Monitoring of Noise \& Dust Emissions 2760/APP/2003/2816 | 5,463 | 5,463 |  | 5,463 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { E/24/62 } \\ & \text { (See also } \end{aligned}$ | Land at Lyon Industrial Estate, High Rd, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cowley - Uxbridge Cowley Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/60 \& | (Employment Training, Air Quality \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PPR/23) | Highway Works) 51095/APP/2000/1004 | 13,940 | 13,940 |  | 13,940 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | E/25/38A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (See also PT/18/38B) | Former Airspeed House, Stanwell Road, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Heathrow / 50395/A97/1297 | 39,015 | 39,015 |  | 39,015 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/26/93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Formerly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {PT/27/92 }}$ | H.S.A Land, Bath Road 41687S/98/16 | 12,204 | 12,204 |  | 12,204 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/27/92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/36) <br> E/28/71 | A4 Heathrow Corridor scheme - Oxford Avenue Green | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/28/71 <br> (Formerly PT/40) | Land at Hendrick Lovell, S.W of Dawley Road, Hayes 43554/C/92/787 | 12,692 | 12,692 |  | 12,692 |  |  |  | 0 |  |


| E29/94D | Land to the West of Stone Close, Horton Road, Yiewsley / 54822/APP/2000/424 (outline) \& 54822/APP/2003/718 (full) | 2,852 | 2,852 |  | 2,852 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E/31/124 (see also | Land at the Chestnuts, Barra Hall, Hayes 8134/APP/2003/2838 \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EYL/57) | 8134/APP/2003/2831 | 42,172 | 42,172 |  | 42,172 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E/32/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Formerly | Sainsbury Minet Site - Grapes Junction / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT/43/01) | 40601/H/91/1970 <br> MOD Records Office, Stockley Road, | 1,008,500 | 1,008,500 |  | 1,008,500 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| E36/140E | Hayes 18399/APP/2004/ 2284 | 52,114 | 52,114 |  | 52,114 |  |  |  |  | 52,114 | 52114.04 |  |
| E/37/152B | Middlesex Lodge, 189 Harlington Road, Hillingdon 12484/APP/2005/1791 | 8,607 | 8,607 |  | 8,607 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Polar Park, Bath Road, Harmondsworth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/38/153B | 2964/APP/2002/1436 \&1437 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  |  | 10,000 | 10000 |  |
| E/39/160 | 9-15 Harefield Rd, Uxbridge 59532/APP/2005/2401 | 8,532 | 8,532 |  | 8,532 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Fmr RAF West Drayton, Porters Way, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/40/155C | West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 | 20,147 | 20,147 |  | 20,147 |  |  |  |  | 20,147 | 20147.3 |  |
| E/41/49 | Land at junction of Hayes Bypass, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Formerly PPR/31/49) | Uxbridge Road \& Coldharbour Lane (Maintenance of Environmental Work) / |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40601H/91/1970 | 453,000 | 453,000 |  | 453,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | MOD Records Office Stockley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/42/140J | 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 100,737 | 100,737 |  | 100,737 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Lombardy Retail Park, Coldharbour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/43/1B | Lane, Hayes 40601/APP/2002/1710 | 11,544 | 11,544 |  | 11,544 |  |  |  |  | 11,544 | 11543.73 |  |
| E/44 | Air Quality Action Plan | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/45 | Porters Way Play Area | 125,000 |  | 125,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Former True Lovers Knot P.H Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E/46 | Spaces provision | 21,195 |  | 21,195 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ENVIRONMENT SUB -TOTAL | 3,768,333 | 3,597,138 | 171,195 | 3,597,138 |  |  |  |  | 93,805 | 93,805 |  |
| H/1/152C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Middlesex Lodge, 189 Harlington Road, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *40 | Hillingdon 12484/APP/2005/1791 | 8,562 | 8,562 |  | 8,562 |  | 8,562 | 8,562 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 9-15 Harefield Rd, Uxbridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| H/2/160B | 59532/APP/2005/2401 | 300,000 | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |  |  |  |  | 300,000 | 300000 |  |
| H/3/155A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fmr RAF West Drayton, Porters Way, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *41 | West Drayton 5107/APP/2005/2082 | 74,041 | 74,041 |  | 74,041 |  | 74,041 | 74,041 |  |  | 0 |  |
| H/4/140H | MOD Records Office Stockley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Road/Bourne Avenue, Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *43 | 18399/APP/2004/2284 | 51,133 | 51,133 |  | 51,133 |  | 51,133 | 51,133 |  |  | 0 |  |
| H/5/161C | Former Honeywell Site, Trout Road, West Drayton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *44 | 335/APP/2002/2754 | 50,032 | 50,032 |  | 50,032 |  | 50,032 | 50,032 |  |  | 0 |  |
| H/6 | 11-21, Clayton Rd., Hayes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *48 | 56840/APP2004/630 | 30,066 | 30,066 |  | 30,066 |  | 30,066 | 30,066 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Hayes and Harlington Scrapyard. Health |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| H/7 | Provision | 2,908 |  | 2,908 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 516,742 | 513,834 | 2,908 | 513,834 |  | 213,834 | 213,834 |  | 300,000 | 300,000 |  |
|  |  | 21,912,902 | 21,487,970 | 424,931 | 21,482,213 | 5,757 | 2,700,413 | 2,702,001 | $(1,588)$ | 2,518,173 | 2,215,204 | 302,969 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |

## Agenda Annex

## Plans for Central \& South Applications <br> Planning Committee <br> Wednesday 20th July 2016



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

| Address | 14 MOORFIELD ROAD COWLEY |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Conversion of existing dwelling into $2 \times 2$-bed self contained dwellings with <br> associated amenity space |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $69313 /$ APP/2016/1283 |

Date Plans Received: 01/04/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 05/04/2016


|  |  | 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




LOCATION PLAN - I:1250






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

Address EASYHOTEL HEATHROW BRICKFIELD LANE HARLINGTON
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Development: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Change of use from Use Class B1 (former mini cab/chauffeurs office) to Use } \\ \text { Class C1 (Hotel) (Retrospective) }\end{array}\end{array}$
LBH Ref Nos: 18/APP/2016/1416

## Date Plans Received: 11/04/2016 <br> Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 20/04/2016








Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces
Address EASYHOTEL HEATHROW BRICKFIELD LANE HARLINGTON
Development: Rear infill extension (Retrospective)
LBH Ref Nos: 18/APP/2016/1414

Date Plans Received: 11/04/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 11/04/2016







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

Address 128 LONG LANE HILLINGDON

Development: $\quad$| Change of use of existing outbuilding to rear from a games room to a |
| :--- |
| bedroom and storage area ancillary to the main dwelling |

LBH Ref Nos: $\quad 230 /$ APP/2016/1491
Date Plans Received: 18/04/2016 Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 20/04/2016

## 128 Long Lane, Uxbridge, UB10 0EH



Site Plan shows area bounded by: $507416.29,183282.29507557 .71,183423.71$ (at a scale of $1: 1250$ ) The representation of a road, track or path is no evidence of a right of way. The representation of features as lines is no evidence of a property boundary.

Produced on 19 th Nov 2015 from the Ordnance Survey National Geographic Database and incorporating surveyed revision available at this date. Reproduction in whole or part is prohibited without the prior permission of Ordnance Survey. © Crown copyright 2015. Supplied by buyaplan.co.uk a licensed Ordnance Survey partner (100053143). Unique plan reference: \#00082301-B83498
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PROPOSED OUTBUILDING PLAN

| CARRINGTONS <br> CARRINGTONS LONDON LIMITED 460 UXBRIDGE ROAD HAYES MIDDLESEX UB4 OSD TEL: 02085618111 FAX: 02085890174 | DESIGNER: <br> SONATA ZILAITYTE | SITE: $128$ | JOB TITLE: <br> CHANGE THE USE OF | DRAWING TITLE: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCALE: } \\ & 1: 100 \end{aligned}$ | DATE: $05 / 04 / 2016$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DRAWN: <br> LON | HILLINGDON MIDDLESEX UB10 0EH | OUTBUILDING | PROPOSED OUTBUILDING PLANS | DRAWING No.: <br> LON 30/3 |  |
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| CARRINGTONS | DESIGNER: | SITE: | JOB TITLE: | DRAWING TITLE: | SCALE: | DATE: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CARRINGTONS LONDON LIMITED 460 UXBRIDGE ROAD | SONATA ZILAITYTE | 128 | CHANGE THE USE OF DETACHED OUTBUILDING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EXISITING } \\ & \text { (PROPOSED) } \\ & \text { ELEVATIONS } \end{aligned}$ | 1:100 | 05/04/2016 |
| MIDDLESEX | DRAWN: | HILLINGDON |  |  | DRAWING No.: <br> LON 30/4 |  |
| UB4 OSD |  | MIDDLESEX |  |  |  |  |
| TEL: 02085618111 | LON | UB10 0EH |  |  |  |  |



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

| Address | EURO GARAGES HEATHROW NORTH SHEPISTON LANE HAYES |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Installation of 1 internally illuminated ATM sign (Retrospective) |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $17981 /$ ADV/2016/46 |

Date Plans Received: 11/04/2016
Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 22/04/2016

## Euro Garages-Heathrow North

| Euro Garages-Heathrow |
| :--- |
| North |
| Shepiston Lane |
| Hayes |
| UB3 1LL |
| T013401 |

OS MasterMap 1250/2500/10000 scale
03 February 2016, ID: BLJT-00499055
03 February 2016, ID: BL.JT-00499055 www.planningapplicationmaps.co.uk

1:1250 scale print at A4, Centre: 507954 E, 178605 N


11 Data

## Heathrow North Service Station



[^0]






Notes:
Site boundary
For identification purposes only.
This copy has been made by or with the suthority 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:
Euro Garages Heathrow North Shepiston

|  |  | Guc Centre, Uxbridge, Middx UB8 1 UW Telephone No.: Uxaridge 250111 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Application Ref: 17981/ADV/2016/46 | Scale: $1: 3,500$ |  |
| Planning Committee: | Date | -103 |
| Central \& Squithe 194 | July 2016 | HILLINGDON |

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

| Address | EURO GARAGES HEATHROW NORTH SHEPISTON LANE HAYES |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Installation of ATM (Restrospective) |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 17981/APP/2016/1404 |

Date Plans Received: 11/04/2016
Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 22/04/2016

## Euro Garages-Heathrow North

Euro Garages-Heathrow
North
Shepiston Lane
Hayes
UB3 1LL
TO13401
OS MasterMap 1250/2500/10000 scale
03 February 2016, ID: BL.JT-00499055 www planningapplicationmaps.co.uk

## Heathrow North Service Station



[^1]






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

| Address | NANAKSAR PRIMARY SCHOOL SPRINGFIELD ROAD HAYES |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development: | Variation of conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref: <br> 4450/APP/2014/1427 dated 16/06/14 (Provision of three temporary modular <br> classroom/administration units, substation, car/cycle parking, new access <br> arrangements and ancillary development on existing school site) to extend the <br> use until 31st August 2017. |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 4450/APP/2016/1928 |

## Date Plans Received: 20/05/2016 <br> Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 31/05/2016




Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces
Address 8 BAWTREE ROAD UXBRIDGE

| Development: | Enlargement of basement to create habitable space and ground floor rear <br> extension |
| :--- | :--- |
| LBH Ref Nos: | $18278 /$ APP/2015/4309 |

Date Plans Received: 24/11/2015 Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid: 24/11/2015






## 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:

## 8 Bawtree Road Uxbridge

Planning Application Ref:
18278/APP/2015/4309
Planning Committee:
Central \& Squathe

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON
Residents Services
Planning Section
Givic Cente, Uxbridge, Middx UB8 1UW Telephone No.: Uxtridige 250111
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