



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting: North Planning Committee
Date: 08-08-2012
Place: Committee Room 5, Civic Centre Uxbridge

Time: 7.00pm

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6	Page: 1	Location: 32 East Mead, Ruislip
Amendments/Additional information: Withdrawn from agenda.		Officer Comments: None.
Item: 7	Page: 39	Location: Land at 24 Court Road
Amendments/Additional information: Withdrawn from agenda.		Officer Comments: None.
Item: 8	Page: 51	Location: Land rear of 41 and 43 The Drive, Northwood
Amendments/Additional information: Amend recommendation to insert: 'Refusal for the following reasons:'		Officer Comments: To ensure the recommendation is clear.
The comments of the Council's Highways Officer in respect of waste collection and storage are noted, however the proposed development is for individual houses. Individual houses within the borough make their own provision for storage of refuse within the curtilage of their properties and bring the refuse bags to the kerb on collection day. The development is within an appropriate distance of the existing road and is not considered to raise any concerns relating to refuse storage or collection.		To provide additional clarity.
Item: 9	Page: 65	Location: Joel Street Farm, Joel Street
Amendments/Additional information: Amend 'reference to '24 signatures' to '197 signatures' in relation to the petition of objection on page 72.		Officer Comments: To reflect additional signatures received.
Item: 10	Page: 85	Location: 25 Joel Street
Amendments/Additional information: Amend agenda to say that the site is within 'Northwood Hills' ward.		Officer Comments: To ensure the location is correctly reported.
Item: 11	Page: 99	Location: 56-58 High Street, Ruislip
Amendments/Additional information: The following text should be added under section 7.22 of the Committee report. It is noted that the National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in determining planning applications and		Officer Comments: To ensure the committee report fully considers the NPPF.

<p>has at its heart a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision making this means: Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan; and</p> <p>Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies out-of-date, granting planning permission unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or - specific policies in the framework indicate development should be restricted. <p>Crucially, applications are still required to be assessed against the development plan and should be refused where they are contrary to this. The application has been considered against the development plan which contains policies relating to the character and appearance of areas in general, the character and appearance of conservation areas and the level of accessibility to be achieved within new development and has been found to be contrary to these policies. Further, it is not considered that the proposal would provide such a benefit to housing need or any of the core area of material concern, such as to outweigh the harm which has been identified within the body of the report.</p>	
<p>Correspondence has been received from the agent highlighting that:</p> <p>(i) The height and bulk of the building has been reduced since the previous application and varied materials have been used to soften the appearance, which does not appear to have been taken into account by the Conservation Officer; and</p> <p>(ii) Clarifying that the development would accord with the building regulations and would meet the relevant size standards.</p>	<p>In respect of point (i) it is acknowledged that the scale of the building has been reduced and the materials altered since the previous application. This point is acknowledged within the officers comment within the Consultations section of the report. However, regardless of these amendments from the previous scheme the Council's Conservation Officer maintains the view that the development proposed is unacceptable in terms of size and design.</p> <p>In respect of point (ii) this point is noted, however the policy requirement is that new developments achieve compliance with 'The Lifetime Homes' standard which goes above the requirements of Building Regulations, as noted within the report achievement of this standard is not simply a function of the size of a dwelling but also its layout. In this instance it is not considered that a unit of the type and layout proposed is capable of achieving the required standard. The agents letter was referred to the Council's Access Officer who re-iterated his objection for the reasons outlined above.</p>

Item: 12	Page: 109	Location: 9 Clive Parade
Amendments/Additional information:		Officer Comments:
<p>Replace condition 6 with</p> <p>'No deliveries shall take place through the shop front and all deliveries shall take place between the hours of 07.30 and 19.00 Monday to Saturday and 09.00 and 14.00 Sundays. All goods to be delivered shall be through the service road access at the rear of the property.</p> <p>REASON In the interests of safeguarding the amenity of the neighbouring residential and shopping area and highway/pedestrian safety in</p>		<p>To provide consistency with the delivery arrangements for the neighbouring unit at no. 8 Clive Parade.</p>

accordance with Policies OE1, S6 and AM7 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).	
Amend condition 7 to insert 'other than staff' between 'no person' and 'shall'.	To provide clarity and consistency.
<p>Additional informative:</p> <p>A licence must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the public highway. This includes the placement of seating or other structures on the footway. You are advised that the grant of planning permission does not override the need to obtain such a license which would be granted only at the discretion of the Highway Authority.</p>	For the applicants information.

Item: 13	Page: 121	Location:	Land forming part of 111 Parkfield Crescent, Ruislip
Amendments/Additional information:		Officer Comments:	
<p>1. The applicant has been asked to demonstrate that No. 111 Parkfield Crescent has a right of way over the adjoining rear service road. The title deeds and title plan for this property have been submitted. The Council's legal services advise that the submissions do not disclose that the property has a right of way on this alleyway. Therefore, the application has not demonstrated that the two parking spaces in the rear garden would be accessible. The proposal would therefore be reliant upon the two car parking spaces in the front garden which would not be adequate to serve the existing and proposed properties.</p> <p>2. An additional letter of objection from a ward councillor in the adjoining London Borough of Harrow, on behalf of the residents in that section of Torbay Road has been received. This re-iterates the point already made about vegetation and the bank being removed from the rear alleyway causing great concern to Torbay Road residents (point xv) and also states in relation to point (xvi:) that there is no public right of way in these alleys, which would preclude any access by residents in Parkfield Crescent. It goes on to advise that Torbay Road is part of the Nash estate built in the 1930s where the councillor also lives. The Deeds to the houses have a common clause, stating that there is access to those who require it, eg for residents parking their cars in their garages at the back, refuse collection (now from the front of the properties), water board, electricity board, etc. but there is no general public right of way. The councillor has been involved in the erection of over 40 gates in the ward over the last six years and these facts have been cleared with the legal department of Harrow Council before beginning this massive project. As far as the councillor is aware, Parkfield Crescent has been given no right of way to this alley and residents in Parkfield Crescent have garages at the front of their properties so there would be no need to access from the rear. Residents would need to take a round trip for about a quarter of a mile to park their cars at the back, ie along Field End Road, Malvern Avenue and into Torbay Road.</p> <p>3. A response from Harrow Council has now been received, raising no objections to the proposal.</p>		<p>1. and 2. The application has not demonstrated that the off-street car parking spaces in the rear garden would be usable and therefore the proposal does not overcome the fourth reason for refusal of the previous scheme. An additional third reason for refusal should be added, which should read:-</p> <p>'The application fails to demonstrate that adequate off-street parking for the new dwelling and existing house would be available for use by the occupiers of the existing house and proposed new dwelling. As such, it is considered that the proposal would be likely to give rise to additional demand for on-street parking in an area which is poorly served by public transport. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's Adopted Car Parking standards.'</p> <p>3. The response from Harrow Council is noted.</p>	
Add informative:		For the applicants information.	

You are advised that the rear elevation shown on drawing 11/200/102 Rev A is inconsistent with the other elevations and plans and appears to show a dormer which does not form part of the development which was applied for. This elevation has not been considered and you are advised of the need to ensure consistency between plans should you submit a revised application.