



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
Date:	TUESDAY 16 APRIL 2013	Time:	7.00pm
Place:	COMMITTEE ROOM 5, CIVIC CENTRE, UXBRIDGE		

ADDENDUM SHEET

Items: 6	Page: 23	Location: Former RAF West Ruislip, High Road, Ickenham
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments</i>	
<p>Comments from Cllr Crowe have been received as follows:</p> <p>“The principle of this development has already been decided and I have no objection in principle to this item. I recognise that the changed economic situation justifies a modification in the proposal. I am concerned about the adequacy of the parking provision referred to in paragraph 7.10. It is stated that the requirement would be 33. Putting in adequate disabled provision means that the number provided will be 28.</p> <p>Ickenham Residents Association consider that the total needed could be in excess of 90. While I do not expect that it would be possible to make provision on that scale I believe that experience suggests that 33 is likely to prove insufficient when visitors including medical and care personnel are taken into account. I would therefore like to see an increase in parking provision”.</p>	<p>The issues raised are covered in the main report.</p>	

Items: 7	Page: 55	Location: 9 Truesdale Drive, Harefield
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments</i>	
<p>The following comments have been received from the agent:</p> <p>1. The two storey side extension is 1.0m set back at both levels from the front wall and is based on previously approved drawings. The Planning Officer has made a mistake. Please check the drawings.</p>	<p>1. Given that there is a proposed canopy/extension to the front of the two storey side extension it cannot be said to be set back 1m at all levels.</p>	

<p>2. The layout of the porch and the canopy is based on an existing porch and canopy recently constructed at No 20 Truesdale Drive. Please refer to the photograph attached. Why is it acceptable at one property and not at No 9 Truesdale Drive. Why are you implementing double standards?</p> <p>3. Noted and accepted that a pitched roof is preferred over gable roof design at the double storey rear extension.</p> <p>Please note the plan, size layout of the proposed extension is based on the previously approved planning application reference number 4749/APP/2012/32. The only objectable changes are the porch and canopy and the gable roof.</p> <p>In order to submit an acceptable revised planning application, could you please determine and confirm whether the porch and the canopy would be acceptable based on the existing porch and canopy constructed at No 20 Truesdale Drive.</p>	<p>2. Planning permission for the extensions to 20 Truesdale Drive was granted in 2002, well before the adoption of the current SPD HDAS: Residential Extensions.</p> <p>If members agree with the officer recommendation then they will, of course, be indicating that the porch and canopy are not acceptable given refusal reason 2.</p>
---	---

Items: 8	Page: 63	Location: 51 The Drive, Ickenham
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments
<p>A petition with 25 signatures has been received, opposing the application.</p> <p>Correspondence from Cllr Hensley has been received, who comments as follows:</p> <p>"I fully appreciate that an individual has the right to develop their property provided that the resulting development is kept in harmony with the street scene and as a consequence does not interfere with the quality of the living environment to the adjoining properties.</p> <p>The Drive is a road having special character from singularly occupied properties, affording parking to each occupier in a reasonable manner allowing also for off-road visitor parking.</p> <p>The proposed development does have a roof height and frontage that is similar to adjoining properties.</p> <p>The rear development whilst meeting HDAS with regard to the 45 degree angle from the neighbouring property's first floor rear fenestration. What HDAS does not take into</p>		<p>The issues raised are covered in the main report</p>

account however, is the effect of the property separation width from the adjoining property which can allow for the proposed development to encroach deeper into the rear garden whilst still keeping within the 45 degree parameter. In doing so, this can allow the flank wall to be over dominant to the adjoining property and can cause over shadowing to occur, especially to a patio area. This I believe is the case in question regarding the proposed development, having a detrimental effect to the rear of the property.

In addition, the parking to the front whilst keeping within 1.5 parking ratio, does not in reality provide sufficient parking for the intended use of this development taking into account its setting with other properties in the road. Also it does not provide for any visitor off-street parking. The hard standing cannot easily be addressed by landscaping and therefore will also have a detrimental effect on the street scene.

This is a private road where the residents cannot benefit from a resident parking scheme. The road is somewhat narrow and on-street parking can also have a detrimental impact together with the incidence for parking on the grass verges. Therefore, this will have a detrimental impact on the street scene which cannot be addressed by a planning condition".

Items: 9	Page: 87	Location: Land to rear of 51 and 53 Pembroke Road, Ruislip
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments
<p>i. Ward Councillors comments have been omitted from the original report and should read as follows:</p> <p>The Manor Ward Councillors' strongly oppose the latest planning application re the above. It is still garden grabbing and we wish the matter to be sent to Committee with strong reasons to refuse including out of character, inappropriate use of back gardens and high risk of further garden grabbing beyond 55 onwards.</p> <p>ii. The full comments of the Council's Highway Officer are as follows:</p> <p>The site is located on a classified road, which is also designated as a local</p>		<p>The matters raised have been covered in the main report.</p>

distributor road within the Council's Local Plan part 2.

No objection was raised on the highways aspect of the previously two refused applications ref: 66982/APP/2010/1004 and 66982/APP/2011/2221. Proposals showing provision of access road layout, refuse collection point, parking, and pedestrian visibility splays were previously considered acceptable. The proposed access road should be lit in accordance with BS 5484 EN 13201.

No surface water should be discharged onto the highway or into the highway drainage system from private land. This issue should be covered through a planning condition and an informative.

No objection is raised on the proposals subject to the following conditions being applied;

Conditions:

1. The development shall not be occupied until the hardstanding area including access road and parking spaces have been laid out, surfaced and drained in accordance with details first submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and shall be permanently maintained thereafter to the Authority's satisfaction.

The access for the proposed car parking shall be provided with 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian visibility splays in both directions and shall be maintained free of all obstacles to the visibility between heights of 0.6m and 2.0m above the level of the adjoining

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the storage and collection of refuse and recycle facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter the facilities shall be permanently retained.

4. The developer shall certify to the Council in writing that the lighting of the access road and is designed in accordance with BS 5984 EN13201 and implemented prior to first occupation of the development and such lighting is to be maintained thereafter, and

the lighting is to be maintained thereafter.

Informatives

1. It is contrary to section 163 of the Highways Act 1980 for surface water from private land to drain onto the highway or discharge into the highway drainage system.

2. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Highways Team in respect of the construction of the vehicle crossover.

iii. An additional informative is recommended as follows:

You are advised that the Council has examined housing supply as part of the Housing Trajectory and is satisfied that the supply of housing is sufficient to meet and as such there is not a pressing need for the development proposed at the application site.

Items: 11	Page: 115	Location: Land adjacent to 56 and 57 and 56 and 57 Greystoke Drive, Ruislip
------------------	------------------	--

<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments</i>
--	--------------------------------

Comments from Cllr Crowe have been received as follows:

"I wish to support the objectors to this development and confidently request that this application be rejected. The summary is sufficient to indicate the range of reasons. The proposal is cramped as a site, this in turn leads to inadequate internal provision. It adds to the density in what I consider to be a fully developed site. It deals inadequately with trees and landscaping. It fails to meet any of the 16 lifetime home standards.

There is a particular problem in relation to parking and access. This seems to rely on opening up the end of Westwood Close. The land required for access is not adopted highway, is in private ownership and it appears highly unlikely that access will ever be obtained. On that basis the highway officer states that he will object. The effect of the development will be very detrimental to the amenity and environment of other local residents in both Greystoke Drive and Westwood Close and I therefore fully support their objections to this proposed development".

The issues raised are covered in the main report.