



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Major Applications Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>15th September 2015</b>	<b>Time: 6:00pm</b>
<b>Place:</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 6 Page: 55</b>	<b>Location: West London comporting...</b>
<b>No addendum</b>	

<b>Item: 7 Page: 55</b>	<b>Location: St Andrews Park, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>	<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Delete existing Condition 2 and replace with the following:</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following specified supporting plans and/or documents:            Design and Access Statement            Arboricultural Impact Assessment            Landscape Management Specification            Landscape Specification            Tree Protection Method Statement            Planning Statement            Transport Statement</p> <p>Thereafter the development shall be retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.</p> <p>REASON            To ensure that the development complies with the objectives of Policies AM2, AM7, AM8, AM9, AM13, AM14, BE13, BE18, BE19, BE20, BE21, BE22, BE23, BE24, BE38, H4, H5, OE1, OE5, OE7, OE8, OE11 and OL5 contained within Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p>	<p>Reworded for clarity</p>
Delete Condition 3	Replication of existing Condition No. 8 attached to the outline consent (ref. 585/APP/2009/2752) and Condition No. 9 of the Section 73

	consent (ref. 585/APP/2015/848).
<p>Additional text to be added to Section 6, page 67 Internal Consultees after Highways Comments:</p> <p>Case Officer's comments: The Highways Officer's comments which state that details of parking allocation need to be conditioned is noted. However there is an existing condition No. 41 that requires these details attached to the outline consent (ref. 585/APP/2009/2752) and condition No. 42 attached to the Section 73 consent (ref. 585/APP/2015/848).</p>	For clarity
Replace site plan on page 138 with correct site plan	For clarity
<p>Additional text to be added to Section 6, page 67 Internal Consultees after Flood and Water Management Officer's Comments:</p> <p>Case Officer's comments: To clarify, there was an agreed drainage strategy that included swales along the spine road. This was amended by the section 73 application (ref 585/APP/2015/848) and the Flood Officer is stating that the permeable paving and rain gardens proposed in place of the swales are acceptable, subject to suitable controls being agreed. There is an existing condition attached to the outline consent (No. 67) and the s73 (No. 68) which requires drainage details to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA. This condition will be used to ensure that the correct drainage measures are put in place.</p>	For clarity

<b>Item: 8 Page: 77</b>	<b>Location: The Boat House, Reservoir Road, Ruislip</b>
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b>	<b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b>
<p>Additional standard consultee responses received, as follows:-</p> <p>"My house is just next to the boat house which they want to do. I would like to request you guys that when they do the work they have to change my fence facing the boat house because it's all damaged because of plants, creeps and bushes which is on council side. And people who come and visit Ruislip Lido they can see in and after doing the new boat house it will attract more people in lido which will make my house insecure. I have 3 kids and my husband is mostly on office trips outside London. They have to increase the height of my fencing as well to keep me and family privacy. As there is many incidents when people who come to visit lido they come and throw empty bottles in my house. I have seen people throwing there wet T- shirts in my garden because the height of fence is not enough. I am not putting any object on planning permission but yes they have to change the height and the fence panels when they start there work. I will not be safe if that is not done. If you have any queries please</p>	<p>The issues raised in the letters received are covered in the main body of the report or are not material planning considerations that can carry any weight in the determination of this application. The issues raised in relation to the external finish of the building have been dealt with in the report and where necessary, conditioned.</p>

<p>contact me”</p> <p>“Can the Cedar Cladding specified please be part of the planning consent to match the Woodland Centre? and NOT the toilet blocks which use printed cladding and do not I believe fit in well with the area - thank you”.</p>	
<p>Additional comment from the Ruislip Residents Association:</p> <p>‘We would like to comment on this application in a constructive way as we have no particular concerns as to the proposal. We believe that a new building would clearly be an enhancement on the old but in keeping with tradition would like to see the existing cupola feature replicated on the new roof. We await the planning decision in due course.’</p>	<p>The comment is noted and the applicant is investigating the matter. However, the existing cupola is not considered to be of any significant heritage value as the boathouse is not within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed or Locally listed.</p> <p>Accordingly, there would be no robust planning grounds on which to turn down or delay determination of the current application. An informative is suggested to address this issue.</p>
<p>Additional Informative:</p> <p>‘You are advised that the local community has indicated a desire to see the existing cupola feature replicated on the roof of the new boathouse. You are therefore encouraged to investigate whether an alternative proposals, or amendments to the existing proposal, might enable the retention of this feature.</p>	<p>To provide additional advice to the applicant.</p>

<p><b>Item: 9 Page: Agenda B</b></p>	<p><b>Location: Pronto Trading Estate</b></p>
<p><b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b></p>
<p>Additional correspondence has been received from the applicants agent critiquing the officers report and suggesting that the Local Authority should obtain third party advice on viability.</p>	<p>The correspondence is noted, however officers maintain that the assessment undertaken into the application is adequate and appropriate.</p>