



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>North Applications Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>11th May 2016</b>	<b>Time: 7:00pm</b>
<b>Place:</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 7</b>	<b>Page: 23</b>	<b>Location: Cottesmore House, Perkins Gardens, Ickenham</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>In Section 6. Consultations - External Consultees, at end of first paragraph, replace last sentence with:-</p> <p>Furthermore, a petition with 21 signatories has been received objecting to the 3 spaces to the front of Cottesmore House.</p> <p>This petition has already been seen by Committee Members but to summarise, it states that residents in Block 1 - 20 of Cottesmore House have had a constant battle with Paradigm Housing over last 2 years. Recent correspondence regarding parking issues from Paradigm has contained inaccuracies, including that access to both sites will be from Josiah Drive which is incorrect as access to the north (rear) site from Coyle Drive and access to south (front) site from Perkins Gardens. Although disagree with the three additional spaces to the front, if permission is granted, access should be through Coyle Drive as taking access through Perkins Gardens will result in additional traffic on an access road that has no footpath. Three spaces to front would be just for staff and area to rear is more secure as gated and this could provide more than the 10 spaces proposed. Spaces at front also a health and safety hazard to residents of the extra care facility.</p>		<p>Access to the 3 spaces to the front of the Cottesmore House if taken directly from Coyle Drive would involve the take up of more amenity/ landscaping space and 3 additional spaces served from Perkins Gardens would not generate significant additional traffic. As regards possibility of providing additional spaces at the rear, the LPA can only consider proposals on their merits which are presented to it. The spaces to the front would also be sited no closer than existing parking spaces to the building which achieve a suitable separation distance.</p>

<p>The parking spaces, 3 off to the south area be denied.</p>	
<p>An additional petition with 26 signatories in support of the application has been received which is summarised as follows:-</p> <p>Cottesmore House is a staffed 24 hour extra care scheme. Both day and night staff on shift, residents with their own cars, visiting family members and professional staff like district nurses, GPs, diabetic nurses and other care providers need to be able to park their cars on site.</p> <p>There are only 9 car parking spaces available for staff, residents, family visitors and visiting professionals.</p> <p>There is clearly not enough provision for these groups of people to park their cars within either the allocated spaces or within the grounds of Cottesmore House.</p> <p>This serious lack of parking at times has resulted in some family members being unable to visit their loved ones and for professional staff not being able to deliver vital nursing care or diagnoses.</p> <p>This is impacting the social well being and health of residents' as they are unable to see family members or receive important nursing care.</p> <p>The extra spaces will address all of the points raised.</p>	<p>The petition in support is noted.</p>

<p><b>Item: 10      Page: 51</b></p>	<p><b>Location: Pembroke House, Pembroke Road, Ruislip</b></p>
<p>A petition with 20 signatories in support of the application has been received which states:-</p> <p>We believe that this application addresses all previous concerns, and complies with both national and local policies. We hereby request that Ms Broderick be allowed to speak on our behalf at the Planning Committee meeting on the 11th of May 2016. We also request that</p>	<p>The petition in support is noted.</p>

<p>the Planning Committee vote in favour of granting planning permission for the above application.</p>	
<p>A copy of a letter sent to Cllr Lavery by the applicant has been received. The main concern is that the report contains a number of statements and conclusions which are inaccurate. For clarity, the main points of the letter are summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The building is to provide refuse storage and office accommodation for the management company;</li> <li>2. The current proposal addresses the previous concerns raised within application 38324/APP/2016/407 as the building height has been lowered, building pushed to the rearmost corner, design more traditional, appropriate levels of car parking provided and no loss of amenity;</li> <li>3. The character of the area does have a lot of rear backland buildings, some of which are two storeys;</li> <li>4. The location of the building is on land used for bin/refuse storage and has never been designated as amenity space;</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An example of 155 High Street was provided, however this is only a single storey backland building. There were no visible examples within the immediate area of two storey backland buildings, only single storey.</p> <p>The original application for the conversion of the building (38324/APP/2011/786) was granted with 115sqm of amenity space proposed at ground level and a condition imposed requiring the requisite amenity space to be provided for the residents.</p> <p>No plan was submitted within the prior approval application detailing this area to be used for refuse, and in any case refuse provision does not form part of the assessment for the prior approval.</p> <p>In order to comply with the conditions and requirements of the original 2011 permission, it was intended for soft landscaping/amenity space to be provided to the rear of the site, which has not been implemented. The Inspector's conclusions that the provision of further development to</p>

<p>5 No concern was raised previously over the impact to the Pembroke House residents. This must remain the case as the revised scheme is set further away, lower in height, narrower than previously proposed, area used for carparking and lies to the north, so there would be no overshadowing.</p>	<p>the rear would remove any space for amenity are therefore still considered relevant to this application. This is also explained within section 7.09 of the report.</p> <p>The design and overall massing of the building has altered within this scheme. Members are referred to section 7.11 of the report for the assessment in relation to these occupants..</p>
---	--

<b>Item:</b>	<b>Page:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Officer Comments:</b>
Amendments/Additional Information:			