



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	North Planning Committee	
Date:	3rd March 2016	Time: 7:30pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6	Page: 11	Location: 81 Field End Road, Eastcote, Pinner
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments:
<p>Include the following reason for refusal</p> <p>The proposed development, by virtue of its close proximity to the eastern boundary, and its extensive projection beyond the front and rear building lines of the adjacent property to the east, Walsh Lodge (1A Deane Croft Road), would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of a first floor flat (Flat 1) in that neighbouring property, by reason of overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook to a side-facing window, which forms the sole opening for a habitable room in that flat. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE20, BE21, BE22 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Layouts (July 2006).</p>		<p>The eastern flank of the proposed building would be set in from the western flank wall of the adjacent property to the east, Walsh Lodge by approximately 3.3m, and it would project beyond the rear building line of Walsh Lodge by 1m, and project beyond the front building line by 11m. There are first floor side-facing windows in the flank wall of Walsh Lodge that serve a store and kitchen. The kitchen diner (which is larger than 20sqm) is classified as a habitable room and the side window is the only opening serving that room. Even though the applicant has indicated on the submitted plans that the proposed building would not intersect 45 degree lines of sight taken from the nearest edges of the front and rear walls of Walsh Lodge, the excessive projection of the building to the front and rear, and its height in relation to Walsh Lodge are such that the building would adversely overshadow the window, and result in adverse loss of light to, and outlook from the window. The building would be visually intrusive from views out of the side window and would therefore result in a significant loss of residential amenities for the occupiers of Flat 1 in the neighbouring property.</p>
<p>Include Article 35 Informative on decision notice to state:</p>		<p>To ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

<p>'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.</p> <p>Guidance was offered to the applicant by the case officer during the processing of the application to identify possible amendments to address those elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the applicant chose not to take the opportunity to make further changes to the design and appearance of the scheme and subsequently lodged an appeal before the Council had an opportunity to formally determine the application. If the Council had the opportunity to formally determine the application, the applicant would have a formal decision to provide the context for any future redesign and resubmission'.</p>	
<p>Section 7.14; Trees, Landscaping and Ecology</p> <p>The report notes that the site is covered by a TPO and located within a conservation area. This is factually incorrect, the site has no TPOs and is not located within a conservation area. There is no protection of any trees within the site.</p>	<p>For information/clarification only.</p>
<p>Additional letters/emails from the Eastcote Conservation Panel have been received and reiterate the original concerns raised which have all been set out within the committee report. The Conservation Panel have asked Officers to bring these objections to Members attention again. Please see section 6 of the Committee Report.</p>	<p>For information/clarity only.</p>
<p>The Eastcote Conservation Panel have also raised the additional points:</p> <p>We bring to your attention that the War Memorial Garden was until the 1920s was a pond. There are working wells within the curtilage of the property Field End Farm opposite this site.</p> <p>No drainage/flooding information.</p> <p>No land contamination information provided;</p>	<p>The report has fully assessed the impact on the war memorial/former pond.</p> <p>The lack of drainage information is a current reason for refusal.</p> <p>Whilst no ground contamination report has been submitted, this matter can be satisfactorily addressed through the</p>

This application is poorly thought out and lacking vital information.	imposition of a suitable condition (were the application acceptable)
<p>Amend recommendation to state:</p> <p>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:</p>	As an appeal has been lodged against this application, this application is not recommended for Refusal, but had the Council been in a position to make a decision on this case, it would have been recommended for refusal, the recommendation wording has therefore been amended to reflect this.

Item: 7 Page: 35	Location: 12A Northwood Road, Harefield
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
<p>Petition in support of the application has been received from the applicant.</p> <p>We have the additional information attached which we would like for you to consider at your planning meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Petition signed by over 100 residents in relation to the approval for this change of use together 2. Copy of a letter from the NHS to the Harefield Tenants and Residents Association. 3. Screenshots of the activity on social media showing the support from the local community on the 17th February. 	<p>The petition contains 104 signatories, and the grounds of support are noted below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High demand for NHS dental services in the area since previous provider vacated premises at No.14A Northwood Road in 2011. 2. No suitable available commercial properties on High Street and adjacent Local Centre. 3. No impact on the Conservation area and traffic 4. Precedent already set as previous provider at No.14A operated in a residential property 5. No impact on housing stock following loss of residential property, as there are several residential properties available for sale. 6. Proposed car parking at rear will not impact on neighbouring amenity as it will be mainly utilised by NHS patients.
<p>The applicant has confirmed in an email that whilst he has served notice on the owner of the side access road who is the owner of the adjoining property, however he does not have any rights of vehicular/pedestrian access. This access is required to serve the proposed development, and without it, the development has a shortfall of car parking.</p> <p>The applicant is willing, through legal procedures, to gain the necessary rights over this access road.</p> <p>As such, the council consider it necessary to impose a grampian condition which requires</p>	To ensure that the development is acceptable in highways terms and to ensure the vehicular access is secured prior to the implementation of the dental surgery.

<p>the applicant to seek the necessary pedestrian and vehicular rights over this access road, prior to the commencement of the use of the proposed Dental Surgery. This grampian condition will ensure that the development use is not commenced without the necessary car parking requirements to serve the development.</p> <p>Include the following condition:</p> <p>The use authorised by this permission shall not begin until the works shown on the drawings hereby approved relating to the vehicular access road have been completed in accordance with those drawings. Full details of vehicular and pedestrian access rights to be secured over this land shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the use authorised by this permission.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure the development is able to provide adequate vehicular and pedestrian access into the rear of the site and to service the car parking area located to the rear of the site in accordance with policies AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (Nov 2012).</p>	
--	--

Item: 8 Page: 53	Location: Land at junction of Warren Road & Swakeleys Drive, Ickenham
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
<p>Within the summary (Section 1) and conclusion (section 10) amend the first paragraph in each to the following: The applicant seeks prior approval for the installation of a 12.5m monopole under Part 16 of schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. The proposal is required to improve 3G and 4G services, coverage and improve capacity.</p>	<p>For clarity. This report erroneously referred to the proposal being an upgrade to an existing telecommunication site. There are no existing telecommunications at this site to upgrade, and this is a proposal for a new mast.</p>
<p>Add the following comments to Section 6 of the report:</p> <p>Email from a Ward Councillor: May I request that the following points be addressed in the report as I cannot support this development at this location.</p>	<p>The planning history for the site has been outlined within section 3.3 of the committee report and explains the differences between this application and the previous schemes submitted and considered.</p> <p>A number of alternative sites have been</p>

<p>A) Applications for an antenna at this site has been refused several times before.</p> <p>B) In the application sent to me for comments prior to submission state that they have considered other sites but they are near to residential properties and therefore been discounted. This site is located not only next to a woodland nature habitat but opposite residential properties of individual character.</p> <p>C) The location would attract unwanted graffiti by its location some 50m from a secondary school entrance which would be anti-social by nature for residents and the Council would have to come and remove such unwanted graffiti.</p> <p>D) They state that Vyners school would be appropriate location but they have denied them access.</p> <p>E) Would this application be classed as vexatious.</p>	<p>considered by the applicant, within the coverage area, and are referred to in section 7.01 of the Committee report. The Supplementary Information document submitted with the application provides detail on all of the sites considered.</p> <p>For clarity, the applicants state that Vyners School was contacted, however they confirmed that they would not be interested in the proposal. Without their consent, the use of this site could not be progressed any further.</p>
<p>Add the following comments to Section 6 of the report: <u>Ickenham Residents Association</u> The Association objects again to this proposal pointing out that the location is quite sensitive, close to residential dwellings and a much used thoroughfare for Vyners pupils going to and coming from school. In addition it would be at the lowest point from Warren Road and Woodstock Drive (both uphill from the site) plus shielded to the west by trees, which would, no doubt, have an influence on the reception quality. We would refer you to our previous letters of objection of 9th April 2015 (2015/867) and 16.11.15 (2015/3728), copies of which we attach for your convenience.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would appear an obtrusive addition in the context of the street scene and that there are other alternatives, such as an upgrade of existing telecommunication facilities.</p> <p>The previous application 2015/3728 appeared to propose 3 shrouded antennas, which you refused on 26.11.15, and this current proposal will support 6</p>	<p>The applicant has acknowledged that signal coverage is reduced as a result of the nearby trees, however it still provides for improved coverage 3G and 4G coverage to the local area.</p> <p>To clarify, 3 shrouded antennas were proposed within application 2015/3728 and 6 are proposed within this submission. Having discussed this with the applicant, the nature of the antennas proposed, means that 6 smaller antennas are proposed within this scheme, of a different design to those previously proposed. The applicant has confirmed that the 6 antennas will all be accommodated within the mast proposed.</p>

shrouded antennas.	
<p>1 additional comment has been received from a resident which raises the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The installations cause cancer and health problems; 2. It would change the fabric of Ickenham; 3. The health of the community should not be compromised just for the sake of earning money by some companies. 	<p>Issues relating to the impact of the mast on health are addressed within section 7.22 of the report and its impact on the character of the area, discussed within sections 7.03 and 7.05.</p>
<p>Add the following Internal consultee comments to section 6 of the report: Highways: No objection</p> <p>Conservation have expressed concerns as to whether the revisions fully overcome the previous reason for refusal. To assist committee, the Conservation Officer has provided the following details of the site context:</p> <p>This is an open green area of land designated as Green Belt and it is situated adjacent to the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. It is characterised by a grassed area, simple footpaths and a backdrop of mature trees, providing a semi-rural setting. This is an attractive environment, which is highly visible from various viewpoints within the street scene.</p>	<p>To note</p>

Item: 9 Page: 65	Location: 11 Sandy Lodge Way, Northwood
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
<p>1 additional letter of objection has been received raising the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of light for 9 Sandy Lodge Way as well as their loss of privacy; - It would appear to be an overdevelopment which would greatly increase the density of housing on a relatively small plot of land and I also have major reservations as I believe the development would change the nature and character for the worst of this very pleasant road. 	<p>These matters have been addressed within the committee report and do not materially change the Officer recommendation to approve this scheme.</p>
Add condition to prevent the use of the flat	To prevent overlooking into the adjoining

<p>roof as an amenity space:</p> <p>“The roof area of the single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.</p> <p>REASON To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).”</p>	<p>property.</p>
---	------------------

<p>Item: 10 Page: 81</p>	<p>Location: 51 Hilliard Road</p>
<p>Withdrawn from the agenda</p>	

<p>Item: 12 Page: 93</p>	<p>Location: Langley Farm, Breakspear Road North, Harefield</p>
<p>Amendments/Additional Information:</p>	<p>Officer Comments:</p>
<p>Amend Condition 13 to state:</p> <p>“No phase of the development shall commence until a landscape scheme for the relevant phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The scheme for each phase shall include: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details of Soft Landscaping <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.a Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100), 1.b Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken, 1.c Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate 2. Details of Hard Landscaping <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.a Refuse Storage 2.b Means of enclosure/boundary treatments 2.c Hard Surfacing Materials 2.d External Lighting 2.e Other structures 3. Schedule for Implementation 4. Other <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.a Existing and proposed functional services above and below ground 	<p>To ensure levels details are submitted and complied with.</p>

<p>4.b Proposed finishing levels, <u>site levels and</u> contours</p> <p>Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.”</p>	
--	--

Item: 13 Page: 125	Location: 37 The Drive, Ickenham
<p>Amendments/Additional Information:</p> <p>A further period of public consultation was undertaken (which expired on 1/3/16) on a revised bin and cycle store siting (Drw. No. 2958-03 Rev. A refers which was the plan/siting considered in the officer’s report) and in order to include the new shed on the rear boundary which was previously omitted from the description of development.</p> <p>Two further responses have been received from neighbouring properties, but these re-iterate previous comments made, with the only new comment being that if this scheme is successful, the neighbouring property will apply for the same.</p>	<p>Officer Comments:</p> <p>The additional comment from the neighbour does not raise any new material planning issue. Any planning application on the neighbouring property would be considered on its own merits.</p>
<p>Replace Drw. No. 2958-03 Rev. A with 2958-03 Rev. B received 24/2/16.</p>	<p>This plan replaces the ‘grasscrete’ previously proposed for the parking surfaces with porous block following officer’s advice as ‘grasscrete’ is not considered to be suitable for permanent/frequent use.</p>
<p>An email dated 22/2/16 has been received from the agent in response to the Ward Councillor’s concerns, advising that parking standards have been met and previously considered acceptable for approved flats at No, 51 The Drive; grounds, verges and communal areas would be maintained by a management company to very high standard as would be expected by the residents; the area of soft landscaping in the front garden would be 695sqm, as compared to 150sqm as existing (see plan that is included in officer’s committee presentation) and noise and disturbance is unlikely to be an issue as was previously concluded at No. 51 as residents would be more likely to be professionals or downsizers.</p>	<p>These points are noted.</p>