



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	North Planning Committee	
Date:	14th March 2017	Time: 7:00pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 3	Page: 1	Minutes of the North Planning Committee held on the 22 February 2017
Amendments:		
Suggested amendments to the minutes on item 9, Land Between 2 & 6 Woodside Road, are as follows. Additions/changes are in bold.		
<i>Members sought clarity on the boundary requirement. Officers confirmed that the proposal complied with the 1.5m requirement, though Members challenged this due to the inclusion of an exterior chimney breast on the south elevation, which appeared to reduce the distance between the properties.</i>		
<i>During discussion relating to the outcome of any potential appeals, Officers highlighted that the conservation officer had been heavily involved with the application and had not raised any concerns.</i>		
<i>Members discussed the application, with some Members deeming the proposal to be acceptable in light of the revisions made and the comments of the Conservation officer. Other Members raised concerns over the size, scale and bulk of the proposed development, and for these reasons, it was moved that the application be refused. This was seconded, and agreed by a vote of 5 to 3.</i>		

Item: 6	Page: 9	Location: 17-21 The Close
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments:
Follow up objection from the Eastcote Residents' Association:		For information.
We ask that this application be refused.		
This site is not suitable for a residential dwelling of any kind as the inhabitants would have no outlook, nor privacy, and would effectively be situated in what is largely a commercial (retail), rather than residential area.		
The front of the bungalow would face the service road to the rear of the Field End Road retail properties, that the road services. This road also provides access to 2 shoppers' car parks situated to either side of the proposed new property.		
The rear of the property might afford privacy,		

<p>but has no real outlook as it will face a fence or walls.</p> <p>The site has been the subject of some 6 applications – see attached.</p> <p>In 2006, the application was for a two-storey apartment block which went to appeal and was refused. The reasons for refusal are as relevant to this current application, as they were then.</p>	
---	--

Item: 7	Page: 21	Location: 271 Swakeleys Road
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments:
No amendments or additional information.		

Item: 8	Page: 35	Location: Pincio, Gate End
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments:
No amendments or additional information.		

Item: 9	Page: 47	Location: 51 Wieland Road
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments:
<p>Page 50-51, Condition 13 (Landscaping) amend wording to the following:</p> <p>No development shall take place until a landscape scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme 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 Landscape Maintenance <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.a Proposals for the replacement of any tree, shrub, or area of surfing/seeding within the landscaping scheme which dies or in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased. 3. Schedule for Implementation <p>Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>REASON To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and provide</p>		<p>The condition as worded in the report included requirements normally only imposed on larger developments.</p>

adequate facilities in compliance with policies BE13, BE38 and AM14 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policies 5.11 (living walls and roofs) and 5.17 (refuse storage) of the London Plan (2015).	
Amend para 7.12 to state: The application is for a single dwelling and there are no accessibility issues.	For clarity.

Item: 10 Page: 67	Location: 53-55 The Broadway, Joel Street
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
This scheme has been withdrawn from tonight's agenda.	

Item: 11 Page: 81	Location: Watercress Beds, Springwell Lane
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
No amendments or additional information.	

Report B

Item: 13 Page: 1	Location: 81 Field End Road, Eastcote
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>Add comments from the Eastcote Residents' Association:</p> <p>The 2015 application to redevelop this site was refused at appeal and we were pleased to see that the Planning Inspector's reasons very much reflected our concerns.</p> <p>We do not see that this new application really addresses the issues raised in the Inspector's report and therefore ask that this new application also be refused.</p> <p>In sum, it is our opinion that the current design will continue to appear obtrusive, starkly at odds with its neighbour, erode the spaciousness of the site, appear intrusive and have a detrimental effect on the openness of the area, just as the Inspector commented on the last application.</p> <p>We do note that the balconies from the original application have been removed and the roof changed to a mansard design but these changes do not alter the overall height</p>	<p>The points raised by the Eastcote Residents' Association have mainly been dealt with in the officer's report.</p> <p>In terms of provision of a children's play area, whilst it is accepted that the roof terraces are not ideal, the proposal for 9 residential units is a minor development and there is no policy requirement to provide child play space.</p>

and dominating appearance as against the two storey houses in Deane Croft Road and the nearby Walsh Lodge. Furthermore a mansard roof is out of keeping with all neighbouring properties.

The site's proximity to the war memorial and listed buildings on the opposite side of Field End Road must also be taken into consideration.

We have no objection to seeing improved facilities being provided at the doctor's surgery – indeed we would welcome them. However, this application does not increase the number of consulting rooms, does not detail any specific enhanced medical facilities that will definitely be provided and offers only a marginal increase in overall size.

The main emphasis of this application actually appears to be on the provision of the pharmacy and the apartments and not the surgery itself.

Eastcote already has 4 pharmacies, one of which is situated close by the surgery (Eastcote Pharmacy). Therefore, another pharmacy, even if funding were provided for it, will not be of particular benefit to the community. If the pharmacy did not materialise, would another dwelling take its place, having a further knock on effect on the occupancy, amenity space and parking issues raised below?

We question the size of the apartments, as they are detailed, relating to the total occupancy for which they allow. The Design and Access Statement details the provision of 5 x two bedroom flats and 4 x one bedroom ones. However, the drawings show that 2 of the so-called one bedroom apartments each have a room designated as a study, of a size that could easily be a 2nd double bedroom in that flat. This has the potential for increasing the total occupancy of the building, which could be further increased by the fact that it is noted that, on the drawings, the designated

bedrooms are also all shown as doubles. Therefore, it seems we have 7 x 4 person flats + 2 x 2 person flats.

We also question whether sufficient amenity space is now provided, as all such private space (in the form of balconies) has been removed. The communal roof top spaces are likely, by definition, to have limited use and are certainly not a suitable play area for any children living there.

If the additional, suggested occupancy is accepted, then the amount of residents' parking provided may not be sufficient. Furthermore, only 6 spaces, including 2 disabled bays, are now provided at ground level, which does not seem to be a sufficient number to accommodate all the requirements for patients, surgery and pharmacy staff and pharmacy deliveries. The current street parking in the immediate area of the surgery is residential. The Devonshire Lodge and other car parks (referred to in the D&A Statement) are all further away and, indeed, much closer to another surgery and the other pharmacies.

Finally, we note that the petition in favour of the application, that is included in this submission, is actually the one that was submitted with the last application and also that not all the signatories are Hillingdon residents. Presumably, therefore, for these reasons, this petition will not be accepted in relation to the current application?