



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>North Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>22nd February 2017</b>	<b>Time: 7:00pm</b>
<b>Place:</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 6</b>	<b>Page: 13-30</b>	<b>Location: Eastcote Motor Services</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
Page 3: Condition 3 - remove reference to details of balconies.		Correction.
Page 16: Add the following Informative:  <i>The applicant is advised that where the conditions requiring the submission of details have been discharged in connection with the original permission, the Local Planning Authority will not require these details to be re-submitted as part of this new planning permission, where those details would remain the same.</i>		Clarification. The pre-commencement conditions 3 (Materials), 4 (Written Scheme of Investigation) and 9 ((Nature Conservation Scheme) have already been discharged. The remaining pre-commencement condition 5 (Sustainable Water Management) has been submitted.
Page 27: EPU did respond to the consultation confirming that they had no objection to the proposed amendments to the original permission.		Clarification.
Add the following informative: "This permission does not authorise the display of advertisements or signs, separate consent for which may be required under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992. To display an advertisement without the necessary consent is an offence that can lead to prosecution. For further information and advice, contact - Residents Services, 3N/04, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel. 01895 250230)."		For clarity.

<b>Item: 7</b>	<b>Page: 31-38</b>	<b>Location: 104 Breakspear Road.</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Page 35: Amend both reasons for refusal to the following:</p> <p><i>Reason 1: The proposed front canopy extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and width, results in an incongruous and overly dominant addition which is detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, the street scene, and the character and appearance of the wider area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.</i></p> <p><i>Reason 2: The proposed white render to the first floor, detracts from the predominantly brick built houses along this part of Breakspear Road South. Therefore, the proposal is considered detrimental to the architectural composition of the original building, the street scene, and the character and appearance of the wider area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.</i></p>		<p>Reasons need to reflect that the works have already been carried out.</p>

<b>Item: 8</b>	<b>Page: 39-52</b>	<b>Location: 103 Shenley Avenue</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>This item has been withdrawn from tonight's agenda.</p>		<p>To enable revised plans to be discussed with the applicant's agent.</p>

<b>Item: 9</b>	<b>Page: 53-70</b>	<b>Location: Land between 2 &amp; 6 Woodside.</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>No amendments or additional information.</p>		

<b>Item: 10</b> <b>Page: 71-88</b>	<b>Location: Bishop Ramsey C of E School, Hume Way, Ruislip</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b> 14 additional letters of objection have been received, which raise the following concerns: i) An application for floodlights will follow. ii) Increased traffic and parking problems. iii) Increased noise and disturbance. iv) Impact on park, nature reserve, ambience. v) Increased bad language, anti-social behaviour and littering. vi) Overdevelopment of the site. vii) The borough has adequate sports facilities. viii) This is a commercial venture. ix) 2008 conditions should stand - nothing has changed. x) Lack of detailed information. xi) A proposed 2018 Academy could also bus its pupils to the existing sports facilities. xii) The school's address is wrong so the application is invalid. xiii) No redline plan has been provided. xiv) Lack of consultation by the school.	<b>Officer Comments:</b> The report addresses most of these concerns.  Officers are unaware of proposals from the school for a new academy.  The address reflects that given by the applicant and adequately identifies the site such that the application could not be made invalid. It is noted the school's correct address is Hume Way.  Given the nature of the application, referral back to the 2008 redline plan is acceptable.  Consultation by the applicant is voluntary. Refusal cannot be justified on this basis.
The Eastcote Conservation Panel has raised the following concerns: i) No justification provided for the proposal. ii) Failure to discharge condition 2. iii) Previous refusal reasons should stand. iv) Conditions 2 and 4 also need to be varied. v) An application for floodlighting will follow. vi) Contrary to Local Plan policies.	These comments are addressed in the report. The conflict with other conditions, as referred to in point (iv) is noted.
The local Councillors for Manor Ward have commented as follows:  "I write on behalf of all three Manor ward councillors and several Manor residents who are impacted by the above application. We wish you to note on the report that will go to committee, that we are totally opposed to this application and request that a refusal is the determined outcome.  When the original approval was given in 2008, the accompanying condition was applied to ensure that there was a balance between usage and local residents amenity not being adversely affected, as required in the Council's published Planning Policy. Below is the wording used with the approval and we can see no reason why that should be removed as the Policy is equally applicable today as it was in 2008.  REASON FOR CONDITION	The concerns raised are addressed in the report.

<p>To ensure that the amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential properties is not adversely affected in accordance with Policy OE3 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007."</p>	
<p>The local Councillors for Eastcote &amp; East Ruislip ward have commented as follows:</p> <p>"We believe that the planning request should be rejected.</p> <p>Local residents are concerned that the proposed increase hours are unsociably long and will cause noise disturbance. It has been reported to us that the shouting from players on the pitch carries to the houses near by. While the MUGA would be in active use until 9pm there would be noise and activity for a significant while afterwards as those using the facility left.</p> <p>The longer opening times will cause increases traffic and parking levels in the residential roads near the school. The application does not provide sufficient detail on how the increased level of traffic and parking demands will be managed."</p>	<p>The concerns raised are addressed in the report.</p>
<p>A Cavendish ward Councillor has raised concerns over potential floodlighting and impact on residential amenity.</p>	<p>The concerns raised are addressed in the report.</p>

<p><b>Item: 11                      Page: 89-108</b></p>	<p><b>Location: 219 Swakeleys</b></p>
<p><b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b></p>
<p>Members Site Visit took place on Friday 17th February. The site was viewed from the neighbouring rear garden of 3 Roker Park Avenue and from the rear garden of the application site.</p>	<p>For information.</p>
<p>Amend Condition 2 on page 56 to:</p> <p>Details of the landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to the local planning authority before the expiry of three years from the date of this permission and approved in writing before any development begins. The submitted details shall also include details of:</p> <p>Add number of car parking and cycle spaces to Condition 9 on p.57:</p> <p>2. Details of Hard Landscaping  2.a Refuse Storage  2.b <b>Storage for 8 cycles</b>  2.c Means of enclosure/boundary treatments</p>	<p>Correction.</p> <p>For clarity.</p>

<p>2.d Car Parking Layouts <b>for 6 spaces including 1 disabled space.</b> 2.e Hard Surfacing Materials</p> <p>Remove final paragraph of Section 7.07 - on page 68.</p>	<p>Correction.</p>
<p>A further response has been received from the petitioner querying whether the 10% threshold for flat conversions has been breached. They point out that some of the 86 original properties stated as being in the relevant 1km of Swakeleys Road only appear to front Swakeleys Road when viewed on a map. In fact some actually front adjoining roads. By their calculation the relevant stretch of Swakeleys Road only contains 72 Properties.</p> <p>Officers have noted and reviewed comments on what properties the petitioners include in their count. Officers have also cross-referenced counts undertaken in connection with other applications. As such we have removed from our count those properties fronting Swakeleys Road but with a different road name. However we can't reach a figure less than 80 properties in the relevant stretch, 7 properties (8 including the application site) have been redeveloped as flats or have planning permission to do so. The scheme therefore would comply with the 10% guideline set out in the SPD.</p>	<p>Clarification.</p>

<b>Item: 12</b>	<b>Page: 109-126</b>	<b>Location: Cornerways</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
No amendments or additional information.		