



# HILLINGDON

Folo

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>North Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>6th December 2016</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: 17 - 32</b>	<b>Location: 56 - 54 Pembroke Road</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Page 19, Reason 9 - refers to failure to provide a Transport Assessment however one was submitted. This reason needs to be reworded to state the following: “ <b>The proposal has failed to demonstrate sufficient parking or cycle storage will be provided or appropriate arrangements for the collection of refuse and recycling from the site. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would not have an unduly negative impact on the local highway network. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</b></p> <p>Page 32 - site plan in the report only shows half the site. Correct site plan will be circulated before the meeting.</p>		<p>Correction.</p>

<b>Item: 7</b>	<b>Page: 33 - 64</b>	<b>Location: 46 The Drive</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Clarification of the Highways comments on page 46 and and the consideration of highways and access issues discussed on page 56:</p> <p>The proposed gradient (1:12) for the ramp giving access to the basement car park does not exceed the Council's maximum standards (1:10) and, as such, it is acceptable.</p> <p>The proposed ramp would have a 90° bend which might pose forward visibility problems.</p>		<p>As a result of this clarification it is recommended that Informative 3 on page 37 of the report be deleted.</p>

<p>As a result, it is recommended that either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic movements in and out of the basement car park should be separated by means of a raised median strip. This would be subject to a swept path assessment and potential widening of the ramp, especially around the bend; or:</li> <li>- Traffic signal arrangements should be considered to implement shuttle operations along the ramp. Further details of the proposed arrangements should be submitted and approved to the council prior to commencement of works;</li> </ul> <p>Should the proposals be deemed acceptable, both the measures described in the previous two paragraphs could be secured through conditions to the planning consent if planning permission were to be granted.</p>	
---	--

<b>Item: 8      Page: 65-74</b>	<b>Location: 46 Burlington Close</b>
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b>	<b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b>
20 signature petition received from residents of Burlington Close objecting to the application. The petitioners wish it to be noted that they are all home owners.	For information.
Page 71, Reason 2 (Privacy) should be removed. The report considers that there will be no significant adverse impact on privacy.	Correction.
A petition was received with 25 signatures in support of the scheme (this petition was heard at the previous Committee meeting and drew the Committee's attention to a similar size dormer window at No.5 Burlington Close).	<u>Additional Officer Comment:</u> Officers have viewed the dormer at 5 Burlington Close on site and noted that its visual impact (due to the configuration of the streetscene) is restricted because of the positions of No 4 Burlington Close and No 6 Burlington Close and is only viewed at oblique angles. Whereas the proposed dormer at No.46 Burlington Close is not constrained by the orientation of neighbouring property and would not be viewed at oblique angles by neighbouring property. This means that the rear dormer proposed to the rear of No.46 Burlington Close will be visible to a much larger number of properties and accordingly it is considered to cause a greater level of visual harm.

<b>Item: 9      Page: 75-84</b>	<b>Location: 235 Tolcarne Drive</b>
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b>	<b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b>
The amended plans received on the 10	The amended scheme proposes less changes to

<p>November 2016 (drawing numbers MC/CL 09-02/LB Rev A and MC/CL 09-03/LB Rev A) removed from application the proposed hip to gable conversion of the roof. As a consequence the description of development for this application needs to be updated to the following:  <b>“Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights and insertion of first floor gable end window”.</b></p>	<p>the property than the original submission. On this basis it is not considered necessary for a consultation exercise to be undertaken.</p>
<p>Petition received in support of the application with 25 valid signatures, which states that the proposed extensions will be no more intrusive than the existing situation.</p>	<p>For information.</p>

<b>Item: 10</b>	<b>Page: 85-96</b>	<b>Location: 2 Linksway</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>1 petition has been received in support of the application with 34 valid signatures, which states that the house fits in with the street and Copse Wood.</p>		<p>For information.</p>
<p>Following on site measurements by the LPA, it was noted that the eaves height had increased by 0.9 metres, which the application reflects. The architect has highlighted to the LPA that there was a discrepancy in the ‘as built’ drawings originally submitted. The ridge height has been checked again on site on a couple of occasions since, and can now be verified as shown on the revised drawings. These lower the height of the ridge from 9.5 metres to 9 metres.</p>		<p>Whilst the revised plans are noted, these do not alter the officer recommendation.</p>
<p>Page 85 drawing numbers: Replace drawings A202 and A203 with drawings A202 Rev A and A203 Rev A.</p>		<p>To reflect the discrepancy in height identified by the architect.</p>

<b>Item: 11</b>	<b>Page: 97 - 106</b>	<b>Location: 16 High Street</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Page 103, Section 7.15 of the report (Sustainable Waste Management) has been left blank. The following wording should be added to this section of the report:  <b>“The change of use of this unit from A3 to A4 without any increase in floor space is not expected to alter the waste storage and management requirements for this use. The site has rear servicing and sufficient external space to store waste”.</b></p>		<p>Amendment to report.</p>

<b>Item: 12</b>	<b>Page: 107 - 116</b>	<b>Location: 22 High Street</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>

No Amendments or Additional Information.	
--	--

<b>Item: 13</b>	<b>Page: 117 - 130</b>	<b>Location: The Old Workhouse</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Page 119 Clarification of the need for a landscape condition.n</p> <p>Why is the landscaping condition necessary?. Where is the landscaping going?</p>		<p>For clarification.</p> <p>The landscaping condition is considered necessary as this is a sensitive site, both in terms of its heritage status and Green Belt designation. The footprint of the proposed building is larger than the existing outbuilding to be demolished , extending into an area of existing hard standing. Ay hard standing around the proposed building will need to be conditioned, as details have not been provided.</p> <p>In addtion, it is likely that existing planting in close proximity to the proposed building will be disturbed during construction. Replacement planting is considered necessary, to ensure that the proposals preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding natural and built environment.</p>

<b>Item: 14</b>	<b>Page: 131 - 136</b>	<b>Location: The Old Workhouse</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
No Amendments or Additional Information.		

<b>Item: 15</b>	<b>Page: 137 - 152</b>	<b>Location: 2 Reservoir Road</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
No Amendments or Additional Information.		