

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 6 HAMILTON ROAD COWLEY UXBRIDGE

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer

LBH Ref Nos: 5670/APP/2017/3929

Drawing Nos: Location Plan (1:1250)
MSB64-02A
MSB64-01A
MSB64-03A
MSB64-04A
MSB64-05A

Date Plans Received: 30/10/2017

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 30/11/2017

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of a two storey detached dwelling situated on the Western side of Hamilton Road, Cowley Uxbridge. The property is finished in a pebbledash render and characterised by a hipped roof and a two storey bay window and a carport to the Northern flank elevation. The house is set back to accommodate a front garden which consists of partial hardstanding and shingle, and is enclosed by a low level brick wall.

The surrounding area is residential in character and falls within the boundaries of the Orchard Drive, Hamilton Road, Clayton Way Area of Special Local Character. The street scene comprises of a row of detached and semi-detached dwellings set back along the adjacent carriageway to contain spacious front gardens and off road parking and positioned in a linear formation.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Consent is sought for a part two storey, part single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer.

The proposed part two storey, part single storey side extension would be set back 1 m from the principal elevation at both levels, would be characterised with a hipped roof set level with the main ridgeline and would extend the entire depth of the original dwelling. The part single storey side extension would protrude approximately 700 mm beyond the two storey flank wall and would be characterised with a dummy pitch roof with a maximum height of 3.7 m and would extend the entire depth of the host dwelling to project 4 m beyond the original rear wall and wrap entirely across it with a part mono-pitch roof with a maximum height of 3.7 m with a lowered flat section.

The rear dormer would be situated centrally to the new rear roof slope and would measure

1.1 m high and 1.7 m in width.

The proposed extensions would be finished in materials to match the existing.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

5670/APP/2017/42 6 Hamilton Road Cowley Uxbridge

Two storey side extension, single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer

Decision Date: 21-03-2017 Refused **Appeal:**06-JUL-17 Dismissed

Comment on Planning History

5670/APP/2017/42: Two storey side extension, single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer - Refused and dismissed at appeal.

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 5 Hamilton Road, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider Orchard Drive, Hamilton Road, Clayton Way Area of Special Local Character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of size, scale, bulk and roof form would result in an incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the host dwelling and the wider Orchard Drive, Hamilton Road, Clayton Way Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3. The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 5 Hamilton Road by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

4. The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its height and bulk would result in an over-dominant and visually intrusive addition that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and this Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Councils Supplementary Planning Documents: HDAS Residential Extensions (December 2008).

The application was dismissed at appeal.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

A total of 10 adjoining and nearby neighbouring properties were consulted via letter dated 05.12.17 including a site notice displayed outside the premises on 18.12.2017.

A total of 9 representations and a petition containing 20 signatures received and the comments are summarised as below:

1. The proposed extensions are overbearing, are not compatible in size, scale and character and do not harmonise with the character and appearance of the original property and the visual amenities of the street or the Area of Special Local Character.
2. Exceeds the original building line, and therefore fails to be subservient.
3. Would no longer benefit from access to maintain fence and guttering.
4. The plans indicate a total of 6 toilets with no WC logo, and therefore misleading.
5. Insufficient parking if this property be returned to HMO.
6. No 45 degree line provided for adjoining neighbours right to light.
8. A condition should be attached ensuring house is not converted into HMO.
9. The proposed extensions would be far too close to the neighbouring property and will spoil the line of buildings along Hamilton Road.
10. Liable to flooding and increased pressure on guttering and sewerage facilities.
11. Not informed regarding resubmission.
12. Will result in overlooking and loss of privacy.
13. The large windows and doors will cause glare.
14. There is a large fir tree within the garden contrary to the application form, and will require pruning for works to go ahead.
15. Plans are bland, characterless and featureless,
16. Agree with the application for a garage to this property, and the lack of windows which indicate it would be used as a parking area. A similar condition imposed a new building along Hamilton Way should also be imposed in this instance,
17. There are many examples of stained glass window features along Hamilton Road, and therefore at least one stained glass window or half way toilet window to the front aspect would reinstate some of the original character and appearance of the dwellinghouse,

OFFICER COMMENTS: With respect to the use of the application site as a House in Multiple occupancy, this is not permitted development. The site falls within the Uxbridge South and Brunel Wards where an Article 4 direction has removed permitted development rights for 3-6 bed HMO's and thus requires separate planning permission. The Enforcement Team investigated the claims, and it was found the site is not currently in use as a HMO. The planning objections raised will be discussed within the main body of the report.

Ward Councillor: Requests that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

BE5 New development within areas of special local character

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.

BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

BE22 Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original building, the street scene and the level of impact on the residential amenity and light levels of the adjoining neighbours.

Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part two (Saved UDP Policies) requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings to harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. Policy BE13 requires the layout and appearance of extensions to harmonise with the existing street scene and Policy BE19 ensures any new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Policy BE22 seeks to preserve the visually open gaps between properties to prevent forming a terraced appearance.

Policy BE5, within Areas of Special Local Character new development should harmonise with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in the area. Extensions should respect the symmetry of the original buildings.

Section 8.0 Front Extensions, Porches and Bay Windows states front extensions are eye catching and change the face of the building. They do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself but also the street scene. Porches should appear subordinate in scale and form, must not extend past the line of any bay window and in the case of being combined with a garage conversion they may be integrated with a forward

extension of the garage not exceeding 1.0 m.

The Council's Adopted SPD the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) or HDAS, contains design guidance (below) for all types of extensions which should appear subordinate in scale to the original building.

Paragraph 5.0: Side and first floor side extensions Two Storey: states extensions at first floor provide additional bedrooms but have the potential to have a significant impact on neighbouring properties and the character of the street. The Council requires all residential extensions of two or more storeys in height to be set back a minimum of 1 m from the side boundary for the full height, to prevent forming a terraced appearance. There is no requirement for a set back or set down to detached dwellings as they would integrate with the existing house, and the roof should follow that of the existing roof. The width and height of the extension should be less than that of the original house, preferably in between half and two thirds depending on the site.

Paragraph 3.0: Single Storey Rear Extensions: states a range of roofs will be acceptable, however they must not exceed 3.4 m in height to prevent obstructing light from any adjoining neighbours property. Extensions should appear subordinate to the original house and as such an extension up to 4 m deep is acceptable on detached houses.

The proposed part two storey side, part single storey side extension would be set back 1 m from the principal elevation and would measure 6.9 m in depth to measure level with the rear wall, would measure 3.4 m in width at first floor level and would be characterised with a hipped roof set level with the main ridge to form a crown roof. The part single storey side extension would measure 4.1 m in width and would be characterised with a dummy pitch roof with a maximum height of 3.7 m. The proposed extension would also retain a separation distance of approximately 600 mm from the side boundary to the front elevation at first floor level and as such would result in the closing of an important visual gap which is characteristic of this Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The proposed maximum width of 4.1 m would not exceed two thirds of the original width of the main dwelling, however, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and roof form would be an overly dominant addition which would detract from the architectural composition of the original dwelling, and by reason of its siting to the flank elevation would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and the Area of Special Local Character.

On this issue the Inspector in his decision commented as follows:

"11. Through its bulky design and lack of space on the Northern side of the appeal site the side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) which require that development should improve and maintain the quality of the built environment where extensions enhance local distinctiveness and conserve and enhance locally recognised historic features such as an ASLC. It would also be contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the UDP in that it would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene, and the scale, form and architectural composition of the original dwelling, and would not complement or improve the amenity and character of an area, as well as previously set out. It would also be contrary to the guidance of the HDAS set out above. Finally, it would be contrary to paragraphs 58 and 64 of the Framework as set out above, and which indicates permission should be refused for development that fails to

take the opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area."

The proposed single storey rear extension would measure 4 m in depth, would extend the full width of the host dwelling including the proposed two storey side extension and would be characterised by a mono pitched roof with a flat tip to measure a maximum height of 3.7 m. The proposed extension would be erected flush with the existing building lines and would retain a small gap between the upper floor windows to appear subordinate, and it is therefore considered by reason of its siting to the rear of the dwelling would not have an adverse impact upon the original dwelling and the street scene. Bearing in mind the size of the rear garden, the proposed extension would not appear cramped.

The appeal inspectorate under the previous planning refusal under ref: 5670/APP/2017/42 stated

"3..... While some of the properties are quite close together there are generally gaps between them, particularly at first floor level, and this provides part of the character of the area and makes it distinctive."

"5..... The replacement two-storey extension would extend to the North with a hipped roof for the width of the existing main dwelling and would continue the ridge of the existing ridge and roof planes. To the rear a single storey flat roofed rear extension would be replaced with a single storey lean-to extension across the whole width of the existing property as well as the side extension. To the front a new lean-to roof would replace the existing porch and extend in front of the side extension. There would be a loft conversion with a dormer in the rear roof plane.

6. The proposed extension would come close to the boundary with 5 Hamilton Road. The exact distance is not dimensioned on the application drawing but would appear to be less than 0.5 m. Policy BE22 of the UDP states that residential extensions of two or more storeys in height should be set back a minimum of 1 m from the side boundary of the property for the full height of the building. This is taken through in the HDAS which indicates that in order to protect the character of and appearance of the street scene and protect the gaps between properties preventing houses from combining visually to form a terraced appearance there should be a minimum of 1.5 m from the boundary. Whatever the precise dimension, the proposal would be less than the 1 m set out in Policy BE22 and the 1.5 m set out in the HDAS. The existing property is close to the Southern edge of the appeal site meaning that the proposal would extend across the vast majority of the width of the appeal site.

7. The design is such that the proposed extension would not appear subservient to the main house. While subservience is not, of itself, a requirement, that the proposal does not have this characteristic means the overall composition of the resultant building would appear bulky with the roof being particularly dominant as an architectural feature.

8. While there are gaps on either side of the appeal property to both 5 and 7 Hamilton Road the extent of the proposed development would extend across the vast majority of the width of the appeal site. This would result in a bulky building out of keeping with the wider character of the area with its significant, in terms of effect, gaps between properties."

Through its bulky design and lack of space on the northern side of the appeal site the side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore

be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) which require that development should improve and maintain the quality of the built environment where extensions enhance local distinctiveness and conserve and enhance locally recognised historic features such as an ASLC. It would also be contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the UDP in that it would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene, and the scale, form and architectural composition of the original dwelling, and would not complement or improve the amenity and character of an area, as well as previously set out.'

Paragraph 7.0 of the HDAS SPD states on detached houses, set ins should be increased to 1 m. Dormers should relate well to the proportions, roof forms and massing of the existing house as it can have an impact on the residential area. The proposed dormer would be set 500 mm below the main ridge, and pushed back and set in from the eaves and flank edges by 1 m. The proposed dormer which although was previously considered overly large and dominant, was considered acceptable by the Appeal Inspectorate whom stated:

'However, this could not be seen from the public domain and would appear as a relatively small element within the overall roof (albeit that I have found the roof would be bulky). I am therefore satisfied that this element, of itself, would not represent an overly dominant and visually intrusive addition to the property had the other elements been found to be acceptable.

The proposed development is considered to detract from the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the visual amenities of the Area of Special Local Character and as such would fail to accord with Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

Policy BE20 requires any new development to be laid out so as to protect the daylight and sunlight levels of existing houses. Policy BE21 requires new extensions by virtue of their siting, bulk and proximity should not result in a significant loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties and Policy BE24 should protect the privacy of the occupiers and their neighbours.

The application site benefits from adjoining neighbours to either side at Nos. 5 and 7 Hamilton Road. The proposed two storey side extension would be erected to the Northern flank elevation and as such would be largely obscured by the main dwelling and as such would not be a visible addition when viewed from the outlook of No.7. The rear dormer would be set centrally within the rear roof slope to face their own rear garden and would retain a separation distance of 32 m from the rear wall of the occupier to the rear at No.12 Clayton Way.

The single storey rear extension would measure 4 m in depth, however the height of the ridge would exceed the recommended limit of 3.4 m by 300 mm. However, due to the sufficient separation distance between the two properties, the proposed single storey extension is considered not to result in a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities and light levels of the adjoining neighbours. All windows would face the rear garden and would not result in a loss of privacy and overlooking.

The adjoining neighbour to the opposite flank at No. 5 benefits from a number of windows

along its Southern flank elevation. The majority of the windows are obscure glazed, however the ground floor flank window is not and serves a kitchen. The kitchen does benefit from a dual aspect with an additional window to the rear elevation, however by reason of its modest size and limited level of outlook, this would be considered as the secondary window. The flank window would therefore be considered as the primary source of outlook and light, which is further backed up by the internal layout, with the worktop and sink positioned on the flank wall. It is therefore considered the proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, and proximity to the shared boundary would have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupier at No. 5 Hamilton Road by reason of appearing over-dominant, over-bearing, over-shadowing and resulting in a loss of outlook and light. The proposed single storey rear extension by reason of its single storey composition, depth and separation distance from the adjoining neighbour would not result in a loss of outlook and light. On this issue the Inspector commented as follows:

"14. The construction of a two storey element in close proximity to that kitchen window would result in an overbearing effect to those in the kitchen and in the immediate area between the two properties and a loss of light within the kitchen. This would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupier of that property as the extension would be to the South and would result in the material loss of sunlight and daylight when compared with the existing situation.

15. Consequently, the proposal would not result in satisfactory living conditions for the occupier of No 5. As such it would be contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the UDP which seek development within residential areas to complement or improve the amenity of the area, that buildings should be laid out so that adequate daylight and sunlight can penetrate into and between them and the amenities of existing houses are safeguarded, and states that planning permission will not be granted for extensions which by reason of their siting, bulk and proximity, would result in a significant loss of residential amenity. It would also be contrary to the HDAS which indicates that large two storey extensions can overshadow habitable rooms of neighbouring property. Finally, it would also be contrary to paragraph 17 of the Framework which seeks a good standard of amenity for all existing occupiers of land and buildings."

The proposed two storey side extension has been marginally reduced in width at first floor level, however given its proximity is considered not to overcome the previous reason for refusal.

The development would therefore fail to accord with Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

Policy BE23 seeks to ensure all new residential development and extensions provide or maintain external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants of the proposed building in terms of its shape and siting. This will be assessed in accordance with the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions. The HDAS: SPD states a 4 bedroom dwelling must retain a minimum of 100 sq m of rear usable amenity to be considered sufficient to protect the residential amenities of the occupants of the host dwelling. The proposal would retain approximately 150 sq m of rear usable amenity area which is usable in terms of its size and shape, and as such would comply with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions

(December 2008).

The application site would retain two off road parking spaces to the front of the property in addition to a single parking space within the new garage, and therefore would accord with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed part two storey, part single storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 5 Hamilton Road, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider Orchard Drive, Hamilton Road, Clayton Way Area of Special Local Character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed part two storey, part single storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and roof form would result in an incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the host dwelling and the wider Orchard Drive, Hamilton Road, Clayton Way Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed part two storey, part single storey side extension by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 5 Hamilton Road by reason of over-dominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

- 1** On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies (2016). On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development

(which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

- 2 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. The Council's supports pre-application discussions with no record of having being taken, however as the proposed extensions are clearly contrary to the Local Planning Policies and Design Guide it could not be overcome by way of negotiation and therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

Standard Informatives

- 1 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
- 2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (July 2011) and national guidance.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:



BE5	New development within areas of special local character
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Naim Poptani

Telephone No: 01895 250230



<p>Notes</p> <p> Site boundary</p> <p>For identification purposes only.</p> <p>This copy has been made by or with the authority of the Head of Committee Services pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (the Act). Unless the Act provides a relevant exception to copyright.</p> <p>© Crown copyright and database rights 2013 Ordnance Survey 100019283</p>	<p>Site Address</p> <p align="center">6 Hamilton Road, Cowley, Uxbridge</p>		<p align="center">LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON</p> <p align="center">Residents Services</p> <p align="center">Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111</p>
	<p>Planning Application Ref:</p> <p align="center">5670/APP/2017/3929</p>	<p>Scale</p> <p align="center">1:1,250</p>	
	<p>Planning Committee</p> <p align="center">Central and South</p>	<p>Date</p> <p align="center">February 2018</p>	
		 HILLINGDON <small>LONDON</small>	