



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	North Planning Committee	
Date:	Wednesday 17 July 2019	Time: 8:00pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6	Location: 59 Elm Avenue, Eastcote
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>1. An appeal for non-determination has now been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Replace the recommendation of 'REFUSAL for the following reasons:' with:-</p> <p>'That the Planning Inspectorate be informed that had an appeal for non-determination not of been lodged, the application would have been refused for the following reason:-'</p>	For update.
<p>2. In Section 6 - Consultations, in External consultations, in first line, replace '13' with '10'. In second sentence, replace '5' with '3'. At end of section add 'A Ward Councillor has also requested that the application be referred to committee'.</p>	For correction.
<p>3. In Policy Section, Informative 2 and in Reason for Refusal, after 'Strategic Policies (November 2012)', add 'Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies With Modifications (March 2019),'</p>	For correction

Item: 8	Location: Scout Hut 4 Ladygate Lane
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Page 35 addendum to the Daylight and Sunlight report received	For completeness
Page 36 'recommendation notes' delete 'The first £50,000 is payable when planning permission is granted; and' and replace with 'The first £50,000 is payable on vacant possession; and'	For update
Page 39 Condition 'Landscaping' delete 2.d and 2.e	For update

Item: 9	Location: 1 Harlyn Drive, Pinner
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Add Additional Condition - HH-RPD4 (Prevention of Use of Flat Roofs as Amenity Space/Roof Gardens).	For update/completeness

Item: 11	Location: 22 Breakspear Road, Ickenham
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Item 11 has been removed from tonight's committee agenda by the Head of Service as the published report was incomplete.	For update

Item:14	Location: Land adjacent to 30 Harvey Road, Northolt
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>Replace wording of Condition 8 with:- ‘The dwellings hereby permitted are required to be constructed to meet the standards for a Category 2 M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with London Plan policy 3.8 c (March 2016), is achieved and maintained.’</p>	For correction.

Item:15	Location: Oak at Catlins Lane High Road, Eastcote
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>The property owner has circulated comments on the Committee report to Committee. The Council’s Tree Officer has responded to the comments raised.</p> <p>Tree Officer comment received :</p> <p>The Oak tree is situated within the front garden of Catlins, High Road, Eastcote it is a very large prominent tree, situated close to the junction of High Road Eastcote and Catlins Lane. Prior to the creation of TPO 777 this Oak was protected by virtue of its location within Eastcote Village Conservation Area. The tree significantly contributes to the amenity and arboreal character of the area. Following a submission of a section 211 notice (CA/2463) to fell the tree it was decided that the tree’s amenity value was worth a TPO.</p> <p>In the objectors further clarification the end remark is as follows: “I believe the objections in regards to safety greatly outweigh the amenity value of the Oak tree brings.” However no Arboricultural evidence has been provided to back these claims up. The building surveyors may have 30+ years in industry each but as their expertise are in building surveying and not arboriculture they are not qualified to make statements such as “We would strongly recommend this tree is gradually reduced in size to reduce the risk of it falling and causing serious damage or injury at a vulnerable location near a traffic junction”.</p> <p>The objector mentions damage to the driveway, the evidence provided was pictures of the blocked paving where the bricks no longer flush. There was no evidence of any lifting of the bricks to determine what was causing this disruption, and as a result it was determined that the amenity value of the tree significantly outweighed the disruption in the driveway.</p> <p>A TPO does not stop future works being carried out, it does however ensure that any work granted is carried out is appropriate with sound arboricultural reasons.</p> <p>As a result of further assessing the objector’s viewpoint it is still our recommendation that TPO 777 be confirmed.</p>	<p>The Tree Officers comments should be noted. The report Recommendation is unchanged as a result of the further comments.</p>