



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Central and South Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>6 August 2019</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: 5</b>	<b>Location: Land to rear of 89 Goshawk Gardens and Haystall Close, Hayes</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>The following text should be added to Section 4 of the report:</p> <p>The Revised Proposed Submission Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) documents (Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Policies Map Atlas of Changes) were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in May 2018. The public examination hearing sessions took place over one week in August 2018. Following the public hearing sessions, the examining Inspector advised the Council in a Post Hearing Advice Note sent in November 2018 that he considers the LPP2 to be a plan that could be found sound subject to a number of main modifications. The main modifications proposed by the Inspector were agreed by the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Recycling in March 2019 and are published for public consultation from 27 March to 8 May 2019.</p> <p>Regarding the weight which should be attributed to the emerging LPP2, paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 states that 'Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);</li> <li>(b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and</li> <li>(c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).</li> </ul> <p>With regard to (a) above, the preparation of the LPP2 is now at a very advanced stage. The public hearing</p>		<p>To clarify Revised Proposed Submission Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) documents (Development Management Policies and how they affect the report.</p>

element of the examination process has been concluded and the examining Inspector has indicated that there are no fundamental issues with the LPP2 that would make it incapable of being found sound subject to the main modifications referred to above.

With regard to (b) above, those policies which are not subject to any proposed main modifications are considered to have had any objections resolved and can be afforded considerable weight. Policies that are subject to main modifications proposed by the Inspector will be given less than considerable weight. The weight to be attributed to those individual policies shall be considered on a case by case basis considering the particular main modification required by the Inspector and the material considerations of the particular planning application, which shall be reflected in the report, as required.

With regard to (c) it is noted that the Inspector has indicated that subject to main modifications the LPP2 is fundamentally sound and therefore consistent with the relevant policies in the NPPF.

With regard to this case the relevant policies are set out within the policy section below. However, the reasons for refusal should include the relevant policies from this document. Thus within reason 1 the following should be added after Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012): Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019)

Reason 2 should be amended to read as follows:

The proposal would result in substandard car parking provision for the existing and proposed development leading to on street parking in an area where parking is already at a premium. Furthermore, due to the proximity of the proposed gate to the highway off Haystall Close, the proposal would result in vehicles overhanging the carriageway while attending to it and coupled with the lack of visibility when exiting the space via Haystall Close would result in the potential for additional conflict points along the highway to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Layouts.

<b>Item: 7</b>	<b>Page: 19</b>	<b>Location: 3 Cambridge Road, Uxbridge</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>Within the printed report reason 1 for refusal is unclear. It should read as follows:</p> <p>1. The proposed development by reason of its size, scale, bulk, layout, site coverage and design would</p>		To clarify refusal reason 01.

result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site to the level proposed would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character and the residential area as a whole. The proposal is detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding and contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF."

However, officers are requesting an amendment to this reason to read as follows:

1. The proposed development by reason of its size, scale, bulk, layout, site coverage and design would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The intensification of the residential use of the site to the level proposed would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character and the residential area as a whole. The proposal is detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding and contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF.

Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) should be included within the list of relevant policies.

<b>Item: 8</b>	<b>Page: 37</b>	<b>Location: 76 Lansbury Drive, Hayes</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
This application has been withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning.		

<b>Item: 10</b>	<b>Page: 71</b>	<b>Location:</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information:</b>		<b>Officer Comments:</b>
<p>A petition in support of the application has been received.</p> <p>The following additional conditions are recommended concerning the new A3 unit.</p> <p>Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority details of kitchen extraction and any flues proposed for the A3 use shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that use commences. Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure kitchen extraction/flues do not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the existing building to the detriment of the overall streetscene and visual amenity in accordance with policy BE3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p> <p>Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority details of fully accessible toilets for the A3 use shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that use commences. Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development achieves a high standard of inclusive design in accordance with the London Plan (2016) Policy 7.2.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the submitted plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority details of lift facilities for the A3 use shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that use commences. Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development achieves a high standard of inclusive design in accordance with the London Plan (2016) Policy 7.2.</p>		<p>To be noted.</p> <p>The application is submitted by INTU, operator of the wider shopping centre. INTU have not yet agreed the precise layout of the A3 unit with the operator. Nonetheless officers consider that the application can be approved for the change of use of part of the unit to A3 use so long as accessibility issues are fully addressed and final extraction/flue details are received. There is no reason to believe these issues cannot be addressed within the fabric of the building/shopping centre as has occurred in other units throughout the shopping centre. Given the location within the demise of the shopping centre officers have not considered there to be a need to condition deliveries or waste management, which are controlled satisfactorily by the wider shopping centre through existing servicing arrangements.</p>