



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Major Applications Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday 16 November 2021</b>	<b>Time: 6:00pm</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Uxbridge</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 7 (Planning Application)</b>	<b>Location: Highgrove House</b>
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information</i></b>	<b><i>Officer Comments</i></b>
<p>After concerns were raised by consultees regarding land ownership, officers have reviewed the Land Registry records and it has been determined that the submitted redline boundary plan is incorrect (details in the presentation) and the redline includes land to the south of Highgrove House within the ownership of LB Hillingdon.</p> <p>An issue is being raised by third parties (see additional third party comments later in the addendum) as to whether this should be an additional refusal reason; that it affects not just the plans but various reports such as the arboricultural report and the ecology report. It should be noted that refusal reason 04 relates to the impact of the proposals on Highgrove Nature Reserve. The additional land has been cross referenced with land registry documents. It is not in the applicant's ownership and no notice has been served on the landowner. The applicant was requested to revise the location plan, they did this once, but the plan was still incorrect; they have refused to do it a second time. Whereas the proposed house is some distance from the Nature Reserve the application boundary has not been amended, it is unclear what the amenity area proposed for the house is and why the applicant cannot submit a correct location plan. It is recommended that the additional text below be added to reason 04:</p> <p><i>Insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the ecology of the immediate locality, including the adjacent Highgrove Nature Reserve (Nature Conservation Site of</i></p>	<p>That Committee should note officer concerns (and those of third parties) regarding the incorrect location plan.</p> <p>That Committee should agree the highlighted revisions to proposed refusal reason 04 to address concerns regarding the location plan.</p>

<p><i>Borough Grade II or Local Importance). Further-more the proposed location plan appears to include part of the nature reserve, (the land is not in the applicant's ownership and no notice has been served on the landowner) the loss of any part of Highgrove Nature Reserve to a residential use would be totally unacceptable in principle and would have adverse ecological and arboricultural impacts. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy EM4 (Open Space and Informal Recreation) and Policy EM7 (Biodiversity and Geological conservation) of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 and Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021).</i></p> <p>This information will be passed to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the planning appeal for the Inspectorates consideration.</p>	
<p>Comments received from the Eastcote Residents Association:</p> <p>Site Boundaries The boundaries shown on the site location plans (Rev G &amp; H) that are posted on the planning website are incorrect. They show the applicant's land as including part of Highgrove Woods. The boundaries on site are delineated by the metal fencing surrounding it. To the rear of Highgrove House and relating to the site of this new house, it looks as if the boundary shown on plan could have encroached as much as some 12 metres or so into the SINC area of the woods.</p> <p>This is fundamental to any further proper assessment of the application since the overall size of the site shown is larger than the reality and the new unit may not be correctly placed within it.</p> <p>Setting of a Heritage Asset – Highgrove House Hillingdon's own policies, reflecting those of the NPPF, are clear that part of the special interest and significance of a heritage asset resides in its setting as well as in the building itself. It is recognised that the asset and land around it can and will evolve over time, as has happened here, but at a certain point the remaining land which creates the setting should be preserved as being indicative of what was.</p> <p>We would submit that that point was reached when the redevelopment application for the site was made in 2006. Then, on page 7 of their D&amp;A statement, the applicant detailed the English Heritage 'request' that 'the mews houses did not extend too far into the space known as the drying area'. 'It was their preference for the mews houses to be within the environs of the ancillary buildings reflecting their size and character'.</p>	<p>Correction</p>

Thus, English Heritage was ensuring a remaining, acceptable setting for Highgrove House.

In turn, the applicant accepted this concept by detailing the EH 'request' themselves and enacting the practical results in the layout for the site that became the approved design for the mews houses and for the amenity space that, as above, also effectively became the retained setting for Highgrove House.

This proposed house is set outside the area of the original ancillary buildings, these largely consisting of the demolished stable block. Also, it is a stand-alone detached house and not, as the current D&A statement says, 'a development of the earlier mews'

#### Communal Amenity/Community Space

As part of the design for the site, which was included in the approved application for its overall redevelopment, the land that is currently undeveloped was shown as communal, amenity space for the residents of the 12 flats and the 4 mews houses which, on the basis of overall bedroom numbers, could accommodate say 40 or so residents. Viewed on site, the two connected areas to the rear and side of Highgrove House are not overly large for this purpose. It could also be argued that these areas meet the definition of a community facility and then the reasons given in DMCI 1 that would allow for its removal have not been addressed and anyway could not be met. Residents certainly use the spaces for community activities - details could be provided.

#### Use of Garden Land

In addition, the applicant's own originally approved design included for the currently relevant area to the rear of Highgrove House to be laid to lawn with a general plan for planting – neither have ever been enacted. Nonetheless, the requirements of the approved plans result in the fact that this cannot be considered a brownfield site – building on any of it is effectively 'garden grab'. The applicant does not meet anywhere near all the criteria in DMH 6 and therefore the Council can and should uphold its policy that building on garden land will not be accepted.

#### Overlooking and Living Conditions

Three of the four mews houses do have a small, private garden area but number 17 does not. It has an unfenced, open garden section running the length of the front of the house to a depth of just c3.2 metres, and 3.6, at its widest. The solid side wall of the new build is shown as eroding this narrow strip even further, sited as it is 2 metres away from the front door of No 17. The windows on this front elevation of No. 17 are the

main source of daylight for the house. Thus, light will be lost and the main aspect will be a brick wall – this results in unacceptable living conditions for the residents of No 17.

The front of the new house also appears to be only c13 or so metres from the rear elevation of Highgrove House with its windows to habitable rooms on 3 floors. There will be overlooking between the two buildings. In addition, on this elevation of Highgrove House, there are 2 small, unfenced, open amenity spaces to the ground floor flats there that will also be affected.

#### Ecology Issues and Tree Report

Lesley Crowcroft (for the ECP) and others with expert knowledge have made submissions regarding the effects on the Highgrove Woods SINC area, the wildlife and the protection of trees. We defer to their far greater knowledge but would stress that we support wholeheartedly the issues they have highlighted. Amongst other serious omissions, the applicant certainly does not seem to be meeting the requirements of policy DME17 on Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement.

#### Parking

Again, we know that others have made submissions re the general parking issues and problems relating to the designated parking spaces as they are currently allocated – again we support these concerns, not least because, with a PTAL of 1a, cars are likely to be a necessity.

The shown position of a car parking space for the new house gives real rise for concern:-

- It involves the removal of the metal fencing as it is currently set up, ie it currently creates a form of general security barrier and then stops any 4-wheel vehicle access – it is believed that the original approved application stated that the area from the railings on, into the mews ‘courtyard’ and beyond was to be pedestrian only and indeed was billed as another area that could then be used for amenity purposes. A car coming and going, using the interior pedestrian pathway areas as a turning circle and the possibility of other vehicles entering, due the opening up of accessibility, would make this a less than safe place for amenity use.
- The space shown is not fit for purpose, due to the available width of the pathway. Parking up against a brick wall with no access from one side of the vehicle is not acceptable.

Overall, no further development should be allowed on any part of the land facing the rear of Highgrove House or on that connected to it, at the side of the house. In addition to likely

<p>issues such as overlooking/loss of light etc in all areas, these spaces form the retained setting of the listed building, they provide the necessary amenity and community space for all the residents living there and are an important buffer zone for the Highgrove Woods SINC, providing an additional safe haven for its many wildlife species.</p> <p>We ask that this application be refused and any attempt by the applicant to suggest that they could gain approval if this property were to be placed elsewhere on the site, be strongly resisted.</p>	
<p>The Ruislip, Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society have requested that the comments they provided in relation to the listed building application reference 10622/APP/2021/1491 also be submitted in response to the full planning application:</p> <p>The Ruislip, Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society is opposed to this application as it will be very damaging to the setting of High Grove a listed grade 2 building. It will also be disruptive for the local wildlife. The proposed three bedroom house (not two bedroom as claimed in the Heritage Statement) will be sited too close to both High Grove and the neighbouring mews houses. It will be obtrusive and detrimental to the surroundings of High Grove. The application claims that the proposed site for the new house is already hard surfaced so that there will be no loss of green space. But according to the previous application in 2009 this site should have been turfed over as it was supposed to be part of the amenity space for the whole area but it did not happen. The Society understands that there seems to be a dispute about the boundary of the site and some of Highgrove Woods has been incorporated by mistake. We trust that this will be sorted out before a decision is made. For all these reasons we request that the application is refused.</p>	

<b>Item: 8 (Listed Building Application)</b>	<b>Location: Highgrove House</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<p>After concerns were raised by consultees regarding land ownership, officers have reviewed the Land Registry records and it has been determined that the submitted redline boundary plan is incorrect (details in the presentation) and the redline includes land to the south of Highgrove House within the ownership of LB Hillingdon.</p> <p>This information will be passed to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the planning appeal for the Inspectorates consideration.</p>	<p>Correction</p>

<p>Comments received from the Eastcote Residents Association:  Site Boundaries  The boundaries shown on the site location plans (Rev G &amp; H) that are posted on the planning website are incorrect. They show the applicant's land as including part of Highgrove Woods. The boundaries on site are delineated by the metal fencing surrounding it. To the rear of Highgrove House and relating to the site of this new house, it looks as if the boundary shown on plan could have encroached as much as some 12 metres or so into the SINC area of the woods.</p> <p>This is fundamental to any further proper assessment of the application since the overall size of the site shown is larger than the reality and the new unit may not be correctly placed within it.</p> <p>Setting of a Heritage Asset – Highgrove House  Hillingdon's own policies, reflecting those of the NPPF, are clear that part of the special interest and significance of a heritage asset resides in its setting as well as in the building itself. It is recognised that the asset and land around it can and will evolve over time, as has happened here, but at a certain point the remaining land which creates the setting should be preserved as being indicative of what was.</p> <p>We would submit that that point was reached when the redevelopment application for the site was made in 2006. Then, on page 7 of their D&amp;A statement, the applicant detailed the English Heritage 'request' that 'the mews houses did not extend too far into the space known as the drying area'. 'It was their preference for the mews houses to be within the environs of the ancillary buildings reflecting their size and character'. Thus, English Heritage was ensuring a remaining, acceptable setting for Highgrove House.</p> <p>In turn, the applicant accepted this concept by detailing the EH 'request' themselves and enacting the practical results in the layout for the site that became the approved design for the mews houses and for the amenity space that, as above, also effectively became the retained setting for Highgrove House.</p> <p>This proposed house is set outside the area of the original ancillary buildings, these largely consisting of the demolished stable block. Also, it is a stand-alone detached house and not, as the current D&amp;A statement says, 'a development of the earlier mews'</p> <p>Communal Amenity/Community Space</p>	<p>Correction</p>

As part of the design for the site, which was included in the approved application for its overall redevelopment, the land that is currently undeveloped was shown as communal, amenity space for the residents of the 12 flats and the 4 mews houses which, on the basis of overall bedroom numbers, could accommodate say 40 or so residents. Viewed on site, the two connected areas to the rear and side of Highgrove House are not overly large for this purpose. It could also be argued that these areas meet the definition of a community facility and then the reasons given in DMCI 1 that would allow for its removal have not been addressed and anyway could not be met. Residents certainly use the spaces for community activities - details could be provided.

#### Use of Garden Land

In addition, the applicant's own originally approved design included for the currently relevant area to the rear of Highgrove House to be laid to lawn with a general plan for planting – neither have ever been enacted. Nonetheless, the requirements of the approved plans result in the fact that this cannot be considered a brownfield site – building on any of it is effectively 'garden grab'. The applicant does not meet anywhere near all the criteria in DMH 6 and therefore the Council can and should uphold its policy that building on garden land will not be accepted.

#### Overlooking and Living Conditions

Three of the four mews houses do have a small, private garden area but number 17 does not. It has an unfenced, open garden section running the length of the front of the house to a depth of just c3.2 metres, and 3.6, at its widest. The solid side wall of the new build is shown as eroding this narrow strip even further, sited as it is 2 metres away from the front door of No 17. The windows on this front elevation of No. 17 are the main source of daylight for the house. Thus, light will be lost and the main aspect will be a brick wall – this results in unacceptable living conditions for the residents of No 17.

The front of the new house also appears to be only c13 or so metres from the rear elevation of Highgrove House with its windows to habitable rooms on 3 floors. There will be overlooking between the two buildings. In addition, on this elevation of Highgrove House, there are 2 small, unfenced, open amenity spaces to the ground floor flats there that will also be affected.

#### Ecology Issues and Tree Report

Lesley Crowcroft (for the ECP) and others with expert knowledge have made submissions regarding the effects on the Highgrove Woods SINC area, the wildlife and the protection

<p>of trees. We defer to their far greater knowledge but would stress that we support wholeheartedly the issues they have highlighted. Amongst other serious omissions, the applicant certainly does not seem to be meeting the requirements of policy DME17 on Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement.</p> <p>Parking Again, we know that others have made submissions re the general parking issues and problems relating to the designated parking spaces as they are currently allocated – again we support these concerns, not least because, with a PTAL of 1a, cars are likely to be a necessity.</p> <p>The shown position of a car parking space for the new house gives real rise for concern:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It involves the removal of the metal fencing as it is currently set up, ie it currently creates a form of general security barrier and then stops any 4-wheel vehicle access – it is believed that the original approved application stated that the area from the railings on, into the mews ‘courtyard’ and beyond was to be pedestrian only and indeed was billed as another area that could then be used for amenity purposes. A car coming and going, using the interior pedestrian pathway areas as a turning circle and the possibility of other vehicles entering, due the opening up of accessibility, would make this a less than safe place for amenity use.</li> <li>• The space shown is not fit for purpose, due to the available width of the pathway. Parking up against a brick wall with no access from one side of the vehicle is not acceptable.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, no further development should be allowed on any part of the land facing the rear of Highgrove House or on that connected to it, at the side of the house. In addition to likely issues such as overlooking/loss of light etc in all areas, these spaces form the retained setting of the listed building, they provide the necessary amenity and community space for all the residents living there and are an important buffer zone for the Highgrove Woods SINC, providing an additional safe haven for its many wildlife species.</p> <p>We ask that this application be refused and any attempt by the applicant to suggest that they could gain approval if this property were to be placed elsewhere on the site, be strongly resisted.</p>	
<p>The comments provided by the Ruislip Residents Association in relation to application reference 10622/APP/2021/1490 are also submitted in response to the listed building consent application:</p> <p>I write in support of the concerns raised by Eastcote Conservation Area Panel. The proposed dwelling lies just</p>	Correction

<p>outside the area presented by Ruislip Residents' Association. Many residents on the east side of Ruislip have raised concerns regarding these plans as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposals should be refused by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. The locations plans show that the proposed detached house will be very close to the front habitable window of no 17 a mews house, the only natural light source for this dwelling. Some of the private amenity space, will also be removed. The development will reduce natural light to the windows of the flats within High Grove House, and the private amenity space for the ground floor flats will lose natural sunlight.</li> <li>2. The proposal will be detrimental to setting of the Grade II Listed Building High Grove House.</li> <li>3. The application site has a PTAL rating of 1a because public transport is poor in this vicinity. Consequently, when I visited the site by car on Saturday 14th August it was clear there are insufficient parking spaces for existing residents and users of the site. The parking arrangements and the access to the proposed house look impractical. The access looks extremely narrow from the entrance to the mews houses that seemed only wide enough for pedestrians! At this point I had great difficulty turning round to leave the site as there were so many cars parked.</li> <li>4. In addition, on my visit on 14th August it was pouring with rain at around 1pm. I noted a lot of surface water sloshing around. I am not surprised therefore that the basement of High Grove House regularly floods in heavy rain. Should this proposal or any further developments be approved on this site then careful consideration should be given to the provision of adequate drainage.</li> <li>5. It is well known locally that there were a lot of problems and delays with the expansion programme of Bishop Ramsey School located the other side of High Grove Woods, "because of the newts". However, no survey for bats or newts was submitted with this planning application!</li> </ol>	
---	--

<b>Item: 9</b>	<b>Location: Northwood and Pinner Cottage Hospital</b>
<b>Amendments/Additional Information</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
The following conditions will be split to enable the delivery of the health centre and residential elements in phases. This results in amendments to conditions:	Correction

<p>5 (Materials)</p> <p>11 (Surface Water Management)</p> <p>12 (Contamination)</p> <p>13 (Low Emission Strategy)</p> <p>19 (Ecology)</p> <p>20 (Secure by Design)</p> <p>22 (Tree Protection)</p> <p>23 (Refuse Storage)</p> <p>24 (Landscaping Scheme)</p> <p>25 (Parking Management and Design Strategy)</p> <p>26 (Baseline Noise Survey and Assessment)</p> <p>As an example, Condition 20 would read as follows:</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL (Blocks A and B and associated car parking and landscaping/amenity areas)</p> <p>The residential units shall achieve ‘Secured by Design’ accreditation awarded by the Hillingdon Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). No dwelling shall be occupied until accreditation has been achieved.</p> <p>NEW HEALTH CENTRE (building, courtyard garden and car park)</p> <p>The healthcare centre shall achieve ‘Secured by Design’ accreditation awarded by the Hillingdon Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA) on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). The health centre shall not be brought into use until accreditation has been achieved.</p>	
<p>The following conditions should be amended to clarify that commencement of works excludes demolition and site clearance works:</p> <p>Condition 11 (Surface Water Management)</p>	<p>For Correction</p>

<p>Condition 13 (Low Emission Strategy)</p> <p>Condition 24 (Landscaping Scheme)</p> <p>Condition 26 Baseline Noise Survey and Assessment)</p> <p>Condition 27 (Noise Ingress Assessment of Residential Units) This condition also needs to clarify that only applies to residential element to read:</p> <p>‘The development (excluding demolition and site clearance) shall not begin on the residential scheme until a detailed assessment has been undertaken .....’</p>	
<p>Amendment to Condition 27 (Noise Ingress Assessment of Residential Units) to read:</p> <p>‘The development (excluding demolition and site clearance) shall not begin on the residential scheme until a detailed assessment has been undertaken .....’</p>	For Correction
<p>Conditions 6 (Relocation of Cottage Hospital Entrance) and 7 (Details of Plaque and Beam) need amending so that only refers to the new health centre</p> <p>As an example, Condition 6 would read:</p> <p>No development shall take place to the Cottage Hospital until details of the relocation of the main entrance in the Cottage Hospital has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The main entrance to the proposed Health Centre shall be located on the eastern side of the principal building, along with the central window at the front of the building.</p> <p>Thereafter the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such.</p>	Correction
<p>Condition 9 (Detailed Energy Assessment) should be amended to:</p> <p>Prior to the commencement (excluding demolition and site clearance) of the refurbishment of the health care facility, the applicant shall provide a detailed energy assessment to demonstrate the project will provide a minimum energy performance of <b>Very Good</b> against the ‘Reduction of energy use and carbon emissions’ as set out in the BREEAM UK Refurbishment and Fit-Out 2014 manual unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The details</p>	For correction and given that the proposal involves conversion works to a listed building, a minimum energy requirement of excellent would be incredibly difficult to achieve and

<p>shall specify the baseline building energy demand (kwhr/annum) for gas and electricity and the associated CO2 emissions. The assessment shall then identify the measures that will be incorporated into the project to meet the BREEAM target set out above or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The development must proceed in accordance with the approved assessment.</p>	<p>therefore too onerous.</p>
<p>Condition 17 (Play Areas) needs amending so that it specifies prior to commencement of above ground works and only refers to residential element which should read:</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of above ground works relating to the residential site, details of play areas for children shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include accessible play equipment for disabled children, including those with a sensory impairment, or complex multiple disabilities. Provisions could include outdoor sound tubes, colour and lighting canopies, and other play equipment and could simulate the olfactory senses. Thereafter, the play areas shall be provided prior to the occupation of any unit within the development and maintained for this purpose.</p>	<p>For correction / clarification</p>
<p>Revise Condition 14 (Dust Control Scheme) to read as follow:</p> <p>No development shall commence until a Plan for reducing emissions from demolition and construction works has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. This must demonstrate compliance (drawn up in accordance with) the GLA Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition SPG (or any successor document).</p>	<p>For clarification</p>
<p>Correction to 7.08 of the Officer report 'IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS – OVERLOOKING'</p> <p>The average separation distance between Sovereign Court and Block A is 21 metres, whilst Block B is between 21.2 and 22 metres distant. Block B is 22 metres distant from Juniper Court at the nearest point. However, some minor transgressions were noted between Block B northern east wing and the terraced properties along Neal's Close. The applicant has now revised the layout and composition of 4 units.</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>
<p>Correction to 7.09 of the officer report: 'LIVING CONDITIONS FOR FUTURE OCCUPIERS EXTERNAL AMENITY SPACE'</p>	<p>Correction</p>

<p>Given the current proposed unit mix, a total of <b>1,620</b> sqm of private/communal amenity space is required to meet the requirements of Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), through private balconies, private gardens and communal amenity space for the use of residents only. In total the scheme delivers a total of <b>2,042</b> sqm of external amenity space and is therefore policy compliant.</p>	
--	--