



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Borough Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>4 October 2022</b>	<b>Time: 7:00pm</b>
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, Civic Centre</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 7</b>	<b>Page: 43</b>	<b>Location: 51 Pembroke Road, Ruislip</b>
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b>		<b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b>
<p>Since the publication of the Committee Report, an additional representation has been received from Ruislip Residents Association which challenges whether the proposal would comply with Policy DMH 4(i) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020), which states that no more than 10% of properties should be redeveloped into flats.</p>		<p>According to the Council's planning records, two houses at Nos. 28-30 Pembroke Road were demolished as part of the flatted development scheme comprising the apartment blocks known as Piccadilly House, Metropolitan House and Central House. Also, eight houses (Nos. 32-46 Pembroke Road) were demolished to facilitate the apartment blocks known as Cheriton Lodge, Merrion Court and Jameston Lodge.</p> <p>Based on the above assessment, 10 dwellings have been demolished out of the original 64 houses on Pembroke Road. This equates to 15.6%. The proposed scheme relating to No. 51 Pembroke Road would marginally increase this threshold to 17.2%. The proposal would therefore not be fully compliant with Policy DMH 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020), in respect to criterion i. However, it should be noted that there are material considerations relating to this site which should be given due regard.</p> <p>As stated in the Committee Report, planning permission was previously granted to convert the existing property into four flats under reference 68788/APP/2019/2659. It is important to note that the now adopted Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020) was of material consideration during the period in which application reference 68788/APP/2019/2659 was determined and is referenced in the delegated report as being a draft Local Plan document.</p>

Given the above, it is considered that the policy context has not so materially changed since the granting of planning permission reference 68788/APP/2019/2659 as to now warrant a different decision on the development proposal. In reaching this view, Officers are mindful that the non-compliance with Policy DMH 4(i) relates to a numerical/technical consideration and that the 10% threshold has already been breached without the development proposal. In the absence of any demonstrable planning harm (e.g. to the character and appearance of the area or neighbouring amenity), the benefits of the scheme (e.g. net increase of 3 residential units) are considered to outweigh the identified technical policy conflict. As such, Officers are of the view that a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of non-compliance with Policy DMH 4 could not be substantiated in the event of a planning appeal.

To clarify, the Officer recommendation (to grant planning permission subject to conditions) remains as set out in Section 2 of the Committee Report.