



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	North Applications Planning Committee	
Date:	15 November 2017	Time: 7:00pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6	Location: Aldis Hall
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
A 3 page letter of support has been received from the applicant. Due to the length of the letter and number of issues raised it has been circulated to Councillors. In summary it states there is demand for a nursery and that the applicant considers the proposals are acceptable from a highway safety viewpoint. That any residual concerns Councillors have could be conditioned (Cornerways is cited as an example in this regard).	To be noted.
A petition of objection has been received which states: We the undersigned petition Hillingdon Council to not allow the development of another nursery on Green Lane in Northwood. Northwood already has a significant number of nurseries supplying the local schools with places available. The area, particularly on Green Lane in the mornings, is significantly congested and the establishment of another nursery will only make an already bad congestion situation worse. In the morning, people going to work struggle with the traffic in and around Green Lane, caused largely due to the schools and nurseries in the area. The idea of yet another nursery making the situation worse is untenable. We request the Council to seriously reconsider this development as it will inflict great stress and difficulties on those who live in the area and have to travel to work.	To be noted.

Item: 7	Location: 7 Hedgeside Road
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>

Revised drawing No's (4676/11F, 4676/09D, 4676/10F) to be included in condition 02. A further objection has been received, from a 3rd party, but on behalf of the next door neighbour, which states: Mr and Mrs Kassam-Kanji of 9 Hedgeside Road in objection to this Planning Application have pointed out this inaccuracy but the Officer has failed to include this point in her report. I quote from their objection letter of 29th October 2017: <i>'At ground level, the gap between 7 and 9 Hedgeside Road is just 75cm see photo and at first floor level, with this REVISED PLANS proposal, there would be a gap of only 150cm between the houses. The REVISED PLANS application is totally misleading in marking a gap of 90cm between no 7 and no 9 at ground floor. Such a measurement ignores the presence of a boundary fence.</i> On the basis of this false 90cm measurement, the Officer's Report goes on to justify the side extensions and approve the application, as below (I have highlighted the key sections): SIDE EXTENSION <i>The proposed two storey extension would in-fill the area to the side of the house behind the garage which would be set beneath an extended roof. The side extension incorporates one additional rear dormer window matching the form of the existing dormers. The proposed side extension retains the existing gap of 900mm between No 7 and No 9 at ground floor level. The extension is set away from No 9 by 1500mm at first floor level retaining the a gap between both properties which is characteristic of the area. This element of the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the host dwelling and surrounding area and is therefore considered to be acceptable.</i> SIDE EXTENSION <i>- at ground floor level the side extension is proposed to include a width of approximately 1.5m and a depth of 4.2m; - at first floor level the width is proposed to be approximately 3.5m and 9m depth; and - the proposed side extension does not project further than the existing wall at ground floor level</i>	The applicant has supplied drawing amendments (4676/11F, 4676/09D, 4676/10F) which clarify the distance between the proposed extension and neighbouring property. A measurement between the proposed side extension and the boundary wall taken recently on site shows the distance is 900mm from the side wall to the boundary fence (a photo is included in the powerpoint presentation to demonstrate this). The proposed distance between the proposed side extension at first floor level and the boundary wall is 1500mm, as shown on the plans and this would be subject to condition 02 which requires the scheme to be built in accordance with the development plans. This distance is in full compliance with the guidance in HDAS residential extensions.
--	--

<i>retaining a 900m gap and 1500mm gap at first floor level.</i> The distance between no 7 and 9 Hedgeside Road is a crucial issue in this planning application as the proposed side extension will result in a terracing and overbearing effect. This inaccuracy and attention to detail is unforgivable and Mr and Mrs Kassam-Kanji of 9 Hedgeside Road expect this planning application to be properly reconsidered by the Planning Officer in the light of the gap between the side of no 7 and the boundary with no 9 Hedgeside Road being only 75cm.	
---	--

Item: 8	Location: 51 Wieland Road
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Delete refusal reasons 2 & 3	The applicant has provided a plan that clarifies all habitable rooms and rooms supporting self-contained accommodation in the basement have been removed from the drawings.
Revised basement plan received - drawing number 1832.02.02 Rev A. This would replace drawing 1832.02.02 on the plans list on the decision notice.	As above.
Additional statement received from the applicant: <u>Neighbouring amenity</u> In comparing the current scheme to the extant permission on the site (17990/APP/2015/645), the impact on the neighbouring amenity by reason of overshadowing and loss of light is considered to be an improvement to that of the extant permission. This is due to its set back from the shared boundary with No. 49 Weiland Road (extant permission 0.4m gap and current scheme 1.5m gap). In addition, it must be noted that the previous application, which is of a comparable scale and bulk, was not refused on the basis of neighbouring impact. <u>Design</u> You noted that the design would fail to reflect the character and appearance of the streetscene. Within the planning statement, Figures. 3 – 7 provide photographs of the eclectic streetscene of Weiland Road and Elgood Avenue, evidencing that there is no uniform character or appearance. In addition, as you would have noted from undertaking	Officers do not consider any of these points alter the stated position in refusal reason 01 as clarified in the committee report. It is noted that the grass verge would not be adversely impacted upon (a key concern of the GRA).

your site visit, the dwelling at 33 Weiland Road which is located 130m from the site, is of a contemporary design. At 33 Weiland Road, permission was approved for the scheme shown in figure. 7 under reference 14787/APP/2009/1154, this scheme was approved against the current adopted policies.

In response to the points raised by the neighbours:

- The impact on neighbouring amenity was not raised as a concern as part of the determination of the previous application on site, nor the extant permission for extensions and alterations to the dwelling. The current application would not result in any demonstrable harm when compared to the two previous schemes on the site. This is a material consideration of significant weight in the determination of the current scheme, and should form the starting point of any assessment on neighbouring impact.
- The grass verge would be retained as part of the proposal, and as shown on the location plan, the red outline comprises only land within the ownership of the applicant
- Weiland road comprises an eclectic mix of dwellings, and contemporary designs are evident along Weiland Road. The plans for no. 33 are evident within the planning statement
- The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk and height would reflect the scale of development along Weiland Road.
- The proposed parking meets the adopted standards, and was not raised as a concern during the determination of the previous scheme on the site.
- A basement was proposed as part of the previous scheme, and concern was not raised in relation to this previously

Points raised in relation to landscaping and construction method statements can be met by condition.

All other points raised, including congestion during construction, are not material planning considerations.

Item: 11	Location: 5 & 7 Kings End
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
Delete unnecessary parts of the landscaping condition: - 2a, 2b, 2d, 2e, 2f.	The application is for two dwelling-houses only where independent refuse/cycle facilities are not a requirement, nor is electric charging considered necessary for 2 dwellings only.
Delete condition 07	Although recommended by the EPU team this condition is only used on large major development proposals.
Add standard SUDS condition	To ensure drainage issues are properly addressed.
Paragraph 7.08 refers to secondary windows. It can be clarified that a side facing dormer window serves a habitable room to No.5 facing No.7, however officers are satisfied that the height of the dormer window is such that there would be only a marginal impact on outlook and no unacceptable harm to residential amenity.	To be noted.