



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Borough Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> July 2023</b>	<b>Time: 7:00pm</b>
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, Civic Centre</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 6</b>	<b>Page: 7</b>	<b>Location: 18 St Edmunds Avenue, Ruislip</b>
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b>	<b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b>	
<p>Since the publication of the committee report, two additional representations have been received.</p> <p>One representation raised concerns with the number of applications that have been submitted over the last few years, and that this application is retrospective. It is suggested in the representation that this may be to try and confuse people, and if approved it would “just make a mockery of the system.”</p> <p>The second representation raised concerns with the accuracy of the committee report. Specifically, the report states that the single storey rear extension “does not extend beyond either of the adjacent neighbouring properties” (p.15). Whereas this representation contends that the extension protrudes approximately 0.5m beyond both neighbours and the drawings do not accurately represent the position of Nos. 16 and 20. Photos were submitted with this representation (shown below for completeness).</p>	<p>There are no restrictions on the number of planning applications submitted for a property. There are also provisions within planning legislation for applicants to apply for planning permission retrospectively. Nevertheless, each planning application – whether proposed or retrospective - is considered on its own planning merits.</p> <p>A site visit confirms that the single storey rear extension extends approximately 25cm beyond the extension at No. 20 and approximately 40cm beyond the extension at No. 16. Measurements are approximate as these detached dwellings are separate from each other, with gaps between them. It was not considered necessary to amend the drawings, as the depth of the subject extension is in accordance with the drawings.</p> <p>Please note that this discrepancy does not have a material impact on planning officers’ recommendation for approval, and the conclusions in the committee report are considered sound. For the avoidance of doubt, the committee report concludes that there is no harm to neighbouring residential amenity and the impacts of the development on the character of the area are acceptable.</p>	
<b>Item: 8</b>	<b>Page:</b>	<b>Location: Northwood Commercial Sales / Autocentre Northwood Ltd, Pinner Road, Northwood</b>
<b>35</b>		
<b><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></b>	<b><i>Officer Comments:</i></b>	

Following publication of the Committee Report, it has been clarified that there is no proposed balcony facing Unit A01 that serves proposed Unit A09. The balcony that serves Unit A09 would face onto Chestnut Avenue.

Consequently, an amendment to Reason for Refusal No. 2 is required to remove reference to this balcony. In addition, the sentence that references the balcony in Section 7.09 of the Committee Report should also be understood to be removed.

Amend Reason for Refusal No. 2 to remove the following (~~striketrough~~):

*2. By virtue of their close proximity to each other, orientation and position, the private balcony and bedrooms serving the proposed flat labelled as Unit A05 would provide direct views into the private balcony space and Bedroom 2 serving Unit A01 and vice versa. ~~The balcony serving Unit A09 would also provide direct views into the private balcony space and Bedroom 2 serving Unit A01.~~ The proposal would therefore result in overlooking issues and a loss of privacy for the future occupiers of Units A01 and A05 to the detriment of their standard of internal living conditions. The proposal therefore, conflicts with Policies...*

**Photos submitted with representation received for 18 St Edmunds Avenue, Ruislip  
(Item 6)**

