



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Borough Planning Committee	
Date:	5th April 2023	Time: 7:00pm
Venue:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 9	Page: 73	Location: 18 Iver Lane, Cowley, Uxbridge
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>		<i>Officer Comments:</i>
- One additional letter of objection has been received objecting on the grounds of loss of privacy.		- The impact on neighbour privacy is addressed in the officers' report.
Item: 10	Page: 99	Location: 32 Kingsend, Ruislip
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>		<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Since the publication of the Committee Report, comments have been received from the Council's Conservation Officer and further comments have been received from a neighbouring resident. These comments and matters raised are summarised as follows.		<i>Council's Heritage Officer Comments</i> Noted.
Council's Heritage Officer "I do think there is a real issue with the scale of the replacement house. With its crown roof and its block-like character it is somewhat overbearing. Fig. 31 in the Heritage Statement shows the existing and proposed streetscape. The sides of the roof should have a shallower slope to reduce bulkiness more in line with the existing house, this would likely impact on the treatment of the central projecting element. The prominent end chimneys also contribute to the sense that of diminished space between number 32 and the neighbouring properties".		

<p>Neighbouring Resident Comments</p> <p>Further comments were received from a neighbouring resident that raised the following summarised matters:</p> <p><u>Impact on Trees</u></p> <p>The officer's site visit was carried out at the end of January 2023 which the resident asserts there would have been little vegetation at that time of year. In addition, the resident notes that the inspection for the tree report was carried out in July 2020. Consequently, this neighbouring resident has provided photos from 04-03-2023 to 26-03-2023 of trees adjacent to and within the application site for the Council's records. These photos are annotated with comments on where these trees are visible, condition and when they were last pruned.</p> <p>Concerning the T6 Ash tree, the resident notes that the main trunk base is located on a neighbouring property, and this neighbour did not agree to its removal and was not consulted prior to the submission of this planning application.</p> <p>It is also noted by this resident that neighbouring gardens have high ground water levels and some flooding, whereby it is too wet to cut their lawns.</p> <p><u>Calculation of Percentage of Flat Redevelopments</u></p> <p>Resident does not agree with calculation in Committee Report under section 7.01 (pp. 108-109) in reference to the percentage of properties within Kingsend that have been redeveloped as flats (Policy DMH 4 – Residential Conversions and Redevelopment). The reason for disagreement cites inconsistency with two previous decisions for development on Kingsend.</p>	<p>Neighbouring Resident Comments</p> <p>Noted. Officer comments are as follows.</p> <p><u>Impact on Trees</u></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Had the application been recommended for approval, any grant of planning permission would not supersede any legal ownership rights. This would be a civil matter.</p> <p>The potential flooding implications to and from the proposal has been assessed by the Council's Flooding Officer who raises no objections. Flooding matters are addressed in the Committee Report on p. 106 Section 6 (in response to external consultation), p. 108 Section 6 (in respect to internal consultation), p. 119 Section 7.11 (in respect to the basement) pp. 122-123 Section 7.17 (in respect to Flooding and Drainage Issues).</p> <p><u>Calculation of Percentage of Flat Redevelopments</u></p> <p>The interpretation of planning policy is nuanced. In the interests of consistency of approach in this specific location, the 14.9 percent of flatted developments within Kingsend stated within the resident's representation is agreed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the calculation, the recommendation remains unchanged. The percentages clearly exceed the 10 percent threshold specified in Policy DMH</p>
---	---

	4. Accordingly, the first reason for refusal remains unchanged as set out in the Committee Report.	
Item: 11	Page: 127	Location: 53 Lavendar Rise, Yiewsley
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments:
<p>- An additional condition is recommended</p> <p><i>"Notwithstanding the submitted plans, prior to the commencement of development on the relevant part of the scheme, details of the proposed fenestration to all elevations shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that the proposed development does not have an adverse effect upon the appearance of the existing building in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020)."</i></p>		Areas of shading on the submitted plans appear to show changes to the property's windows that are not part of the application. This condition would secure appropriate fenestration details for the avoidance of doubt.