



Planning Committee – 14 April 2011

Addendum

The Addendum details amendments made to the agenda reports since their publication. It may include corrections to the report, additional information (such as extra informatives and conditions) and late correspondence received in relation to the agenda items.

Pages 1-11; 07/3167/DD10; Teddington School

- A petition with 29 signatories & 3 letters including a brochure of correspondence have been received re-iterating objections to the light pollution for neighbours' houses & gardens & ecology. The recently fitted back shields make no difference to the unacceptable situation & look more dominant in daylight.

Page 13, 10/3735/FUL, 80 High Street Hampton Hill


- Since writing the report the number of letters received objecting to the proposal has risen to 330
- A petition with 114 signatures has been received objecting on the grounds headlined in the report.

Pages 15-20, 11/0131/HOT, 70 Copthall Gardens, Twickenham

NI01: Notwithstanding what is shown on the submitted plans, hereby approved, this decision solely relates to the first floor rear extension. For purposes of clarity, no decision or approval has been made on the roof extension.

Page 29, 10/3738/FUL, 68 Gloucester Road Hampton

- Correct location plan



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
LA 100019441[2011] '- Do not scale'

Page 33- 40, 10/2276, 6 Thameside Teddington

- Condition DV44 - Level 5 rather than 6
- Informative NI01 – Level 5 rather than 3

Pages 47-56; 10/0926/FUL and 10/0927/LBC, The Britannia Public House, 5 Brewers Lane, Richmond

Amendment to IL12: Replace 07.23.03A with 03.B and 07.23.07 with 07.23.07A

Replace IL12 to DV48 (approved drawing numbers condition)

Received comments from applicants regarding alternative locations: These were flawed in one way or another, hence why we reached the current scheme. I note below those options:

1. To run the ducting from it's current location under the fire escape stair, along the left hand boundary of the garden/patio area at ground level, returning along the rear boundary and then exhausted into the air. The trunking would be visually treated with some trellis and seating etc, but unfortunately the exhaust fumes would be at too lower level to be dispelled
2. To run the ducting through the flat roof of the kitchen at the rear and run it along the parapet of the flat roof over, disguising it in a similar fashion to (1) above and then direct the trunking vertically in the same way as we are currently proposing. However, this would also require