



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Major Applications Planning Committee		
Date:	2 December 2013	Time:	7.00pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge		

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 5	Page: 1	Former Master Brewer Site: 4266/APP/20121/1544 (full)	
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>		<i>Officer Comments</i>	
<p>13 additional letters of objection to the Spenhill commercial scheme have been received, raising similar issues to those reported in the main report. The main areas of concern relate to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The store is in the wrong place. 2. No attractive retail frontage or an improvement to the look of Long Lane. The design mirrors a 1990s style out of town retail park. 3. Lack of commitment to the project 4. Traffic impact 		<p>The comments are noted. These issues have been dealt with in the individual report.</p>	
<p>A petition of objection to the Spenhill proposals, from local businesses and shopkeepers in Long Lane, bearing 4 signatures, has been received. The covering e-mail makes the following representation: The Bride Hill store would be suitably positioned to support footfall and linked trips to other local shops and services, which would not be the case with the Spenhill store.</p>		<p>The issue of accessibility and integration with the Local Centre has been extensively addressed.</p>	
<p>A letter addressed to the Chief Executive making a number of observations relating to the published reports on this agenda has been received. The key issues are summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee Reports continue to be inadequate in a number of respects and do not allow a fair, balanced and representative assessment of the applications under consideration. <p>2 Inaccurate, flawed and misleading representation of Tesco Highway matters (Items 5 and 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental impact upon pedestrian crossing times at Hillingdon Circus • Under Reporting of Impact Upon Journey Times Along Long Lane • Insufficient Coverage of VISSIM Model And Inadequate Study Area for Journey Times • Lack of AM And Saturday Peak VISSIM Modelling • Under-Reporting of Northbound Traffic Flows in PM Peak VISSIM Modelling 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee reports on this agenda provide a fair and balanced assessment of the applications under consideration. 2. These issues have been dealt with in the main body of the individual reports. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of Traffic Signal Phasing at Hillingdon Circus <p>3. Misapplication of planning policy</p> <p>4. Failure by LB Hillingdon to take account of the NPPF</p> <p>5. Flawed presentation of the comparative situation (See Item 9)</p>	<p>3. It is considered that Local and London Plan policies have been properly applied.</p> <p>4. Proper regard has been given to the provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>5. (See Item 9)</p>
<p>Amend hotel parking numbers (page 32) Delete: 22 car parking spaces and 4 cycle spaces Add: 18 car parking spaces and 16 cycle spaces</p>	<p>For clarity and consistency.</p>
<p>Amend description at pages 1 and 6 by replacing the number 181 with the number 171.</p> <p>Amend text at page 7 by replacing the number '181' with '171'.</p> <p>Amend text at page 32 by replacing the number '198' with '171' and the number '22' with '18'.</p>	<p>171 parking spaces are proposed for the retail component and 18 spaces for the hotel.</p>
<p>Amend condition 4. (Authorised use)</p> <p>By inserting the words 'and shall not be used in conjunction with the main store' .at the end of 4(i).</p> <p>Delete: 4(iv) Add: New 4(iv) The Safer Neighbourhood Centre shall be used as a Safer Neighbourhood Centre or for a use within Class D1 of the Town and Country Planning Use Classes, the details of which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the first occupation of the hotel hereby approved.</p>	<p>To ensure that there are not unacceptable retail impacts.</p> <p>In order to ensure that appropriate levels of on site parking are provided .</p>
<p>Amend condition 7 by inserting the words 'including the provision for 8 motor cycle parking spaces' between the words 'surfacing)' and 'have'</p>	<p>To ensure motor cycle parking is provided.</p>
<p>Amend condition 9 by inserting the words: 'details of 171 parking spaces being allocated to the retail use, including 20 for disabled persons and 18 spaces for the hotel as well as' between the words include' and 'details'</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>
<p>Add the following condition: Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, 3 dedicated parking spaces for disabled persons shall be provided for the hotel and one additional space shall be designed for use by brown badge holders.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure adequate parking provision is made for hotel occupiers in accordance with policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p>	<p>To ensure adequate parking provision is made for hotel occupiers.</p>
<p>Amend condition 16 as follows: 2.a by adding the word 'covered' 2.b by adding the words 'covered and secure' 2.d by adding the words for 171 spaces (including 20 designed for disabled persons) for the retail component and 18 spaces (including 3 designed for disabled persons) for the hotel.</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>
<p>Replace the title condition 32 with the words 'Sustainable Urban Drainage':</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>
<p>Amend text at page 33 by deleting the words · 'Introduction of an</p>	<p>For clarity the off site</p>

additional right turn lane for right turning traffic at the Hillingdon Circus junction from the Long Lane southbound approach.'	highway works are set out at page 87.
Amend condition 6 by inserting the words or 'air conditioning' between the words 'extraction' and 'system'	For clarity
Add the following condition: Notwithstanding the plans and details hereby approved, there shall be no dedicated coach parking for the hotel on Freezeland Way. REASON: To ensure the highway is not obstructed and to accord with policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).	For clarity
Amend the following informative: In discharging condition 38 the Council will expect deliveries to occur outside of peak hours and noise sensitive hours. Standard delivery hours are 08.00-18.00 hours Mondays to Fridays 08.00-13.00 hours Saturdays and not at all on Sundays Public and Bank Holidays.	For clarity
Add standard informative I28 (Food hygiene)	For clarity
Add the following condition Sign plates, incorporating a representation of the Universal Wheelchair Symbol, should be displayed to indicate the location of convenient facilities to meet the needs of people with disabilities. Such sign plates should identify or advertise accessible entrances to buildings, reserved parking spaces, accessible lifts and lavatory accommodation, manageable routes through buildings and availability of special services. Signs for direction and location should have large characters or numerals and clearly contrast with the background colour. REASON: To ensure that people with disabilities are aware of the location of convenient facilities in accordance with policy AM13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).	For clarity
Add standard off airport parking condition.	For clarity
Amend condition 11 by deleting the words 'without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than for routine maintenance which does not change its details.'	For clarity

Item: 6	Page: 127	Former Master Brewer Site: 4266/APP/2012/1545 (outline)
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments
(See Item 5)		The highway comments provided at Item 5 above are also applicable to this application.
Add the following head of term: A mechanism for reviewing of the financial viability of the scheme to ensure the maximum amount of affordable housing is provided.		
Amend description at pages 127 and 132 by replacing the number 99 with the number 100. Amend text at page 127 by replacing the number '99' with '100'. Amend text at page 133 and 153 by replacing the number '99' with '100'		100 spaces are proposed for the residential units.
Add the following condition: Before commencing development details of measures (physical and management) to ensure the residential parking spaces are not		For clarity.

<p>misused by shoppers or any other parties, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the measures retained for the life of the development.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure adequate parking is available for residents and to accord with policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p>	
<p>Amend condition 20 as follows: 2.b by adding the words 'covered and secure' 2.d by replacing 99 with 100. Delete 3.b</p>	For clarity.
<p>Amend the description at page 127 and 132 to reflect 100 parking spaces and 125 bicycles.</p> <p>Amend text at page 127, 133 and 153 by replacing the number '99' with '100' and 150 with 125.</p>	For clarity.
<p>Amend condition 9 by inserting the words 'as well as car club siting within the development' between the words 'surfacing)' and 'have'</p>	For clarity.
<p>Amend condition 10 by inserting the words 'The allocation scheme shall ensure that not more than 1 space is allocated per unit, and that the spaces designed for wheel chairs units are allocated to the flats designed for wheel chair users.'</p>	For clarity
<p>Amend condition 14 by deleting the words 'without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than for routine maintenance which does not change its details.'</p>	For clarity
<p>Amend condition 4 by '(including secure play area)' between the words 'areas' and 'for'</p>	For clarity
<p>Amend condition 24 by inserting the words '(which may include air conditioning)' between the words 'scheme' and 'for'</p>	For clarity
<p>Amend condition 31 by inserting the words 'The charging points shall be distributed proportionately between the block' between the words 'Authority' and 'A'</p>	For clarity

Item: 7	Page: 227	Land Adjacent to Hillingdon Station: 3049/APP/2012/1352	
Amendments/Additional Information:			Officer Comments
Add plan reference 8023PP100 to plan list.			For clarity.
Amend refusal reasons 1 and 3 by adding reference to para 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework and London Plan policy 6.3.			For clarity.
<p>A petition in support of the Bride Hall proposals, from local businesses and shopkeepers in Long Lane, bearing 4 signatures (less than the required 20), has been received.</p> <p>The covering e-mail makes the following representation: The Bride Hill store would be suitably positioned to support footfall and linked trips to other local shops and services, which would not be the case with the Spenhill store.</p>			The issue of accessibility and integration with the Local Centre has been extensively addressed in the various reports included in this agenda.
16 additional letters of support for the Bride Hall scheme have been received.			The comments are noted. These issues have been dealt with in the individual report.
<p>The applicants have submitted additional information in relation to highway modelling and impacts.</p> <p>In a letter of the 5th June the Head of Planning said that officers wished to present applications to a 30 August Committee meeting and</p>			To make members aware of late information.

<p>would not consider information received after the 1st August 2013. Late submissions made it impossible to proceed with that date.</p> <p>On the 12 September the Planning Service manager advised by e-mail that:</p> <p><i>'Mr Thomas, The Council has just received a considerable amount of disparate information in relation to the planning application at Hillingdon Circus. The late receipt of information is highly problematic, obviously we will base the assessment on the information submitted, however be aware that we are now at such a late stage in the process that it will be extremely difficult to take into account any further submissions.</i></p> <p><i>That submission and a further submission in fact led to the 2nd committee postponement (of the meeting that would have otherwise occurred on the 8th October).</i></p> <p><i>Officers have therefore reached a point where the late submission of material by Morrison's has been subject to multiple warnings that it might not be considered. On this basis it is not considerable unreasonable to refuse to consider yet another very late submission of highway information. A view backed up by the Councils legal officers.'</i></p>	
<p>A letter addressed to the Chief Executive making a number of observations relating to the published reports on this agenda has been received. It raises the comments already addressed in the addendum for Item 5, and additionally the following:</p> <p>1. The given reasons for refusal for the Morrisons proposal are completely inconsistent with the current and overarching policy position as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Any decision based on the committee reports and the given reasons for refusal is therefore highly likely to be considered unsound (See Item 7)</p> <p>2. Failure to provide substantive and valid reasons for refusal (Item 7)</p> <p>3. Factual errors and inconsistencies (Item 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • erroneously stating that 242 commuter car parking spaces will be re-provided, whereas the actual number is 250. • servicing for the proposed Premier Inn hotel will be made from an on-street lay-by. However, all servicing will be accommodated within the purpose built, off-street service yard • There is a clear bias towards the reporting for the Tesco proposal as these overestimated and overly robust assumptions are exactly the ones that the Council are using to suggest that the Bride Hall highway impact is unacceptable • The submitted VISSIM model and technical work that supports 	<p>1. The Committee reports on this agenda provide a fair and balanced assessment of the applications under consideration.</p> <p>The reasons for refusal for the Bride Hall scheme are consistent with the policy advice in the NPPF.</p> <p>2. The reasons for refusal in the Bride Hall scheme are considered to be robust.</p> <p>3. Minor factual errors have been corrected on this addendum.</p> <p>Officers disagree with the comments in relation to retail.</p>

<p>the Morrisons proposal, demonstrates that queues will reduce significantly as a result of our development proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reporting of the retail impact assessment in respect of the Morrisons scheme fails to make any mention of the household survey that was undertaken in 2011 to provide an evidence base for the preparation of the Retail Impact Assessment. <p>4. Misapplication of planning policy</p> <p>5. Failure by LB Hillingdon to take account of the NPPF</p> <p>6. Flawed presentation of the comparative situation (See Item 9)</p>	<p>4. It is considered that Local and London Plan policies have been properly applied.</p> <p>5. Proper regard has been given to the provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>6. (See Item 9).</p>
<p>The scheme proposes 336 parking spaces (including 20 disabled) for the retail, 21 spaces (including 8 disabled) for the hotel, 86 spaces (including 11 disabled) for the residential units.</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>

Item: 9	Page: 323	Comparative Assessment	
Amendments/Additional Information:			Officer Comments
<p>A letter addressed to the Chief Executive making a number of observations relating to the published reports on this agenda has been received, stating amongst other things that presentation of the comparative situation is flawed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no clear comparative assessment has been made to compare the impact of these schemes against each other, particularly in respect of highways issues and no analysis of advantages versus impacts is made • Significant weight has been placed upon traffic and highways in the determination of these applications, but no clear assessment has been made about the comparative benefits of the two proposals. • Any comparative assessment should ideally be approached using an equal and level baseline position • No flaws have been identified in the Bride Hall evidence base or methodology for their highway assessment either by officers or their consultants. 			<p>The comparative assessment has been conducted in accordance with relevant criteria in the Development Plan, the London Plan, the provisions of the NPPF and/or against the material facts of the sites proposed. The comparative assessment is considered to be fair and objective.</p>
<p>(Page 201) There are no 4 bedroom units in residential unit mix for the Spenhill scheme. The indicative mix is provided below: 1 bed x 36; 3 bed x 78 and 3 bed x 9.</p>			<p>For clarity.</p>