



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Major Applications Planning Committee		
Date:	11th February 2014	Time:	7.30pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge		

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6	Page: 35	Land adjacent to 18 Highfield Crescent
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>		<i>Officer Comments</i>
This application has been withdrawn from the agenda and will not be considered.		

Item: 7	Page: 55	Former Arla Food Depot, Victoria Road, Ruislip
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>		<i>Officer Comments</i>
<p><u>Additional Public Comments:</u> Five additional letters of support, and three additional letters of objection have been received on the application.</p>		The reasons for objection and support are in line with those contained in the report.
<p><u>Additional Statutory Consultee Responses:</u> The Greater London Authority provided additional comments on the application, following the reconsultation in October, which stated:</p> <p><i>The GLA position remains unchanged if the application still includes the 8,500+ sq.m. foodstore and 5,900 sq.m. cinema.</i></p> <p>Transport for London has provided additional comments on the application. They state, in summary:</p> <p><i>To summarise TfL is satisfied that the majority of the concerns have been addressed however TfL are unable to comprehensively state at this stage that this development would not have an unacceptable on the highway network until the modelling can be considered to be fit for purpose.</i></p>		These additional responses are noted, and do not impact on the recommendation.
<p><u>Additional correspondence has been received from Sainsbury's.</u></p> <p>In summary the correspondence notes that Sainsbury's permitted scheme represents significant major in-centre investment that is not only significant in terms of the build cost but is significant in terms of the loss of trade that we will</p>		The additional correspondence, which closely aligns with previous comments received from Sainsbury's, is

<p>experience during the build programme given we that we will be demolishing our store to make way for the new and improved store. To this end Sainsbury's have been seeking to evolve a temporary store format over the last few months that will 1) ensure our customers can still continue to shop with us during the build albeit in a much smaller store and 2) the smaller temporary store will provide a level of trade to help support the appraisal for the new investment.</p> <p>The correspondence also notes that were the current Arla application to be approved this would create a level of impact that the financial appraisal will be unable to sustain and Sainsbury's in-centre investment will be put at risk.</p>	<p>noted.</p> <p>Officers note that active discussions have commenced with regard to the implementation of the in-centre development and that the potential of the proposed development to compromise delivery of this in-centre development is a material consideration.</p>
<p>Additional correspondence has been received from the applicant putting forward arguments in support of the scheme and criticising the approach the Local Planning Authorities Officers have taken in assessing the scheme.</p> <p>This correspondence has been circulated separately to members. However, having regard to this correspondence, officers would make the following additional comments.</p> <p>The applicant says that the report makes little or no reference to the economic development benefits of the proposals. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration and it supports sustainable economic development but equally the NPPF requires due regard to be paid to development plan policies. Paragraph 7.22 demonstrates that officers were aware of the NPPF when they determined the application. There were numerous meetings at pre-application stage, a key meeting in August during determination and numerous e-mail exchanges with the applicant during determination. The officers approach has consistently been that a mixed use scheme is supported in principle provided its scale is not inappropriate.</p> <p>A meeting occurred on the 6th August to discuss the scheme which was followed up with a comprehensive 7 page letter detailing precisely which issues needed to be overcome to enable a positive recommendation. In particular the letter stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The scale of the proposal is not in keeping with the scale of the local centre. This is an issue raised by the GLA, the Council and objectors. There is concern that the excessive increase in scale of the centre brought about by the proposal will result in unacceptable impacts on in centre committed development in terms of traffic, air quality and vitality and viability of other centres. A clear response is required to address the scale issues. 	<p>To be noted.</p>

The footprint of the ASDA store and Cinema have not materially altered since the letter was issued and no robust justification has been provided by the applicant. The rationale the applicant appears to refer to is that smaller footprints would not meet the operator's requirements. It must be stated that on all other major development sites officers have dealt with incorporating A1 or D1 space they have not encountered such an in-flexible approach. Furthermore, such an approach does not address the very strong retail policy objection reflected in the GLA's comments that the amount of new floorspace would so radically alter the position of South Ruislip in the Borough's retail hierarchy that it would become the second largest retail destination in the Borough after Uxbridge.

It is considered that if the applicant were able to adopt a more flexible approach to the scale of the development then in balancing the economic development benefits of the scheme officers would be able to assist the applicant further in delivering a scheme that could have a favourable recommendation.

Item: 9	Page: 143	Northern Runway, Heathrow Airport
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>		<i>Officer Comments</i>
Additional correspondence has been received from Heathrow in support of the application. This correspondence has been circulated separately to members.		The correspondence is noted; in addition the Council's Environmental Impact Assessment Officer provided further detailed commentary on this matter, which is attached as an appendix to this addendum.
An additional letter of objection from Cranford Primary school has been received.		The correspondence is noted and the issues raised given due consideration in the officers report. The letter is attached as an appendix to this addendum.
One additional letter of objection has been received from a resident. This states: 'The airport is unfortunately in the wrong place and is already causing noise and pollution levels beyond EU regulations. Another runway will inevitably worsen this position, even with 'quieter' jets. The fact is early flights into Heathrow regularly wake us up from 4.30am, and they are not that quiet during sleeping hours. Levels of acceptable noise is a relative concept		The correspondence is noted.

and depends on the activity and context.'	
Additional responses have also been received from various neighbouring borough and statutory consultees, following the Local Planning Authorities consultation on additional information. These letters re-iterate the concerns expressed in the original objections from these parties but do not raise additional issues.	The correspondence is noted.

Item: 11	Page: 273	Solid Waste Transfer Station, Civic Way, Ruislip
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments
<p>In Drawing Nos, add agent's covering email dated 27/1/14 and replace CX_001 Issue 22, CX_200 Issue 08, CX_300 Issue 05 and CX_402 Issue 02 received 9/7/13 with CX_001(P) Issue 01, CX_200(P) Issue 01, CX_300(P) Issue 01 and CX_402(C) Issue 02 received 27/1/14.</p> <p>Amend Condition 2 by replacing CX_001 Issue 22 with CX_001(P) Issue 01.</p>		Plans have been amended to consistently show the red line boundary.

Item: 12	Page: 303	Former Anglers Retreat Public House, Cricketfield Road, West Drayton
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments
<p>Amend Condition 11 to read as follows:</p> <p>No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of sustainable water management has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall clearly demonstrate that sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) have been incorporated into the designs of the development in accordance with the hierarchy set out in accordance with Policy 5.15 of the London Plan and will:</p> <p>i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;</p> <p>ii. include a timetable for its implementation; and</p> <p>iii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.</p> <p>The scheme shall also demonstrate the use of methods to minimise the use of potable water through water collection, reuse and recycling and will:</p> <p>iv. provide details of water collection facilities to capture excess rainwater;</p>		<p>To ensure the development does not increase the risk of flooding in accordance with policy OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and policy 5.12 of the London Plan (July 2011).</p>

<p>v. provide details of how rain and grey water will be recycled and reused in the development. Thereafter the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved scheme.</p>	
<p>Amend Condition 13 by amending the following:</p> <p>2.a Refuse Storage (covered and secure) 2.b Secure, covered cycle Storage for 19 bicycles 2.d Car Parking Layouts (including the provision 19 car parking spaces, including at least 2 disabled parking spaces, and demonstration that at least 4 parking spaces are served by active electrical charging points).</p>	<p>To ensure cycle storage and bin storage is covered and secure, and that sufficient disabled parking allocation is provided.</p>
<p>Amend Condition 15 by adding 'The scheme shall allocated 1 space to 1-bed and 2-bed flats and 2 spaces to 3-bed flats' after 'Local Planning Authority.'</p>	<p>To ensure sufficient car parking is provided for the units on the site.</p>
<p>Add condition 22 as follows:</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development a detailed energy assessment shall be submitted showing how the development will reduce carbon emissions by 40% from a 2010 Building Regulations compliant development. The assessment shall clearly show:</p> <p>i) the baseline energy demand (kwhr and kgCO2) for each element of the regulated energy use (e.g. space heating, hot water and electricity) for all the relevant uses (e.g. residential, commercial etc). ii) the methods to improve the energy efficiency of the development and how this impacts on the baseline emissions and where they will be included within the development. iii) roof plans and elevations showing the inclusion of the PVs. iv) how the technology will be maintained and managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>The development must proceed in accordance with the approved details.</p>	<p>To ensure a sustainable approach to energy efficiency and carbon reductions is met across the site, in accordance with Policies 5.2 and 5.3 of the London Plan (2011).</p>
<p>Additional Information: With regard to the concern raised in Section 7.15 regarding on-site manoeuvring, revised plans have been received which demonstrate refuse vehicles can turn on site.</p> <p>With regard to the Access Officer's comments, revised plans have been received which address these concerns.</p>	

Item: 13	Page: 359	Former RAF West Ruislip, High Road, Ickenham
Amendments/Additional Information:		Officer Comments
In Recommendation, at 1. delete (iii) Construction training		It was previously accepted by officers

<p>Add comments from English Heritage (Archaeology):</p> <p>'Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, I conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.</p> <p>There are no archaeological sites recorded in the immediate vicinity of this development.</p> <p>No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary.'</p> <p>In 2. Recommendation, delete 'subject to no adverse issues being raised by English Heritage (Archaeology) that could not be dealt with by appropriate condition,'</p> <p>In Planning Nos:- Replace 10-1666-101 Rev. F, 10-1666-103 Rev. C and 10-1666-105 Rev. G with 10-1666-101 Rev. H, 10-1666-103 Rev. D and 10-1666-105 Rev. I received 6/2/14 and add 10/1857/070, 10/1666/070, 10/1666/071, PP/2741/M&S/2008/F, 6909/02 Rev. A, Water Efficiency Measures Statement, Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Bird and Bat Box Location Plan received 17/12/13, 10/1857/071 received 6/2/14. Add agent's second letter dated 17/12/13 and letter dated 5/2/14 and covering email dated 6/2/14 and Cycle Shelter Manufacturer's Brochure received 6/2/14.</p> <p>Add material details:- Main facing brick: Parham Stock - Red Mortar joints: Trowel Handle - Natural Decorative Bricks: Fireborn Blocks - Natural blue (215 x 215) Balcony: Powder coated galvanized steel - White Render: Monocouche - Chalk Ground Floor Render: Ashlar render - Cream Cladding Panels: Rockpanel - RAL 7004 Roof: Sarnafill - Grey Facia/Soffit: Aluminium powder coated - Grey Rain Water Goods: UPVC- Black Windows: Aluminium powder coated - Grey</p>	<p>and agreed by Members at committee that construction training should not form part of the S106 Agreement. The current proposal only adds a basement level which would not alter this assessment.</p> <p>Comments from English Heritage (Archaeology) are noted and the recommendation has been revised accordingly.</p>
---	--

Stonework: Cast stone string courses - Ivory

The agent's letters of 17/12/13 and 5/2/14 query the recommendation and a number of the recommended conditions, namely 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 15.

Officer's recommendation:-

Delete Conditions 3 (Levels), 4 (Materials) and 5 (Tree Protection)

In condition 6, delete 'and basement plan have', with 'has' and delete part 2.a.

In respect of Conditions 8 (Energy) and 9 (Ecological Enhancement), 13 (Contaminated Land) and 14 (Drainage), the Council's Sustainability Officer, Flood and Water Management Officer and EPU Officer advise that the current wording of the conditions should not be altered. It is also considered that the wording of Condition 15 (Secure by Design) is acceptable.

Full details of the site and finished floor levels have now been submitted and are considered acceptable. Details of the proposed materials, mainly the same as those previously approved have also been specified and some samples have been submitted which the Council's Urban Design/Conservation Officer considers acceptable. The Tree Officer has also confirmed that following the submission of further information, Condition 5 can now be deleted.

A basement plan has already been submitted and full details of 16 covered and secure cycle spaces have now been submitted.



Environmental Impact Assessment Observations Report for Committee Report Addendum

Category	Response to Heathrow Airport Limited Letter dated 31 January 2014		
Officer	Adrien Waite		
Site	NORTHERN RUNWAY HEATHROW AIRPORT HOUNSLOW		
Ref	41573/APP/2013/1288	Date	11 February 2014

Proposal

Enabling works to allow implementation of full runway alternation during easterly operations at Heathrow Airport including the creation of a new 'hold area' at the western end of the northern runway, the construction of new access and exit taxiways, and the construction of a 5 metre high acoustic noise barrier to the south of Longford Village.

Summary

Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) wrote to 'Members of the Major Applications Planning Committee' on 31 January 2014 setting out its concerns with officers' recommendations for their proposed development on the northern runway.

The letter does not reference the committee report but is based on numerous officer discussions with HAL that have taken place since the original submission of the application. The letter aims to rebut concerns of officers and focuses on the following main issues:

- 1 - General approach to noise mitigation and compensation;
- 2 - The proposal will result in an unacceptable impact on schools;
- 3 - The noise metrics used in the assessment are not acceptable; and
- 4 - The air quality impact upon Longford is unacceptable.

These issues are covered extensively by the Committee Report. However, the following commentary provides a brief response to the points raised in the letter for ease of reference.

1 General Approach to Noise Mitigation and Compensation

HAL re-state the reasons behind the ending of the Cranford Agreement by the Government as an objective to more fairly distribute aircraft noise. The Council does not dispute this and the Committee Report is based on the fact that the policy decision to end the Cranford Agreement has already been determined. The Council is not



challenging this position. However, the Council acknowledges the Minister for Aviation's statement on 7th Sept 2010 which stated:

I will look to BAA to ensure that proper consideration is given to appropriate mitigation and compensation measures for those likely to be affected by the proposals.

This statement goes to the crux of the officer's concerns. HAL has simply not presented an adequately considered approach to noise or air quality including mitigation and compensation measures.

HAL's case as set out in the letter is rigidly based on certain extracts from paragraphs of the Aviation Policy Framework (APF) which they claim supports their approach. For example, HAL's letter quotes the following from the APF that airport operators should offer:

...financial assistance towards acoustic insulation to residential properties which experience an increase in noise of 3dB or more which leaves them exposed to levels of noise of 63dB LAeq 16hr or more.

Importantly, HAL has focussed on **only** an extract from the relevant paragraph. The full paragraph reads:

Where airport operators are considering developments which result in an increase in noise, they should review their compensation schemes to ensure that they offer appropriate compensation to those potentially affected. As a minimum, the Government would expect airport operators to offer financial assistance towards acoustic insulation to residential properties which experience an increase in noise of 3dB or more which leaves them exposed to levels of noise of 63 dB LAeq, 16h or more.

Gatwick Airport has taken the decision to consider the wider context of the APF and not to focus on part of a paragraph that has been taken out of context. On 3 February 2014 they announced that its noise mitigation will start at 60dB LAeq16 and not the 66db level at which Heathrow Airport believes is the only necessary standard. Gatwick has therefore focussed on what they believe to be appropriate compensation, and not the minimum standard.

Likewise, the Council is also expecting that the applicant focuses less on the minimum requirements and more on what is considered appropriate. The Council's committee report clearly sets out why the mitigation measures are not adequate and therefore not appropriate. In this regard, far from being contrary to the APF, the Council is fully supported in its approach for seeking an appropriate outcome for residents.



2 The proposal will result in an unacceptable impact on schools

The concerns related to schools are fully covered in the committee report. Suffice to say, the approach adopted by HAL does not go far enough and is not considered appropriate.

HAL's assertion that the schools impacted lie outside the boundary of Hillingdon is entirely immaterial. Consultation responses, particularly from the London Borough of Hounslow raise serious concerns about the impacts on some schools.

The impacts on non Hillingdon related schools are material planning consideration and the Council would be exposed to serious questions if these were not properly covered.

3 Noise metrics

HAL refer to the 57dB Laeq noise contour as being "enshrined" within the APF. There is significant flexibility within the APF in this regard and it is openly acknowledged that this does not necessarily encompass all those impacted by noise (para 3.17). Importantly, the APF states:

The Airports Commission has also recognised that there is no firm consensus on the way to measure the noise impacts of aviation and has stated that this is an issue on which it will carry out further detailed work and public engagement. We will keep our policy under review in the light of any new emerging evidence.

The Council believes that there is now a huge amount of evidence available to justify an alternative metric. The APF is intentionally flexible to avoid stipulating inappropriate standards and represents the conflicting theories about measuring noise impacts from new development.

To some extent, HAL accept that the 57dB laeq metric is not entirely appropriate as set out in their letter. They also suggest that other assessments have been undertaken in the environmental statement to keep within the 'spirit' of the flexibility of the APF. However, Officers maintain that these additional assessments have not informed the conclusions in the assessment or the mitigation measures.

4 The air quality impact upon Longford is Unacceptable.

It is unclear what HAL are expecting in this regard. Their assessment indicates there will be locations that currently meet air quality limit values but will exceed these as a result of the development. This is fundamentally unacceptable.

The assessment provides no clear mitigation measures for these new exceedence levels and instead relies on broader air quality action plans around the airport as mitigation. The Council does not believe that the approach set out in the Environmental Statement



regarding the new exceedences is acceptable. Officers believe the Council would be questioned if it a planning proposal were allowed to go from meeting air quality limits to failing them without specific and detailed mitigation measures proposed.

Ian Thynne
Principal Sustainability Officer

Date: 11 February 2014



Cranford Primary School
Berkeley Avenue
Cranford
Hounslow
TW4 6LB

Head Teacher: Mrs Meena Walia
Chair of Governors: Mrs Judy Matthews

7th February 2014

Ms V. Beale
Hillingdon Borough Council

Dear Ms Beale,

Re: The Removal of the Cranford Agreement

I am writing to you in my capacity as the Chair of Governors of **Cranford Primary School**. We are a Primary School with 700 plus children on roll. Co-located on our site is a Children's Centre that works with families ante-natally, newborns and children up to the age of 5 years old. There is also a day care provider on site offering care for babies to 5 year olds.

The Governors, Headteacher and senior team feel strongly about the detrimental affect the altering of the existing Cranford Agreement will have upon our staff, children and families who access our provision.

With the Cranford Agreement coming to an end we are extremely concerned about the detrimental effect that the change in the alternations of the northern runway will have on our pupils.

We understand that in order to fulfil Government policy, Heathrow airport must make a number of changes so that aircraft can **take off as well as land** on the northern runway. The proposed changes mean that in the future the school will be exposed to the noise from departing aircraft.

When this is happening the noise will be worse than currently experienced.

With the Cranford agreement in place - current noise levels experienced by the school are:-

When aircraft are landing on the northern runway the noise level is 63 to 66dB LAeq, 8hour.

Without the agreement – future noise levels predicted:-

Aircraft departing off the northern runway = Greater than 72dB(A) LAeq,8hour.

The units used (LAeq,8hour), indicate that this is the average noise energy experienced by the school over a 8 hour period.

In addition, it has been predicted that the noisiest aircraft, when departing off the northern runway (in the future), will cause an instantaneous noise level of 94 dB(A) Lmax. This is similar to being 50 feet away from a pneumatic road drill. The increases do not look very large on paper but because a decibel is a logarithmic measure it means that +3dB(A) is noticeable.

Tel: 02087590305 Fax: 02087540208

Email: office@cranfordprimary.hounslow.sch.uk

Website: <http://webfronter.com/hounslow/cranfordprimary>

We know that Heathrow have made a planning application and that Hillingdon Council are giving it due consideration.

We are very unhappy and concerned about the noise levels that our pupils will be exposed to and have organised a petition objecting to the proposals which we will be presenting to you.

Yours sincerely,

J. Matthews

**Mrs J. Matthews
Chair of Governors Cranford Primary School**

Tel: 02087590305 Fax: 02087540208

Email: office@cranfordprimary.hounslow.sch.uk

Website: <http://webfronter.com/hounslow/cranfordprimary>