

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
Background					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 1: Rebalancing Employment Land: Proposed Strategic Industrial Locations					
65	12	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on behalf of Purplexed LLP	1.1	Support the removal of Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) designation and the identification for residential-led mixed use redevelopment under Site SA2 (The Old Vinyl Factory).	Support noted and welcomed. <u>No Proposed Change</u>
66	2	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on behalf of Workspace Group	1.1	Support the removal of the Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) designation and the identification of Enterprise House for residential-led mixed use redevelopment under policy SA1.	Support noted and welcomed. <u>No Proposed Change</u>
Chapter 2: Proposed Locally Significant Employment Locations					
21	2	The Emerson Group	Map 2.4	Support is given to the identification of the three sites north of the A4 Bath Road as shown on Map 2.4 and the inclusion of these as Locally Important Employment Areas under Policy DME1 (Employment uses in Designated Sites). Concerns expressed that the proposed expansion of Heathrow Airport will increase industrial vacancy rates.	Support noted and welcomed. <u>No Proposed Change</u>

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses

February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
				Policy DME2 (Employment Uses Outside of Designated Sites) is a logical attempt to underpin the broad policies in the Core Strategy to accommodate the required 9,000 jobs over the plan period.	
Chapter 3: Proposed locally Significant Industrial Sites					
53	6	Cllr Janet Duncan	Chapter 3	<p>Supports the removal of the Old Coal Yard site in Tavistock Road, Yiewsley from the IBA designation as detailed work and information have shown that it is not suitable for an industrial designation and high generation of HGVs.</p> <p>The close proximity of the site to a Crossrail station and bus station would encourage mixed use development which minimises the need for car parking and does not generate HGV traffic.</p> <p>Crossrail investment encouraging higher employment uses should be maximised, to support both the local town centres of Yiewsley and West Drayton and the local economy.</p> <p>The removal of this site has made the plan sounder and good development is achievable.</p>	<p>Supported noted and welcomed.</p> <p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>Officers propose to allocate the Old Coal Yard Site for residential led mixed use development. An appropriate scheme for the site will be identified in the revised version of the Site Allocations document, which will be issued for consultation in May of this year.</p>
Chapter 4: Deletion from the Green Belt Boundary					
73	1	Mercer Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mr. R	Chapter 4	Request that 59 Reservoir Road be excluded from the Green Belt as it does not meet the tests outlined in the NPPF. Consider that a	An extensive review of the Green Belt was undertaken in 2013. Officers are of the view that there are no exceptional circumstances

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
		Mahmud		detailed review of existing Green Belt boundaries should be carried out.	to the justify exclusion of 59 Reservoir Road as required by the NPPF. The site meets two of the purposes for including land in the Green Belt as identified in the NPPF - to prevent unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The current boundary is based on existing definable physical features whereas the deletion of the site from the Green Belt would result in a Green Belt boundary that was no longer clearly defined. <u>No Proposed Change</u>
26	7	Nexus Planning on behalf of Hillingdon Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	Chapter 4: Deletion from Green Belt	<p>The Trust made separate representations to the Local Plan Part 2 in respect of land at the Mount Vernon Hospital Site. Amongst other things, these representations seek the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The removal of land at the Mount Vernon Hospital Site from the Green Belt. ii) Deletion of the proposed extension to the Grade I SINC to include land at the Mount Vernon Hospital Site (Ref. SINC Ext 13). iii) The allocation of land at the Mount Vernon Hospital Site as a housing site. 	<p>The release of Green Belt land is not necessary to meet Hillingdon's current housing target contained in the Local Plan Part 1 or the revised target contained in the Further Alterations to the London Plan. This is reflected in policy EM2 of the Local Plan Part 1, which seeks to maintain the current extent, hierarchy and strategic functions of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains in Hillingdon.</p> <p>Policy 7.16 of the London Plan states that the Mayor strongly supports the current extent of London's Green Belt. As such, the London-wide Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which formed the basis of Hillingdon's revised Annual Monitoring target for housing provision, did not identify sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>A further review of SINC boundaries will be undertaken prior to the examination, in</p>

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
					<p>accordance with the recommendation contained in the Cabinet report.</p> <p><u>No Proposed Change</u></p>
56	1	Heathrow Airport Ltd	Map 4.2 Proposed removal of Terminal 5 Business Car Park	<p>Support the deletion of Former Perry Oaks Sludge Works Site and consider the A3044 marks a logical boundary.</p> <p>However, a further area of Green Belt requires removal at the site of the T5 Business Car Park. Given the site's isolation from other Green Belt land as a result of the realignment of the Duke of Northumberland's River and the development of this area as car parking, it is not considered that the land designated as Green Belt at Longford Park to the south of the River serves a Green Belt function.</p> <p>Request redefining the Green Belt boundary along the river and the airport boundary so that it corresponds with the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed</p> <p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>The area of land with planning permission for the Terminal 5 Business Car Park will be removed from the Green Belt.</p>
Chapter 5: Additions to the Green Belt Boundary					
3	1	Kenneth Morgan	Map 5.1	<p>Considers that white area at the rear of the houses in Merle Ave and the Sports Ground has no natural boundary. Asks why is it that particular shape and why is it coloured white? On site it is just part of one large field with only access via a farmyard or public footpath. Suggests including the area into the Green Belt.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>The Green Belt boundary will be amended to include the land to the rear of Merle Avenue up to the western boundary of the Sports Ground. This forms a clearly defined boundary for the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF.</p>

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
4	1	Anthony Crane	Map 5.1	<p>The sports field for Harefield school and the adjoining land is not included as proposed new Green Belt.</p> <p>Considers that including the sports field into the Green Belt would ensure that the Olympic legacy of sport facilities is up held for local people.</p> <p>Half the adjacent field surrounding the sports field is already in the Green Belt. Considers that it is therefore illogical not to include the whole field.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>The Green Belt boundary will be amended to include the land to the rear of Merle Avenue up to the western boundary of the Sports Ground. This forms a clearly defined boundary for the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF.</p>
10	1	Harefield Tenants and Residents Association (HTRA) (Paul Stone)	Map 5.1	<p>Requests that a small plot of land adjacent to Merle Avenue should be included within the Green Belt Boundary. Enquires as to why this piece of land has not been included as it meets the same criteria as neighbouring Green Belt land.</p> <p>Requests that the Green Belt boundary be extended to include a neighbouring sports pitch.</p> <p>HTRA are delighted to note extensions to nature conservation sites on the Proposals Map, but are concerned about the potential loss of the land at the rear and the end of Merle Avenue and the Sports Ground (School Playing field). The current Green Belt boundary is illogical and requests the inclusion of a small parcel of land at the rear and the end of Merle Avenue in to the Green Belt to create a definable and logical boundary.</p> <p>HRTA petitions also for the sports ground to</p>	<p>Support for extensions to conservation sites noted.</p> <p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>The Green Belt boundary will be amended to include the land to the rear of Merle Avenue up to the western boundary of the Sports Ground. This forms a clearly defined boundary for the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF.</p>

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
				be granted Green Belt status within the Local Plan Part 2 and urge the Council to do all they can to ensure that these excellent facilities are preserved for future generations.	
47	1	Anthony Wilkinson	5.1	Fully supports the addition to the Green Belt in Map 5.1.	Supported noted and welcomed. <u>No Proposed Change.</u>
Chapter 6: Proposed Metropolitan Open Land					
13	1	Mark Stirling	6.3 Kings College Playing Fields	<p>Justification is given for classifying the land as Metropolitan Open Land, but no justification is provided for removing this land from the UDP designation 'Areas form links in a Green Chain'. The guidance suggests the two are certainly compatible.</p> <p>Removing the Green Chain classification would reduce the protection afforded to this area and this seems contrary to the Council's stated aims. Moreover, the removal of this status is not highlighted elsewhere (e.g. under the heading 'Green Chain Deletion' in the Site Allocation and Designations document) and might therefore be missed by anybody casually reviewing these documents.</p> <p>The site should be retained as Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chain.</p>	<p>Metropolitan Open Land designation offers more protection to green spaces than a Green Chain designation. The London Plan paragraph 7.56 explicitly states that "open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their London-wide importance". Kings College Playing Fields can be designated as MOL through Policy 7.17 D of the London Plan because it satisfies at least one of the criteria listed - a) and d).</p> <p>Both Site Allocations and Atlas of Change documents refer to replacing a Green Chain designation with a Metropolitan Open Space designation.</p> <p><u>No Proposed Change</u></p>
Chapter 7: Amendments to Areas Forming Links in Green Chains					

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses

February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
23	3	Eastcote Conservation Panel	No specific reference in the chapter	Request the inclusion of the Parkway Open Space linked to Colombia Avenue Open Space by railway embankment as Green Chain. Further request that the status of the Bessingby/Cavendish/Pine Gardens Parks, Warrender Park and Highgrove Woods be upgraded to Metropolitan Open Land. Consider that these meet the criteria for designating MOL.	<p>The Parkway /Columbia Avenue open spaces are already protected from development as open spaces, under the provisions of policy DMCI 3: Public Open Space Provision.</p> <p>The nature conservation value of the areas themselves and the link between them would need to be demonstrated in order to justify the Green Chain designation.</p> <p>Whilst the spaces listed contribute to the value of the local area, it is not considered that they meet the criteria for the designation of Metropolitan Open Land listed in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan.</p> <p><u>No Proposed Change</u></p>
Chapter 8: Proposed Extension to Nature Conservation Sites of Metropolitan or Borough Grade 1 Importance					
71	6	London Wildlife Trust	Chapter 8	The Nature Reserve boundary shown for Frays Island/Mabey's Meadow Nature Reserve on Thorney Mill Road is inaccurate in that it omits the meadow element. Suggest revising the boundary and are happy to provide details.	<p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>Details of the boundary of Frays Island will be amended to include Mabey's Nature Reserve.</p>
71	5	London Wildlife Trust	Chapter 8	The boundary of the Frays Farm Meadows Nature Reserve is omitted from the Plan, as is the boundary of the wider Frays Valley Local Nature Reserve. Suggest adding boundaries and are happy to provide details if they are not readily available.	<p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>Frays Farm Meadows is a proposed Nature Conservation Site of Metropolitan or Borough Grade 1 Importance. This is shown on the composite Policies Map but not in the Atlas of Changes. The Atlas of Changes will be amended accordingly.</p>

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
83	2	St James Group	SINC Ext 6 - 8.5	Proposed SINC extension 6 (Yeading Brook, Minet Country Park, Hitherbroom Park) is unsound because it pays no regard to the works approved under planning permission LBH-54814-APP-2009-430 and the safeguarding within the Council's Development Management Policies which permits works to create a new access from Pump Lane to the Southall Gas Works site, along with the drainage and flood relief works. The extension to the SINC should be revised to omit the land adjoining Pump Lane.	<p><u>Proposed Change</u></p> <p>The Policies Map will be amended to reflect the latest position of the approved alignment of the access road.</p>
68	2	DP9 on behalf of Red & Yellow	8.10	Object to proposed extension SINC Ext 11 (Medipark Harefield). Have carried out ecological survey work demonstrating that the site does not merit its proposed designation.	<p>The rationale for SINC extension is based on work undertaken by the London Ecology Unit in 2005 as it abuts an existing site of Metropolitan importance. The proposed extension is to a site of Metropolitan importance.</p> <p>In accordance with the recommendations contained in the Cabinet report, a full review of all SINC's in the borough will be undertaken prior to the examination</p> <p><u>No Proposed Change</u></p>
<p>Chapter 9: Proposed Deletion of a Nature Conservation Sites of Metropolitan or Borough Grade 1 Importance</p>					
<p>No representation submitted</p>					
<p>Chapter 10: Proposed Extensions to Nature Conservation Sites of Borough Grade 2 or Local Importance</p>					

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
71	4	London Wildlife Trust	Chapter 10	The boundary of the Crane Meadows Nature Reserve is omitted from the Plan. This London Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve lies between the River Crane and the airport perimeter. Its designation and improvement is an important enhancement to the Green Belt and river corridor.	Crane Meadows is identified as a proposed extension to a Nature Conservation Site of Borough Grade 2 Importance. <u>No Proposed Change</u>
Chapter 11: Heathrow Airport Boundary					
No representations submitted					
Chapter 12: Road Safeguarding					
83	1	St James Group	12.1	Map 12.1 in the Policies Map: Atlas of Changes does not reflect or adequately take account of the permitted scheme for Southall Gas Works because: a) the position of the road safeguarding on the plan is not in accordance with the position of the eastern access route approved under the Permitted Scheme b) the plan does not identify the location of the two further permitted pedestrian and cycle routes bridging the canal to provide access to the Minet Country Park and Springfield Road. Suggest amending map to take account of eastern access, pedestrian and cycle bridges. Furthermore, the road safeguarding	The plan will be amended to take account of the correct alignment of the access. <u>Proposed Change</u> Amend Policies Map to reflect exact position of access road, in accordance with the approved scheme.

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
				contemplated by Map 12.1 does not appear to have been considered alongside SINC Ext 6: Yeading Brook, Minet Country Park, Hitherbroom Park).	
Chapter 13: Archaeological Priority Areas					
No representations submitted					
Chapter 14: Archaeological Priority Zones					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 15: Change to Centre Boundaries - Town Centres					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 16: Change to Centre Boundaries - Local Centres					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 17: Site allocations - new homes					
72	2	Burnett Planning & Development Ltd on behalf of Deutsche	Chapter 17: Willow Tree Local Centre boundary	Suggest extending the boundary of the centre to include the existing retail units on the south side of Glencoe Road, which function as part of the centre due to excellent pedestrian links.	No justification to extend the boundary of the site. <u>No Proposed Change</u>

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
		Alternative Asset Management Ltd		As drafted the plan fails to plan positively and promote a competitive town centre environment.	
66	3	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on behalf of Workspace Group	Chapter 17: SA1	Consider that the policy is out-of-date and inaccurate and should be updated to reflect the most recent planning history for the Enterprise House.	<u>Proposed Change</u> The provisions of SA1 will be amended to reflect the latest planning history for Enterprise House.
39	1	Solent Planning on behalf of Bourne End Investments Ltd	17.28	Plan 17.28 does not show the full extent of the Trout Road site, which totals 2.31 ha. Request that Map 17.28 be amended in accordance with the submitted red line plan and consider that whilst the allocation is supported, the site could be developed solely for residential development.	<u>Proposed Change</u> The site boundary will be amended to reflect the most recent planning history for the site.
40	2	Carter Jonas on behalf of Buccleuch Property	Map 17.9	There is an existing car park adjacently north of the site, which is owned by Network Rail, which should be included within the site boundary.	Satisfactory parking provision needs to be retained or increased for the station. Any reprovision as part of a wider redevelopment could come forward through the planning application process. <u>No Proposed Change</u>
Chapter 18: Site allocations - safeguarding public transport interchanges					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 19: Site allocations - school sites					

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
No representation submitted					
Chapter 20: Site allocations - safeguarding minerals sites					
No representations submitted					
Chapter 21: Scheduled Ancient Monuments					
No representations submitted					
Chapter 22: Conservation Areas					
No representations submitted					
Chapter 23: Areas of Special Local Character					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 24: Sites of Special Scientific Interest					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 25: Public Safety Zones					

Appendix 3: Policies Map Atlas of Changes: Schedule of Representations Received and Officer Responses
 February 2015

ID	Rep No	Individual/ Organisation	Para, Policy, Map	Summary of Representation	Council Response
No representation submitted					
Chapter 26: Registered Parks and Gardens					
No representation submitted					
Chapter 27: Air Quality Management Area					
No representation submitted					