



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Major Applications Planning Committee	
Date:	5th August 2015	Time: 6:00pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 5 Page: 1	Location: THE OLD VINYL FACTORY, BLYTH ROAD, HAYES
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>Add the following External Consultee Response (Section 6, page 17:</p> <p>METROPOLITAN POLICE I have spoken to the Architect, a Mr Jonathan Stewart. Mr Stewart has previously discharged Secured by Design condition, so he is fully aware of the scheme.</p> <p>In relation to this site, I would recommend that the development achieves Secured by Design due to it remote location and the nature of the transient users. I submit the following advice to be considered in support of this.</p> <p>a) Boundary - Boundary treatment to achieve a minimum of 2.1m in height. A clearly defined boundary using a fence, wall or other effective barrier against intrusion is a prerequisite for a secure site and to define ownership. A secure boundary will help staff manage the school site by limiting trespass and by channelling visitors to the site through appropriate entrances.</p> <p>b) CCTV - The monitoring of CCTV on entrances may be appropriate some sites. The planting of new trees and the lighting design should be considered in tandem with the installation and the operational requirement of any specified CCTV system.</p> <p>c) Bicycle Store - External and preferably roofed bicycle stores with individual stands for securing bicycles are best located close to supervised areas of the school building and preferably within 100m.</p> <p>d) All accessible doors and windows to the building to achieve PAS 24:2012.</p> <p>e) Fully compliant alarm system to be installed.</p> <p>f) Car park lighting scheme to be compliant to BS 5489:2013 (SBD does not support bollard lighting). CCTV system to be complementary of the lighting scheme so as</p>	<p>Additional response. No amendment to conditions as there is an existing Secured by Design condition</p>

<p>to give good facial recognition.</p> <p>g) Audio / Visual control with encrypted fobs to be used for all entrance doors to the site.</p> <p>h) Within the building, any high valued assets (such as computing equipment etc) are to be protected within a room off the main study area with a PAS 24:2012 door.</p> <p>i) Consideration needs to given to a daytime and night time security scheme.</p> <p>j) In relation to the proposal for a gym for the community use within the grounds. Strict control as to channelling of visitors to the gym will have to be considered with on site security to ensure that members of the public cannot roam about the whole site.</p> <p>k) Accredited lockers to a standard are to be considered to ensure that opportunistic theft is kept to a minimum.</p> <p>l) Access and movement throughout the school at all times in operation needs to be defined between private, semi private and public via an encrypted access control system.</p> <p>Above are just some of the recommendations, further adherence can be obtained from the Schools 2014 Design Guide.</p>	
<p>Add the following External Consultee Response (Section 6, page 17:</p> <p>TRANSPORT FOR LONDON</p> <p>Further to our correspondence about bus capacity and forecast passenger demand from your development and cumulative development (using the TA from the Old Vinyl Factory entire consented scheme) I have the following to report:</p> <p>Please find attached a spreadsheet with rough workings that supports TfL's request for your development to increase capacity of route 195 which currently has little to no spare capacity and is the only route linking OVF with Southall to the east. We only need the contribution to cover the first two years of opening as after that there will be Crossrail services at Hayes & Harlington Station after which bus services will be reviewed and most likely improved where extra capacity it needed.</p> <p>I and my bus colleague have used the demand figures from the trip rate generation analysis from your own TA and that for the whole OVF. I have taken into consideration the number of pupils attending in each year from the opening of the school.</p> <p>1.Global Academy development TA assumption is that 40% of students will travel by bus. 2016/17 = 80 pupils. 2017/18 = 200 pupils. 2018/19 = 280 pupils 2019/20 = 320 pupils</p>	<p>Additional response received from TfL on 04/08/15. Due to late submission of request for financial contribution there are unresolved issues regarding the methodology used to calculate the contribution figure. Discussions are ongoing to confirm a final contribution level.</p>

<p>Total additional usage figures:</p> <p><u>2016/17</u> 407 arriving in AM 384 departing in PM</p> <p><u>2017/18</u> 527 arriving in AM 504 departing in PM</p> <p><u>2018/19</u> 607 arriving in AM 584 departing in PM</p> <p>2.TA for OVF outline app (consented 2012) BUS/coach trip gen · AM peak : 327 arr, 104 dep · PM peak 120 arr, 304 dep</p> <p>Table 5.1: Student numbers 2016/17 2017/18 2018/19 2019/20 200 500 700 800</p> <p>SUMMARY My analysis shows that route 195, serving Southall and Brentford to the east of the site, will require one additional vehicle in the PM peak. This will be at a cost of £60,000 per year, for the first 2 years after the Global Academy opens. After Crossrail begins, it is likely that demand for the 195 between Hayes & Harlington and Southall will reduce and the additional vehicle may no longer be required.</p> <p>I hope that you will be agree this sum is reasonable and justified, also in the context of our not requiring mitigation for other public transport impacts (save the £20k for bus stops and Legible London that was secured previously for the extant whole-site scheme).</p>	
<p>Additional Head of Term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus Contribution 	<p>Developer has agreed to the principle of making a contribution towards bus capacity. Final contribution figure is subject to ongoing discussions and is to be agreed by the Head of Planning and Enforcement.</p>
<p>Amend Condition 5</p> <p>2.b: Replace text to read '120 cycle parking spaces/storage' 2.d: Replace text to read: 'Detail of vehicle access, pick up and drop off area and car parking layout to include 5 visitor disabled car parking spaces.'</p>	<p>For clarity</p>
<p>Amend Condition 14</p>	<p>To ensure the cohesion with the site wide Construction Management</p>

Text insert 'The Construction Management and Logistics Plan shall be tied in with The Old Vinyl Factory site wide Construction Management Framework'	Framework
Text insert under section 7.08 on page 34 'In addition, due to the close proximity of residential properties it is also recommended that a Floodlighting condition is added to protect residential amenity from unacceptable light pollution.'	To explain/justify floodlighting condition
Additional Condition: No floodlighting or other form of external lighting shall be installed unless it is in accordance with details which have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. Any lighting that is so installed shall not thereafter be altered other than for routine maintenance which does not change its details. REASON To safeguard the amenity of surrounding properties in accordance with policies BE13 and OE1 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).	To protect the residential amenity of adjacent occupiers
Text insert under section 7.20 on page 36 after point 5. Parking schemes '- to include details of 40 staff car parking spaces (including 4 disabled spaces) with 8 car spaces served by active electrical charging points, 4 spaces by passive electrical charging points and 2 motorcycle parking spaces.'	For clarity

Item: 6 Page: 41	Location: FORMER CONTRACTORS COMPOUND, SOUTH OF SWINDON ROAD, HEATHROW AIRPORT
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
Add the following consultee response(section 6, page 60) CONSERVATION OFFICER The current proposals lack the ingenuity and architectural interest of the original scheme and the loss of the central landscaped open courtyard is to be regretted- although the practicality of this space was open to question. The currently proposed building is fairly mundane in terms of its external appearance, although its internal layout and services have clearly been given some considerable thought. The lighting of the elevations will, however, provide some additional interest at night time. A better landscaping scheme needs to be provided for the site and we should still seek improvements to the pedestrian path from the airport car park, even though it appears that a raised link to the existing walkway may be	The comments of the Conservation Officer are noted and given that this is an outline application, final details of the design and landscaping of the site remain as reserved matters. The Section 106 agreement includes public realm improvement, which will improve the pedestrian links from the airport to the site. In terms of the GLAAS consultation, this, they have been consulted, however comments have yet to be received from this department. The footprint and scale of the building is the same as that considered previously, the main difference is

<p>forthcoming in the near future.</p> <p>I am not clear how closely the revised scheme reflects the agreed development parameters, but I am concerned that the current proposal does now seem to have a double basement. GLAAS commented on the original scheme and it would be useful to seek their comments again on the revised proposal, although it is unlikely to change their advice</p>	<p>that a further basement is proposed beneath the building. Having reviewed the comments made by GLAAS in relation to the previous application, and subject to the recommended condition 6 (Archaeological Investigation), the scheme is considered acceptable in this regard.</p>
<p>Page 47: Condition 10 (Traffic Arrangements) Delete parts ii) and iii) and replace with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A scheme for blue and brown badge parking, to comply with the London Plan and Council policies. These should show the bays being a minimum of 4.8m long by 3.6m wide, or 3m wide where two adjacent bays may share an unloading area. 	<p>The London Plan states that for hotel development, the provision of disabled parking spaces should be limited to operational needs. The Councils SPD 'Accessible Hillingdon' seeks to achieve a minimum of 5% of the total spaces as brown badge and 10% as blue badge. Notwithstanding such, the Council will invoke its discretion where a development application can demonstrate that the above percentages would amount to over provision and regular under occupation of the accessible parking bays.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the applicant provide a suitable scheme for blue and brown badge parking on the basis of the sites operational requirements.</p>
<p>Page 49: Amend condition 14 (Landscaping) to delete parts 2b) and 2d)</p>	<p>To avoid duplication of information requested by condition. These items are already requested within Condition 10.</p>
<p>Page 64 Section 7.10 HIGHWAYS: The Highways team had concerns with regards to the drop off and general road/pedestrian layout and accessibility of the site. It is acknowledged by the applicant that much improvement is required to these parts to make them acceptable, as the site has mainly been used for servicing to date. Within the previous scheme, the applicants devised a public realm improvement plan and agreed to enter into a S106 to secure these improvements. Details of the drop off points and parking layout are also requested by condition 10. Therefore subject to the S106 and planning conditions to secure these improvements, the scheme is considered acceptable.</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>

Item: 9 Page: 102	Location: UNIT C, PROLOGIS PARK STOCKLEY ROAD WEST DRAYTON
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
Add to the recommendation: "The provision of a Travel Plan (including £20,000.00 Bond)"	To ensure that planning obligations are applied consistently.
Delete Condition 4 requiring 'Secured by Design' accreditation for the building.	To prevent duplication. This requirement has been addressed pursuant to condition 4 of permission 18399/APP/2013/1019.
Delete Condition 5 requiring imported soils testing for the site.	To prevent duplication. This requirement has been addressed pursuant to condition 9 of permission 18399/APP/2013/1019.
Delete Condition 6 requiring works below ground comprised within the development.	The scheme does not involve works below ground - it is for a change of use of an existing building.
Delete Condition 7 referring to warehouses buildings approved.	For clarity as no buildings are proposed or approved by the permission.
Officer comments under pages 108 and 109: Replace 'The robustness granted.' and '.....which still leaves.....baseline' With the following: ' the actual highways impacts of unit C alone compared to the lawful use are therefore not considered to be significant.	For clarity.

Item: 10 Page: 115	Location: SENATOR COURT, BELMONT ROAD, UXBRIDGE
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
Add the following informative: The applicant is advised that where the conditions requiring the submission of details have been discharged in connection with the original permission, the Local Planning Authority will not require these details to be re-submitted as part of this new planning permission where those details would remain the same.	For amendment.
An email dated 28/7/15 has been received from the agent, advising that the appeal scheme which included three trees along the Belmont Road frontage is not feasible or implementable due to the structural constraints imposed by the lower ground floor/basement car park and water attenuation tanks in this area and that trees of any significant height, girth or crown could not be accommodated here due to these constraints, problems	The Council's Tree Officer advises that it may not be possible to accommodate additional street trees, but as they were proposed on the previously approved drawings, evidence should be provided to show why they are now considered not to be feasible, with the key issue

<p>of maintenance and proximity of the building. Furthermore, small trees would not be appropriate in this setting and a good quality hard landscaping scheme might be more appropriate.</p> <p>Replace condition 7 with:-</p> <p>'Prior to the occupation of the development, details of a hard and/or soft landscape scheme to include 3 replacement trees along the Belmont Road frontage (unless it can be demonstrated to the reasonable satisfaction of the LPA that tree planting is not feasible) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.</p> <p>REASON In order to ensure that appropriate landscaping is provided, in accordance with Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p>	<p>being the volume of topsoil needed to support healthy tree establishment. The officer does advise that canopy spread is not a valid argument as there are many fastigate (naturally upright) trees whose crown spread is minimal and ideally suited to urban environments.</p> <p>The officer also advises that given the likely siting/nature of the landscape works in this case, the landscape details condition can be amended to ensure that details are submitted prior to occupation so as not to delay the build programme.</p>
<p>An email dated 31/7/15 has also been received, concerning the recommendation, asking for Items 1(a) (PERS Audit) and 3 (10 Year Green Travel Plan) to be omitted as these did not form part of the Unilateral Undertaking agreed as part of the original approval granted at appeal. Although it is agreed that given the proximity of the site to Uxbridge Underground Station, the PERS Audit previously requested by TfL would provide little benefit and can be dispensed with, the scheme clearly satisfies the threshold where a Travel Plan would normally be required and the fact that the previous Inspector failed to secure one should not be used as justification that such an omission should persist with the current scheme.</p> <p>In 2. RECOMMENDATION:-</p> <p>(i) delete Item 1(a). Re-number 1(b) as 1(a) and re-word as follows to reflect wording of the UU:-</p> <p>Highway Works a. Reinstatement of the existing car park entrance on Belmont Road to a footway b. White lining works to the proposed loading bay to service Belmont House c. The relocation of parking bays to Belmont Road</p> <p>(ii) At end of 3, insert 'to include a £20,000 bond'.</p>	<p>For amendment.</p>
<p>In Trees/ Landscape Officer comments on p. 123, after 'The line of four trees along Belmont Road', add 'close to the entrance'. After, 'contrary to the approved plan, these trees will not be replaced by three replacement trees close to the entrance'. Between 'There will be a net loss of' and 'trees across the site', add '3'.</p>	<p>For clarification.</p>

In Section 7.14 in fourth paragraph, at end of first sentence, add 'by 3 replacement trees'. In second sentence, add '3' after 'there will be a net loss of'. At end of paragraph, add 'as part of a soft/hard landscaping scheme unless it is demonstrated that replacement tree planting is not feasible'.