



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Major Applications Planning Committee	
Date:	Wednesday 18 November 2015	Time: 6:00pm
Place:	Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 5 Page: 1	Location: Former Royal British Legion Club
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Page 2 :Amend proposed heads of terms. Recommendation (A) (2) Add '£20,000' before bond.	To provide clarity and precision to the proposed heads of terms.
Amend recommendation D) lines 1 and 2, page 3. If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised by the 30/11/2015 or any other date that may be agreed by the Head of Planning and Enforcement, that delegated...	To correct typographical errors.
Amend condition 6 to include the words "beyond the steel/timber superstructure (including roof structure)" between the words "place" and "until."	So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.
Amend condition 8 (landscaping) Add and one motor cycle space at the end of 2.d	To ensure that adequate facilities are provided.
Page 17 Section 3,2 line 3. Delete: '20 parking spaces including 3 disabled spaces, set beneath the hotel' Add: '23 parking spaces including 3 disabled spaces, set beneath the hotel and one taxi space at ground level'	To provide consistency to the report and to reflect the latest amended plans.
All references to the London Plan 2011 should now read London Plan 2015.	To ensure that the correct revision to the London Plan is referred to.

Item: 6 Page 41	211-213 Swakeleys Road, Ickenham
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>Page 42: Recommendation Under part A) of the recommendation, add: v) S278 works for alterations to the highways to allow for new accesses and restoring foot ways</p>	<p>For clarity and to ensure that the scheme provides adequate highway improvements.</p>
<p>Amend Condition 12, page 46 to read: All ground floor units hereby approved shall be built in accordance with part M(2) of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 Edition). Further 10% of the units hereby approved shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 Edition)</p>	<p>The Mayor of London's Housing Standards Policy transition Statement, May 2015 (Implementation October 2015) states that from October 2015, 90% of homes should meet building regulation M4(2) - 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.</p> <p>The applicant has stated that in order to achieve full compliance with Part M4(2) for the whole building, would require the addition of a lift within the building. To install such, would require a redesign of the entire scheme.</p> <p>Part M4(2) requires 'reasonable' provision to be made for most people to access the dwelling and incorporate features that make it suitable for a wide range of occupants. It has been confirmed by the applicant that the ground floor units could be adapted to meet the requirements of part M4(2).</p> <p>In this instance, given the date of submission of the application and that such a requirement was not in force during the preparation of the detailed drawings for the scheme, and the Councils obligation in the paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, to take a positive approach and look for solutions to help deliver development, a lesser compliance with this requirement would be permissible.</p>

Amend condition 7 to delete 2.d.	To remove an unnecessary requirement.
Delete informative 10.	To remove an unnecessary informative.

Item: 7 Page 65	Imperial House, Victoria Road
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
Amend recommendation head of term 1 to state: Highways: S278/S38 to secure highways works as indicated on the approved drawings with final details to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.	To ensure clarity about the requirement.
To Drw. Nos, add:- Technical Note No. 5, November 2015 received 13/11/15. In 3.2 Proposed Scheme, after paragraph titled Technical Note No. 4, October 2015, issued 28/10/15, add:- Technical Note No. 5, November 2015: This provides traffic modelling in relation to the Stonefield Way (west)/ Victoria Road junction. Again the developer's highway consultants make the point that the Transport Assessment is considered by them to be sufficiently robust and this further assessment was only undertaken at the request of Council Highway Engineers. It advises that the junction was surveyed on Friday 6th and Saturday 7th November 2015 during the peak periods. Results are presented and the report concludes that the junction operates within capacity during all time periods and scenarios assessed, namely existing, existing with committed development and existing with committed and proposed development so that the impact of the proposed development would not be significant and no capacity improvement works are required.	For completion
In Condition 8 (Food Sales Floor Area), delete 'Lidl'.	For correction in order to ensure the condition applies to any operator of the new store.
In Condition15 (Delivery Hours), after 'the hours of', replace second 'of' with '07:30 to 09:00 hours and'. At end of condition, add 'and 12:00 to 14:00 hours on Saturdays'.	To address Highway Engineer comments.
Delete condition 16.	This condition is unnecessary.
58 additional responses have been received on this	The additional supporting

<p>application, 54 in support and 4 objecting to the proposal.</p> <p>As regards the supporting comments, 33 raise similar comments summarised in point (i), 23 make comments summarised at point (ii), 16 comments relate to point (iii) and 5 in point (iv). One comment, whilst in support, did stress the need to make sure development did not affect traffic on the highway and deliveries should be in the evening.</p> <p>As regards the objection comments, 2 comments received relate to point (i), adding that another chain store not needed in close proximity to other existing and proposed stores. New objection concerns related to:-</p> <p>(vii) the general increase in traffic in an area which is already congested and problems of more deliveries, with increased noise and pollution. Research has shown that discounters arriving in an area result in unnecessary increased car usage as people make multiple trips to 'shop around' to save marginal sums on their groceries. Additional fuel costs caused by congestion will wipe out any savings,</p> <p>(viii) Increased competition on small local independent traders will be likely to result in further closures of valuable community and business assets,</p> <p>(ix) Proposal with increased HGVs will add to road damage and cost to taxpayers and delay for road users whilst repaired.</p>	<p>comments are noted but do not raise any new material planning issues that have not already been considered in the officer's report. As regards the further objection issues raised, Point (vii) is dealt with in the officer's report. In terms of point (viii), the planning system does not seek to restrict competition between individual retailers, only to safeguard the competitiveness of town centres which is dealt with in the officer's report and point (ix) is not a material planning consideration.</p>
<p>In fourth paragraph concerning Servicing within the Highway Engineer comments on p.91, replace 'early morning weekday period is considered necessary because this coincides with children going to schools in the vicinity', with 'weekday periods are considered necessary to limit delivery vehicle movements at peak times'. Replace 'periods' with 'period' and 'coincide' with 'coincides'.</p>	<p>For correction.</p>
<p>Add additional Highway Engineer comments:-</p> <p>Highway comments:</p> <p>1. RE. Supplementary modelling Technical Note 5.</p> <p>a. The results of traffic surveys at Stonefield Way (W) exit onto Victoria Road have not been carried forwards and added onto traffic flows along Victoria Road. This error will affect the assessment of junction performance along Victoria Road at the site access and Long Lane. The Long Lane / Victoria Road junction as improved as part of the ARLA</p>	<p>For up-date/ revision</p>

development, will operate at capacity with the Lidl development traffic and experience congestion at peak periods.

b. The submitted traffic modelling for the Stonefield Way (W) junction indicates that the junction will operate within capacity with the proposed development. However, in context of (a) above, it is also likely to be operating at capacity during the weekday evening peak period.

Notwithstanding the above comments, the Transport Assessment shows the proposal will not result in a significant traffic impact.

2. RE: Servicing and Delivery:

a.. The applicant has proposed restriction on servicing between 17:00 to 19:00 on weekdays and between 12:00 to 14:00 on Saturday. However, It is recommended that further restriction on delivery / servicing vehicles entering the site between 7.30am-9.00am on weekdays, also be included. The early morning weekday period restriction is considered necessary because this coincides with the peak travel times.

The applicant has informed the LPA that the proposed Lidl store will only have one delivery a day. Therefore, no objection is raised if the deliveries are restricted during the aforementioned hours to cover the periods coinciding with peak travel times on the highway and/or during peak customer activity at the site, which includes three large retail stores.

Item: 8 Page: 111	Location: Grassy Meadow Day Centre, Grange Road, Hayes
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>
<p>One additional letter of objection has been raised, which raises the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Visual impact on the surrounding area - it fails to enhance, improve or contribute to the Grassy Meadow area or Conservation Area. ii) The Hayes Conservation Area Appraisal remarks of the low rise residential area and open spaces. The proposed building will in no way fit into this area as it is too large, tall and ugly and will result in the loss of trees and shrubs. iii) Loss of parking to the Beck Theatre will lead to increased on-street parking when events take place. 	<p>Issues relating to visual amenity and the size of the building have been addressed in the report as have matters relating to parking.</p> <p>The solar panels would be located on the roof and so views of them, if any, would be very limited. Full details are required by way of condition.</p> <p>Consultation letters were sent to</p>

<p>iv) Hayes & Harlington station is not within easy walking distance as suggested.</p> <p>v) Solar panels will be an eyesore.</p> <p>vi) Lack of consultation - more comments would have been made on the application if people were aware of it.</p>	<p>64 local owner/occupiers and site and press notices were posted. This exceeds statutory consultation requirements.</p>
<p>Amend condition 6 to include the words “beyond the steel/timber superstructure (including roof structure)” between the words “place” and “until.”</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.</p>
<p>Condition 8: Amend the first sentence to read “Within six months of the date of this consent a landscape scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”</p> <p>Replace reference to play equipment in part 2.g with reference to “sheds/stores, pergolas”</p> <p>Delete part 3 of the condition and replace with the following: “3. Details of the living roof”</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.</p>
<p>Condition 11: Replace the words “Prior to the commencement of development” with the words “prior to installation.”</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.</p>
<p>Condition 12: Replace the words “Prior to the commencement of development” with the words “within 6 months of the date of this consent.”</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.</p>
<p>Condition 16: Replace the words “Prior to commencement of development” with the words “within 6 months of the date of this consent.”</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.</p>

<p>Item: 10 Page: 165</p>	<p>Location: Park View Day Centre, Farrier Close, Hillingdon.</p>
<p><i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i></p>	<p><i>Officer Comments:</i></p>
<p>Amend condition 6 to include the words “beyond the steel/timber superstructure (including roof structure)” between the words “place” and “until.”</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.</p>
<p>Condition 9: Amend the first sentence to read “Within six months of the date of this consent a landscape scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”</p> <p>Replace reference to play equipment in part 2.g with reference to “sheds/stores, pergolas”</p> <p>Amend 3a to ask for details of the living roof</p>	<p>So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site and provide clarity over the information required.</p>

proposed Delete part 3b	
Replace the words "Prior to the commencement of development" with the words "prior to installation."	So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.
Condition 16: Replace the words "Prior to the commencement of development" with the words "within 6 months of the date of this consent."	So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.
Condition 17: Replace the words "No development approved by this permission shall be commenced" with the words "within 6 months of the date of this consent"	So as not to unnecessarily delay the start of works on site.