



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Major Applications Planning Committee	
Date:	19/2/2019	Time: 6:00pm
Place:	Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Uxbridge	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6 Land off Harefield Road	
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>

Page 9, Drawing Nos. add additional documents: Proposed Scheme Daylight and Sunlight December 2018 Wind Design Note December 2018	For completeness
Page 11, Reason for Refusal Number 5 'Heritage' add additional text: '.....and paragraphs 195, 196 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).'	For completeness
Page 13, Reason For Refusal Number 15 'Daylight/Sunlight' replace with the following text: "The submitted Daylight and Sunlight report states that 27% of the proposed units fail daylight requirements in accordance with BRE guidelines. In addition the application has failed to provide evidence that the proposed amenity areas accord with BRE daylight, sunlight and overshadowing standards as well as details of microclimate for the proposed development. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE23 of the Local Plan: Part 2 (November 2012), Emerging Policies DMHB 10 and DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (October 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2018)."	For clarity following receipt of additional reports
Reason for Refusal to be deleted.	See comments below
Additional consultations comments have now been received which state: MOD - DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANISATION (Summary) In summary, the MOD has no statutory safeguarding objections to this development subject to the above planning conditions being applied to any planning permission granted (Bird Hazard Management Plan and Construction Management Plan).	Reason for Refusal no.1 is no longer relevant as the MoD have withdrawn their objection.
Add new informative: The decision to refuse planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 adopted 2012 including supplementary planning guidance: PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage PT1.EM6 (2012) Flood Risk Management PT1.H1 (2012) Housing Growth PT1.H2 (2012) Affordable Housing PT1.EM1 (2012) Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation	For completeness
Add new Informative: On this decision notice, the following policies from the Councils Emerging Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Proposals Map (2015) including the Modifications published in 2018 are relevant to this decision: DMH 2 Housing Mix DMH 7 Provision of Affordable Housing DMHB 1 Heritage Assets DMHB 10 High Buildings and Structures DMHB 11 Design of New Development DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping DMHB 16 Housing Standards DMHB 17 Residential Density DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space DMT 6 Vehicle Parking DMEI Living Walls and Roofs and Onsite Vegetation DMEI 2 Reducing Carbon Emissions DMEI 6 Development in Green Edge Locations	For completeness

<p>DMEI 7 Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement DMEI 9 Management of Flood Risk DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality DMEI 14 Air Quality DMCI 7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy DMTC 1 Town Centre Development DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts DMT 2 Highways Impacts DMT 4 Public Transport DMT 5 Pedestrians and Cyclists DMT 6 Vehicle Parking DMCI 3 Public Open Space Provision DMCI 7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy</p>	
<p>Amend Section 6 Consultations, page 22 to state: 6 Petitions in objection to the proposals Add the following text: Petition 6 has 36 signatures and states: ‘We, the undersigned, from Laburnum Court Retirement Development, object to the proposed development which is directly opposite to us across the Harefield Road on the grounds: 1 - The proposed development is totally unsuitable for the site. It appears to have been conceived with no thought to what would be suitable or fit into the locality. 2 - It is far too big for the size of the plot. 3 - It is too high and bulky in relation to the surrounding buildings. 4 - The proposed facades of the buildings are garish and do not blend into Harefield Road, doing nothing to ‘enhance the urban neighbourhood’. 5 - The ‘Car Free Zone’ is totally unrealistic and unworkable for this position on Harefield Road. Impossible to enforce on residents or visitors to the site. Parking is already a huge problem in the immediate vicinity. 6 - The development will have a negative impact on Laburnum Court, through noise, being overlooked and loss of daylight on the Harefield Road side. 7 - No provision is made at all to support an already overloaded infrastructure - i.e. GP surgeries and local schools which are already oversubscribed. 8 - The Developers are offering no ideas/funding to improve local roads/access. 9 - The whole project needs a re-think if the priority is to provide much needed extra homes but must be on a scale that meets the need but does not negatively impact on Harefield Road and North Uxbridge which has already seen redevelopment. Local infrastructure will not currently adequately service the area which is already under massive strain. 10 - Proposed access/parking for disabled people is totally inadequate for the proposed number of residents, regardless of their visitors.</p>	<p>For completeness</p>
<p>Section 6 Consultations, page 22, 2 additional consultation letters received from the MP for Uxbridge and South Ruislip who has objected to the proposed scheme noting the strength of feeling in the local community that planning permission should be refused. The objection can be summarised to state - the application appears to be an overdevelopment for the location, with too high a density proposed. A twelve storey tower block in amongst this development is wholly out of character for the locality and the application does not appear to take account of the current housing stock.</p>	<p>For completeness</p>

<p>- the lack of parking provision and almost certain increase in on-street parking on local roads.</p> <p>- increased pressure on local services including schools and doctors is taken account of to ensure Hillingdon welcomes sustainable developments and inappropriate applications such as this are refused.</p>	
<p>Additional Comments received from Highways Officer: FINAL highway Officers Comments</p> <p><u>Page 35 - Car Parking</u> Add the following paragraph:- <u>Hillingdon Council Response</u> Under normal circumstances, a minimum 3 % disabled compliant parking provision out of the 267 units proposed would be expected in line with the draft London Plan policy T6.1. The applicant has therefore proposed 9 disabled spaces which is accepted. However the policy also requires an additional 7% provision totalling 18 spaces should demand rise in the future. The applicant makes a case to be exonerated from this requirement for the 'accessibility' related reasons stated above which TfL have accepted. However the Council does not accept this position as presented with particular reference to the 'step free' access at Uxbridge station. The problem lies with the general absence of similar 'step free' provisions throughout the London Underground network, hence in practise, wheelchair bound travel remains severely restricted on the network. As a consequence wheelchair user accessibility from destination to destination cannot be relied upon and be used as justification for a lower on-plot disabled compliant parking provision in future years. The further 7% future disabled parking 'future proof' provision is therefore considered a requirement which the applicant has not presented.</p> <p><u>Page 57 - Site Characteristics and Background/Parking Provisions</u> Replace text with the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The quantum of residential development should read 267 units in lieu of the stated 264. 2) The breakdown of 267 residential units consists of:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32 - Studio flats 107 - 1 bedroom flats 115 - 2 bedroom flats 13 - 3 bedroom flats <p><u>Page 59 - Cycle Parking</u> Replace whole paragraph with the following - In terms of cycle parking there would be a provision of 457 secure and accessible spaces in total for residents and visitors located on the ground floor throughout the site which is acceptable in format and design layout terms and the quantum conforms to and exceeds Hillingdon's saved UDP standard which would require a figure in the region of approximately 280 spaces. Notwithstanding the above, the indicated provision of 457 is considered excessive as it is a demonstrated fact that the vast majority of larger new developments in Hillingdon do not fully utilise cycle provisions which results in large numbers of spaces remaining empty and occupying areas which could be better used for amenity or other more useful purposes. A reversion toward the saved UDP standard (280 spaces) would therefore be considered more prudent in this regard. The underuse can be explained by the borough's Outer London status and the travel challenges that this brings for residents who are therefore reliant, more so, on the private motor car. This is reinforced by census data (2011) which indicates that Hillingdon exhibits one of the highest car ownership rates per household in London and a commensurate increase in this trend is anticipated since the collation of census data in 2011. The private motor vehicle is</p>	<p>For accuracy; the additional comments do not alter the proposed reasons for refusal.</p>

therefore likely to remain as the main dominant mode of choice in lieu of cycling for many residents by reason of need and convenience for the foreseeable future.

Page 60 - Internal (thru-site) Roadways/Cycling/ Pedestrian/ Servicing Provision

Add the following to the 2nd Paragraph:-

However the Council's waste service has expressed some concern with regard to the internal roadways being marginally insufficient in dimension to comfortably cater for refuse vehicles entering and leaving the site. Hence on balance, a concern is raised on this basis.

Page 61 - Development Footfall

Delete - "(Please note this list is indicative and not necessarily exhaustive and may therefore be subject to alteration - costing to follow)" and add to the list of public realm enhancements with an additional paragraph as follows:-

- Provision of 'Way-Finder' signage to enhance local pedestrian route legibility.

A total financial contribution up to a maximum of £350k would be sought via a s106 agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in order to facilitate the above and cater for contingencies such as statutory undertaker costs for likely diversionary works. Any residual monies would be returned by-way of the above legal mechanism within a mutually agreed timescale.

Page 62 - Travel Plan - Residential

Add the following Paragraph:-

Under the same legal remit, it is considered justifiable to apply a 'Performance Bond' in order to assist in ensuring the continuing success of the FTP as this would act as a clear incentive toward meeting and potentially exceeding the aforementioned agreed targets. This bond would amount to £20,000 and cover on-going monitoring costs and assist in achieving the target based performance of the FTP. If there is an unreasonable default in meeting the said targets then, to place matters 'back on track', the Council shall use the available monies to fund the delivery of appropriate travel plan measures.

Page 79 - Residential Cycle Parking

The quantum of cycle parking should read **457** units in lieu of the stated 485.

Page 80, Development Footfall paragraph, delete text:

It is a normal requirement for this scale of residential development to be accompanied by a Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) audit in order to provide an inventory of local pedestrian facilities thereby allowing an informed determination of the suitability of the local highway network to be made in order to cater for the uplift in foot traffic generated by a proposal.

Replace with the following:

The applicant has provided this audit [PERS] in the form of a mainly inconclusive 'condition survey' and without footfall estimations arising from the proposal. The audit did however identify the need to provide tactile paving at all crossings in the area and 'way-finding' signage to improve local pedestrian legibility.

It can however be anticipated that the quantum of development has the potential to generate well in excess of 500-600 new occupiers. At present the established footfall to and from the site is transient and not excessive as the choice of transport mode for most customers of the two established retail units is by motor vehicle. There is some foot traffic generated by the retail uses which is partially encouraged by the '1 hour maximum stay' free parking regime of the car park which results in some pedestrian 'linked trip' activity

<p>due to the proximity of the town centre. However from observation, this level of activity is of relatively low significance.</p>	
<p>Section 6, page 62, Internal following the Sustainability Officer comments add the following text: Case Officer comments: The Applicant has provided a two reports 'Proposed Scheme Daylight and Sunlight, December 2018' and 'Wind Design Note, December 2018'. These reports have been forwarded to the Sustainability Officer for consideration. SUSTAINABILITY OFFICER 3rd comments (submitted reports only): These are technically design matters. My interest is primarily in whether there is a reliance on PVs and if so are they overshadowed; also whether the amenity space is adequately served in terms of light. Neither of these issues are resolved by the sole focus of the sunlight assessment, with no sun path analysis (bizarrely the plans don't even have a compass point on them). These matters should have been fed into the design comments.</p>	<p>For clarity following receipt of additional reports</p>
<p>Section 6, page 52, add the following text: Case Officer comments: The Applicant has provided a two reports 'Proposed Scheme Daylight and Sunlight, December 2018' and 'Wind Design Note, December 2018'. These reports are not considered to resolve the concerns raised by the Council's Urban Design Officer, as set out in Section 7.09 of this report.</p>	<p>For clarity following receipt of additional reports</p>
<p>Section 7.03, Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character, page 71, insert the following paragraph: Paragraph 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) requires an assessment of the particular significance of designated heritage assets, whilst paragraphs 194 to 196 of the NPPF requires an assessment of the degree of harm to that significance for new proposals. The applicants submitted submitted a Townscape Heritage Review which has been considered. The Council's Conservation Officer has considered the significance of the heritage assets and has determined that the proposed scheme would cause to less than substantial harm to the surrounding heritage assets. Harm in this respect should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal, however, the scheme fails to provide substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.</p>	<p>For completeness</p>
<p>Section 7.09 Living Conditions for Future Occupiers, page 76, delete the following paragraph: There is also no information on sunlight and daylight to the properties within the development as well as the proposed outdoor space. This would constrain the quality of this open space, and fails to demonstrate whether the proposed development provides suitable amenity for occupants. And add text: The Applicant has submitted a 'Proposed Scheme Daylight and Sunlight' report (December 2018). In terms of daylight the report states that the analysis results showed that 73% of the habitable rooms (482 out of the 660), satisfy the recommended criteria and that the majority of the dwellings have at least one room achieving the criteria set out by the GLA and BRE. Taking the above into consideration the development is considered to provide unacceptable levels of access to daylight for future occupants as 27% of the habitable rooms fail to satisfy the recommended criteria and some dwellings fail to have a single room which meets the criteria.</p>	<p>For clarity following receipt of additional reports</p>

<p>The submitted report contains no information on sunlight and daylight to the proposed outdoor amenity space. Thus failing to demonstrate whether the proposed development provides suitable amenity for occupants.</p> <p>Page 77, delete the following paragraph: Similarly, no information on the impact of wind has been provided to demonstrate that the open space is usable. Again, this is a significant concern given the concentration of tall buildings around the open space presenting a likely wind tunnel affect.</p> <p>And add text: A Wind Design Note (December 2018) has been submitted as part of the application. This note concludes that ‘The development’s massing has been designed and placed to reduce the four commonly accepted negative wind effects; downwash, funnelling, corner and wake effects. Furthermore, the scheme has provided mitigation measures by way of placement of; shelter to entrances, stacked balconies and hard/soft landscaping; this is to reduce wind speeds at sensitive seating, standing and leisure walking areas.’</p> <p>Page 78, Internal Privacy It is also noted that Block A and Block B are only 12m apart. This relationship is considered to provide an insufficient separation distance to afford acceptable levels of privacy for properties within these blocks where habitable rooms have windows within the facing elevations.</p> <p>Page 78, Internal Outlook As stated above Block A and Block B are proposed to be only 12m apart. This relationship is considered to provide an insufficient separation distance to afford acceptable levels of outlook for properties within these blocks where habitable rooms have windows within the facing elevations.</p>	
---	--

Item: 7 Page 91	John Crank Building Brunel University.
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>

<p>Amend drawing list (page 91) and condition 2 (page 94)</p> <p>Delete:</p> <p>1511-PPA-SI-DR-A-20100 P05 LOCATION PLAN 1511-PPA-SI-DR-A-20101 P05 SITE PLAN 1511-PPA-SI-DR-A-20102 P05 DEMOLITION PLAN 1511-PPA-SI-DR-A-20111 P05 PROPOSED SITE PLAN</p> <p>Add:</p> <p>1511-PPA-SI-ZZ-DR-A-20100 P05 LOCATION PLAN 1511-PPA-SI- ZZ-DR-A-20101 P05 SITE PLAN 1511-PPA-SI- ZZ-DR-A-20102 P05 DEMOLITION PLAN 1511-PPA-SI-ZZ-DR-A-20111 P05 PROPOSED SITE PLAN</p>	For accuracy and clarity.
<p>Amend condition 5 (page 95) To ensure that the correct part of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (<i>Class M – extensions etc for schools, colleges, universities and hospitals</i>) is referred to</p> <p>Delete: Part 8 Add: Class M Part 7</p>	For accuracy and clarity..
<p>The quantum of academic floorspace should read 7,685m2: instead of 7,300m2.</p> <p>Amend the description (page 91) and proposed scheme (section 3.2, page 109) accordingly.</p>	For clarity, accuracy and consistency, following receipt of updated schedule. There is no change to the plans.
<p>External Consultees (page 113) Add:</p> <p>The application has been advertised under Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning General Development Management Order 2015 as a Major Development. Site notices were also posted. 72 adjoining owner/occupiers have been consulted. No responses have been received to the neighbour consultation.</p>	For clarity.
<p>Delete Condition 12; Waste Management Plan.</p>	As set out in section 7.15, Brunel has an existing and established refuse management plan.

Item: 8	Location: Axis House, 242 Bath Road, Sipson
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:

Condition 3 - General compliance with supporting documentation, the following document to be added: “Sustainable Drainage Strategy Statement by Shear Design ref 16084.D100F dated November 2017”	For clarity.
Condition 7 - Sustainable Water Management. Text highlighted in bold, to be added so that reference is made to the correct drainage document. “The scheme shall clearly demonstrate how it (follows the strategy set out in the SUDS Statement, produced by Shear Design ref 16084.D100F dated November 2017 , and)”	For accuracy and clarity.
Condition 9 - Landscaping (car parking & refuse/cycle storage). Following text highlighted in bold to added for clarity: 2.b Cycle Spaces and Storage - to include a total number of 11 2.g Motorcycle Parking Spaces - to include a total number of 2	For accuracy and clarity.
Condition 14 - Air Quality. Point 1) text highlighted in bold to clarify the requirement, this now reads: 1) The fleet composition serving the Hotel to be Euro VI or above or have implemented retrofitting devices that will enable compliance with such Euro standards.	For accuracy and clarity.
Section 2 Recommendation, Clause 7; Section 7.20 Planning Obligations, Non-monetary contributions No.5, to be amended with the additional text, highlighted in bold below: “5. To provide 50 allocated car parking for residents of Axis House. No charges for residents car parking at surface or basement levels save for reasonable service charges or ground rent for the upkeep and maintenance.”	To reflect the agreed wording in the previous s106 agreement of the extant planning permission.
Condition 19 - Materials & Fenestration Detailing. Text to be added (in bold) so that this becomes applicable later within the construction phase. “No development above damp proof course level ”	For accuracy and clarity.
Condition 24 - C02 Reductions. Text highlighted in bold, to be added so that reference is made to the correct energy document. “Prior to the commencement of development full details of the carbon reduction measures that conform to the energy strategy (Energy Assessment Rev.P1-J1054-ER-001, prepared by Kinetic Engineers Ltd, dated August 2018) shall be...”	For accuracy and clarity.
Condition 25 - Accessible Car Parking. Text highlighted in bold, to be amended for accuracy, should now read: “...This prescribed standard also states that an accessible parking space should be provided for every accessible bedroom, which in this instance should equate to 15 parking bays.”	For accuracy and clarity.

Item: 9 Page 193	Former Master Brewer Site, Freezeland Way
<i>Amendments/Additional Information:</i>	<i>Officer Comments:</i>

<p>Add new informative: The decision to refuse planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 adopted 2012 including supplementary planning guidance: PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment PT1.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage PT1.EM6 (2012) Flood Risk Management PT1.H1 (2012) Housing Growth PT1.H2 (2012) Affordable Housing LDF-AH Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010 HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006.</p>	<p>For completeness</p>
<p>Add new informative: On this decision notice, the following policies from the Council's Emerging Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Proposals Map (2015), including the Modifications published in 2018 are relevant to this decision: Emerging Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies, DMH 2 Housing Mix DMH 7 Provision of Affordable Housing DMHB 1 Heritage Assets DMHB 10 High Buildings and Structures DMHB 11 Design of New Development DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping DMHB 16 Housing Standards DMHB 17 Residential Density DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space DMT 6 Vehicle Parking DME2 Employment Uses Outside of Designated Sites DMEI Living Walls and Roofs and Onsite Vegetation DMEI 2 Reducing Carbon Emissions DMEI 6 Development in Green Edge Locations DMEI 7 Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement DMEI 9 Management of Flood Risk DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality DMEI 14 Air Quality DMCI 7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy DMTC 1 Town Centre Development DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts DMT 2 Highways Impacts DMT 4 Public Transport DMT 5 Pedestrians and Cyclists DMT 6 Vehicle Parking DMCI 3 Public Open Space Provision DMTC 3 Maintaining the Viability of Local Centres and Local Parades Local Plan: Part Two Site Allocations and Designations, Emerging Policy SA 14 'Master Brewer and Hillingdon Circus'.</p>	<p>For completeness.</p>
<p>The applicants have indicated that they have not agreed to the following Heads of Terms. (v). None of the market housing will be occupied until 100% of the affordable housing is delivered.</p>	<p>Given that the application is being recommended for refusal, further negotiations with the</p>

<p>– this item is not accepted. Revised wording has been suggested, at 75% of the private sale units on a phased basis.</p> <p>(vii). Landscape Screening and Ecological Mitigation: a financial contribution in the sum of at least £252,308.88.</p> <p>-This figure is not accepted.</p> <p>(viii) Air Quality: a financial contribution in the sum £247,906 has been identified and is not accepted. Confirmation of the methodology is required.</p>	<p>applicants regarding details of the proposed heads of terms have not been undertaken.</p>
<p>3 petitions in objection to the proposals have been received since publication of the committee report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A petition bearing 22 signatures, organised by the Ickenham Residents' Association has been received, objecting to the application on the following grounds: We the undersigned fully support the Ickenham Residents Association in their objective of ensuring that the wishes of its members as well as the wishes of the people of Ickenham in general are heard by the LBH Planning Committee. 2) A petition organised by the Oak Farm Residents' Association bearing 24 signatures has been received, objecting to the application on the following grounds: We the undersigned fully support the Oak Farm Residents' Association in their objective of ensuring that the wishes of its members as well as the wishes of the people of Oak Farm Estate in general are heard by the LBH Planning Committee. 3) A petition bearing 28 valid signatures organised by the residents of Ickenham Manor and Long Lane Farm has been received, objecting to the application on the following grounds: We the undersigned, fully support residents of Ickenham Manor and Long Lane Farm to ensure that their objections to the application are heard by the LBH Planning Committee. Plus visual images of the impact of the proposed development on Ickenham Manor and Long Lane Farm. 	<p>For completeness and to allow for speaking rights for petitioners to be acknowledged. Comments from the Ickenham Residents' Association have been reproduced in full in the main body of the report (page 219). Comments from the Oak Farm Residents' Association have been reproduced in full in the main body of the report (page 226). Representations from residents of Ickenham Manor and Long Lane Farm are reflected in the main body of the report. (pages 214 - 215)</p>
<p>10 additional individual internet representations have been received from local residents (9 objecting and one in support), the contents of which reiterate previous comments set out on page 214-215 of the committee report.</p>	<p>For completeness</p>
<p>1 additional consultation letters received from the MP for Uxbridge and South Ruislip who has objected to the proposed scheme supporting the objections raised by the Oak Farm RA (see above).</p>	<p>For completeness</p>

Item:	297 Long Lane
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:

Additional comment of objection to the proposals received that includes concerns raised in previous noted objections plus an objection to the proposed flat roof design, proximity to RAF Northolt Flight path and potential to attract birds, that a Bird Hazard assessment needs to be completed and safety risks.

For completeness