

Matt Kolaszewski
Planning Department
Residents Services
3N, Civic Centre
High Street
Uxbridge
Middlesex
UB8 1UW

24552/A3/DO/RM/sl

13 October 2017

BY REGISTERED POST & TRANSMITTAL

Dear Matt

Former Nestle Factory, Hayes
Ref: 1331/APP/2017/1883
Scheme Amendments

Following on from our recent discussions and to address officer comments, enclosed are amendments to the overall masterplan, the residential and the industrial scheme drawings that form the proposed redevelopment of the former Nestle factory site in Hayes.

As requested, 1 x A1 and 1 x A3 set of drawings and updated CGIs are enclosed, together with a CD containing each individual drawing as well as a drawing booklet.

Masterplan and Residential Scheme

Details of the proposed amendments to the masterplan and residential schemes are shown on the enclosed schedule, prepared by Makower Architects. The schedule shows the proposed amendments, cross referenced to the relevant drawings.

Residential Scheme – Car Parking Amendments

As requested by officers, the overall provision of car parking has been increased within the residential scheme. Additional area is proposed within the basement of Block B within the residential area of the proposed development.

The extension to the basement area is proposed to increase the number of car parking spaces within the scheme, at the request of LB Hillingdon.

The provision of more car parking spaces increases the residential ratio of spaces from 0.5 to 0.6 spaces per unit. The increase in spaces is set out in the schedules below.



| Car Parking Spaces - Future Expansion | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Location | Standard | M4(3) | Blue Badge | Non-resi |
| Basement B | 136 | | | |
| Podium B | 194 | 9 | | |
| Podium C | 123 | 9 | | |
| Canal Street | 74 | 121 | 26 | 20 |
| Canal Mews | | | | |
| Milk Street | | | | |
| Milk Yard | | | | |
| Sandow Walk | | | | |
| Viveash Yard | | | | |
| Total | 527 | 139 | 26 | 20 |
| | 712 | | | |

| Car Parking Spaces - Future Expansion | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Location | Standard | M4(3) | Blue Badge | Non-resi |
| Basement B | 273 | | | |
| Podium B | 194 | 9 | | |
| Podium C | 123 | 9 | | |
| Canal Street | 74 | 121 | 26 | 20 |
| Canal Mews | | | | |
| Milk Street | | | | |
| Milk Yard | | | | |
| Sandow Walk | | | | |
| Viveash Yard | | | | |
| Total | 664 | 139 | 26 | 20 |
| | 849 | | | |

Block B Basement - Increased

The Transport Assessment estimates of residential traffic generation are based on a person trip rate for all modes of travel for a residential scheme of this type. Local vehicle mode share information for journeys to work from the 2011 Census have then been applied to obtain a vehicle trip rate per residential unit.

As the level of car use has been taken from data for the area immediately around the site, it reflects the availability of car parking for existing residents and the accessibility by other modes of transport. No adjustment was made to the vehicle trip rates to reflect the lower than average level of car parking provision for the development site. The vehicle trip rates therefore reflect existing car ownership and parking availability in the immediate area, which is higher than was proposed at 0.5 spaces per unit.

For existing flatted development in the Botwell Ward, the Census shows car ownership levels at 0.625 spaces per unit and at an average of 1.04 across all types and sizes of residential unit. The vehicle trip rates used would therefore reflect this and therefore remain a robust estimate of the level of traffic that the residential scheme would generate, even increased to an average of 0.6 spaces per residential unit. The increase in residential parking would therefore have no effect on the assessment that has been made of the traffic impact of the residential development proposals.

Industrial Scheme Changes

As notified in our letter dated 18 August 2017, SEGRO has undertaken a further design exercise to respond to officers' comments on the industrial part of the scheme. Details of the amendments to the planning application proposals are set out below.

The proposed industrial scheme changes are shown on the following drawings:

- MS 102 – Illustrative Site Layout Unit 1 Data Centre
- MS 200 - Illustrative Elevations Unit 1-P2
- MS 201 – Illustrative Elevations Units 2&3
- MS 202 - Illustrative Elevations Unit 4-P2
- MS 207 – Illustrative Elevations Units 1 Data Centre
- MS 210 – Roof Plan Unit 1
- MS 211 – Roof Plans Units 2&3
- Ms 212 – Roof Plan Unit 4

These drawings show the following changes:

- MS200 & MS201 Elevations for Units 1, 2 & 3 – The pistachio colour has been introduced on as part of the curtain walling spandrel panels between ground and first floor and the elevations overlooking the service yards have been updated to reflect the white grid based on the design of the other elevations.
- MS202 Elevations for Unit 4 – The dark panels on the north elevation have been replaced by white ones.
- MS210, MS211 & MS212 Roof Plans for Units 1, 2, 3 & 4 – Show the indicative location of roof lights and the position of PV panels.
- MS102 & MS207 Data Centre Option for Unit 1 – Show the indicative size and position of the external plant, on site layout and elevation drawing, of a potential Data Centre in Unit 1.

Updated Industrial Energy

Due to the provision of PVs on the roofs of the industrial units, the energy strategy for the industrial scheme has been amended to give 20% on site renewables. The 20% on site renewables contribution are made up from the CO2 savings from the air source heat pumps (VRF) topped up with an amount of PV to give the 20% total. The ASHP contribute a 5.1% saving with the PV providing the remaining 14.9%. Also enclosed is an updated executive summary to reflect the changes to the industrial scheme.

Response to Design Comments

Below are the outstanding responses to the comments received from the Conservation and Design Team from the SEGRO design team.

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| <p>31.</p> | <p>Only Unit 4 of the Segro site makes any attempt at reflecting the character of the original factory buildings, the others are very ordinary industrial sheds with barrel roof forms, which do not reflect the architectural style of any of the existing buildings.</p> | <p>The development of the former Nestle factory industrial scheme has followed an iterative approach between modern functionality and reference to the retained elements of the locally listed building together with reference to the housing proposals. Consistency in window types though the two elements can be seen on unit 4 along with the concrete frame designed to complement the existing Truscon façade. The grid of these windows, together with the art deco grid that can be seen in the canteen and the office element has inspired the gridded cladding proposed to all the buildings. This system has not been used elsewhere and design specifically for the commercial elements. This highlights the importance of this development.</p> <p>Following consultation with the design officers, it was explained, that along with elements that can be used – such as the cladding etc., it is also as important that functionally the buildings must work as well. External gutters must feature in order to avoid leakage risk which necessitates the use of barrel vault roofs. Following this meeting, further reference to the retained elements are incorporated into the design – such as the mint colour</p> |
|------------|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|----|-----|-------------------------------|----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|--------|-----|-------------------------------|-------|----|--------------------------------|-----|----|
| | | <p>spandrel panels which are now incorporated into the design of the office elevations, and the grid of which extended to the next bay up. Furthermore the design officer has suggested that the canopy and colonnade is removed. This detail has also been incorporated into the design and the revised proposals.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>32.</p> | <p>Unit 1 needs a better detailed elevation onto Nestle Avenue, a green wall? The northern elevation of unit 3 needs to look more like unit 1 and relate better to the original factory design. All of the units should have green roofs.</p> | <p>The unit 1 elevation to Nestle Avenue is situated behind a thick screen of existing and mature trees. It is intended that this is further thickened with more trees and planting and therefore a green wall is not necessary. The proposed cladding is a rainscreen system of varying shades of silvers, which is of a superior quality finish and design to that of a standard industrial elevation.</p> <p>SEGRO has seriously considered green walls and screens on all of its elevations, although these are not proposed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As part of the design evolution of the scheme, we have previously discounted green walls as being excessively expensive and with major maintenance implications for occupiers. 2. Green screens have also been considered, although climbers will only grow about 4m approximately and so cannot cover the 12m in height to the eaves industrial units. 3. The proposed elevations are of the highest quality. 4. High quality landscaping is being provided and includes indigenous species which are good for creating habitats. A native mixed hedge for example will provide much better habitat than a screen of ivy. The industrial scheme provides the following quantum of soft landscaping: <table data-bbox="742 1456 1356 1859"> <tr> <td>Existing trees prior to demolition</td> <td>86</td> <td>No.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing trees to be retained</td> <td>60</td> <td>No.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed trees</td> <td>147</td> <td>No.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total trees within industrial area</td> <td>207</td> <td>No.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net gain of trees</td> <td>121</td> <td>No.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed number of shrubs</td> <td>14,637</td> <td>No.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing shrubs to be removed</td> <td>1,140</td> <td>m2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing shrubs to be retained</td> <td>182</td> <td>m2</td> </tr> </table> | Existing trees prior to demolition | 86 | No. | Existing trees to be retained | 60 | No. | Proposed trees | 147 | No. | Total trees within industrial area | 207 | No. | Net gain of trees | 121 | No. | Proposed number of shrubs | 14,637 | No. | Existing shrubs to be removed | 1,140 | m2 | Existing shrubs to be retained | 182 | m2 |
| Existing trees prior to demolition | 86 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing trees to be retained | 60 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed trees | 147 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total trees within industrial area | 207 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net gain of trees | 121 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed number of shrubs | 14,637 | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing shrubs to be removed | 1,140 | m2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing shrubs to be retained | 182 | m2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | | <p>Proposed plant beds 4,290 m2</p> <p>Proposed grass areas 2,130 m2</p> <p>Industrial Area 23,578 m2</p> <p>Area of proposed soft 28 %</p> <p>Native hedgerow (East boundary) 215 m</p> <p>Beech Hedge 530 m</p> <p>Ornamental species hedge 172 m</p> <p>Green roofs are not possible to portal framed buildings due to the additional weight of the substrate and planting involved. To achieve a green roof, substantial additional weight of steel and concrete (to foundations) will be required together, which seriously affects viability, with significant compromise to the roof lights required to allow daylight into the building.</p> |
| 33. | The Segro site could have shared office and visitor parking in a multi- storey structure, as per the Vinyl Factory site, so freeing up the land adjacent to the canal. | <p>The scheme has been designed so that individual tenants can lease properties that has its own service yards, officer and car parking, which is representative of the type of units proposed and the market they are aimed at. Separate businesses will occupy each of the buildings and will require their own parking facilities to allow for each unit's individual operations.</p> <p>The proposed Nestle redevelopment does not compare with the Vinyl factory where multi tenanted building is provided with support facilities and car parking can be shared.</p> |
| 34. | The end use of the buildings on the Segro site should be agreed. Having "flexible units" could mean that in the future applications may be submitted for additions or changes to the size and external appearance of the units that may be detrimental to the appearance of the conservation area. If the units are to be used for data storage, then this should be made clear at this | <p>A data centre use is now only proposed to be contained within Unit 1, unless otherwise agreed with the Council. The enclosed drawings show where additional kit could be accommodated within the service yard and how the enclosure would look in plan form and on elevations.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | stage and the site design amended accordingly, this may free up space within the loading bay areas etc. for landscaping. | |
|--|--|--|

If you have any further queries, please contact me at this office.

Yours sincerely



Daniel Osborne
BARTON WILLMORE

Enc.

Cc L O'Hagan Barratt London
M Scholar Barratt London
S Lord SEGRO
N Impiazzi SEGRO