

BRISTOL
CAMBRIDGE
CARDIFF
EBBSFLEET
EDINBURGH
LEEDS
LONDON
MANCHESTER
NEWCASTLE
READING
SOLIHULL

**BARTON
WILLMORE** bartonwillmore.co.uk
7 Soho Square
London
W1D 3QB
T/ 0207 446 6888

James Rodger
Head of Planning & Enforcement
Residents Services
3S/03, Civic Centre
High Street
Uxbridge
Middlesex
UB8 1UW

24552/A3/DO

24 October 2017

BY EMAIL & TRANSMITTAL

Dear James

Former Nestle Factory, Hayes
Ref: 1331/APP/2017/1883
Outstanding Planning Matters

Further to your letter dated 13 October 2017, we respond below to the outstanding matters to be resolved in relation to the planning application to redevelop the former Nestle factory in Hayes, which is to be determined at planning committee at the end of November 2017.

Affordable Housing

As you are aware, the masterplan submitted for approval has been designed as tenure blind, therefore at the point of the submission of the planning application, the overall location of affordable housing and tenure provision was not determined.

The Proposed Development will meet LBH affordable housing policy by providing 35% affordable housing by habitable room. The proposed tenure split is 30% low cost rent (London Affordable Rent), 30% intermediate product (shared ownership) and the remaining 40% also intermediate (shared ownership). This approach is supported by the GLA and has been confirmed in both pre-application discussions and the GLA Stage One Report. As the proposals are policy compliant, i.e. 35% affordable housing being proposed, a financial viability appraisal is not required for the determination of the planning application.

A number of meetings have been held with housing, planning and Housing Zone officers, to discuss a preferred affordable housing unit mix, which has been led by the Council seeking to acquire some of the affordable units to decant its existing tenants from other properties in Hayes. Following these discussions, Barratt London has agreed, in principle, to sell the London



FS 29637

Registered in England
Number: OC342692

Barton Willmore LLP
Registered Office:
The Blade
Abbey Square
Reading
RG1 3BE
F/ +44 (0)118 943 0001

Affordable Rent units to LBH, subject to contract and detailed discussions to agree commercial terms.

Barratt London's formal affordable housing offer is as follows:

- 35% affordable housing by habitable room, split (70:30 Intermediate: London Affordable Rent), 30% intermediate product (shared ownership) and 40% also intermediate (shared ownership) and 30% low cost rent (London Affordable Rent);
- This equates to 469 affordable dwellings out of a total of 1,381, split between 330 shared ownership and 139 London Affordable Rent;
- 29% (41 units) of the London Affordable Rent dwellings are family sized 3-bed units, with a further 22 3-bed units proposed within the shared ownership tenure.

A summary of the proposed overall housing provision is as follows:

Unit Type	London Affordable Rent	Intermediate	Private Market	Total
Studio	0	33	78	111
One-bedroom	62	135	378	575
Two-bedroom	36	140	381	557
Three-bedroom	41	22	75	138
Total	139	330	912	1,381

Further details are shown on drawings MP 702, MP 800 – 809, which are enclosed. These show the proposed location of all of the affordable residential dwellings. These drawings are to be read in conjunction with the accompanying schedule, setting out details of the units and within which phase they are proposed to be delivered.

Affordable Housing Split

Further information has been requested in relation to the proposed split of tenures within the affordable housing offer, which is proposed at 70% intermediate and 30% London Affordable Rent.

Policy 3.11 and 3.12 in the London Plan states that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing provision should be sought when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use-schemes. It also states that targets should be applied flexibly, taking into account, inter alia, site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements.

The Mayor of London's aim is to ensure that Londoners have access to a wide choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for homes of different sizes and types (Policy 3.8). In terms of tenure split, London Plan Policy 3.11 aims for 60% of the provision to be affordable rent and 40% intermediate housing.

Since the planning application was submitted, the Mayor of London has adopted his Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (August 2017). Paragraph 13 states that the Mayor's preferred affordable housing tenure mix includes a range of products to meet different needs, with principally low cost rented accommodation to meet general needs, and London Living Rent and shared ownership to meet intermediate needs.

Paragraph 2.40 states that the preferred tenure split for schemes to deliver is as follows:

- At least 30 per cent low cost rent (social rent or affordable rent);

- At least 30 per cent as intermediate products, with London Living Rent; and
- The remaining 40 per cent to be determined by the LPA.

The proposed affordable housing offer is compliant with the provisions set out in the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG. The scheme proposes a range of unit types and tenures that meet general and intermediate needs and the proposed tenure split is also consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 2.40 of the SPG. The GLA confirmed in its Stage One report that:

"The weighting towards intermediate tenure has been developed following joint GLA/Hillingdon Council pre-application discussions, and (whilst representing a departure from the strategic split within London Plan Policy 3.11) the tenure balance accords with the parameters of the Mayor's draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG".

In relation to local planning policy, the Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policy SO7 seeks to address housing need in Hillingdon using appropriate planning measures. Policy H2 states that housing provision is expected to include a range of housing to meet the need of all types of households and LBH will seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing from all sites. For sites with a capacity of 10 or more units, the Council will seek to ensure that the affordable housing mix reflects housing needs in the borough, particularly the need for larger family units.

The policy supporting text sets an indicative target of 35% of all new units to be delivered as affordable. It also sets an indicative tenure mix of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate, but notes that housing market conditions in Hillingdon are complex and a blanket approach will not be appropriate for all areas in the borough.

The proposed scheme meets the requirements of strategic Policy SO7 and Policy H2 as the proposed scheme seeks to deliver a range of housing types and tenure to meet local housing need, including a significant amount of family housing within the London Affordable Rent tenure.

The Local Plan Part 1 provides only an indicative tenure split of affordable housing. Paragraph 6.29 states:

"Subject to viability and if appropriate in all the circumstances, the EVA indicates that 35% of all new units in the borough should be delivered as affordable housing, with an indicative tenure mix of 70% housing for social rent and 30% intermediate housing. Housing market conditions in Hillingdon are complex and a one size fits all approach to tenure provision will not be suitable for all areas in the borough".

The guidance set out above allows affordable housing tenure split requirements to be applied flexibly. This supports the proposed affordable housing offer in the context of complying with the provisions of the Mayor's SPD. Given the

Overall, the scheme proposes to deliver a significant proportion of affordable units, 469 in total, 63 of which are 3-bed family housing. This represents over half of the identified affordable housing need within the Hayes Town Centre Housing Zone.

In addition to the significant proportion of affordable housing, the scheme brings a number of additional public benefits (see page 6 below), CIL requirements and mitigation measures that should be considered in the overall affordable housing offer in line with the guidance set out in paragraph 6.29 of the Local Plan Part 1.

Increase in Residential Parking Ratio

As requested by officers, the overall provision of car parking has been increased within the residential scheme from 0.5 to 0.6 spaces per unit. This has been achieved by increasing the size of the basement underneath Block B within the residential area of the proposed development.

A response in relation to disabled parking is under the section "Disabled Parking Strategy" below.

Nestles Avenue Widening

As confirmed in email correspondence on 13 and 17 October 2017, both Barratt London and SEGRO are supportive of the Council's desire to improve the transport connectivity and accessibility in this part of Hayes through the implementation of a multi-modal transport spine (MTS Scheme) and recognise this would be beneficial to both existing and future residents of the Nestle factory development.

The applicants have agreed to grant the Council the necessary rights of access on land within the Nestle factory site required by the MTS scheme, to be adopted as public highway.

As requested, enclosed is a drawing (ref: MP 725) showing the maximum area of land take required by the MTS scheme within the former Nestle factory site. The maximum parameter area identified has been informed by the design work that Project Centre has undertaken, together with the proposed revised location for the bus turning area (see PBA drawing ref: 30710/5501/SK003, enclosed for illustrative purposes, not for approval) and the proposed bus layby (away from the Wallis Gardens railings). The area of land identified will be safeguarded until such time as LBH has obtained the necessary permissions to deliver the MTS scheme in its entirety.

The enclosed drawing (ref: MP 725) serves two purposes a) to be an approved drawing as part of any future planning permission, showing the maximum area of land required for the MTS scheme and b) to be included as part of the s.106 agreement to safeguard the land and to identify land over which the necessary rights will be granted to the Council to deliver the scheme and for such land to become adopted as public highway. Relevant clauses will also be included within the s.106 to set out the provisions for access, notices etc, the detail of which is to be agreed.

Baseline Traffic

There have been a number of submissions on this issue as part of the pre-application discussions, within the Transport Assessment and as part of other documentation submitted with the Application.

A structural survey was undertaken of the main factory building and the canteen, which can be seen in Appendix A of the Transport Assessment and is enclosed with this letter. This found that buildings on the former Nestle site could be repaired to a sufficient standard to allow them to be structurally safe for occupation.

A further report was produced by Savills (enclosed) regarding the potential to re-let the existing buildings for the current B2 use and whether there was any market demand for this. This indicated that there is demand for B2 floorspace in the area, particularly in the food production sector. This type of user has a preference for ground and first floor space and is unlikely to be interested in the upper floors of the retained buildings above this level.

It is therefore clear that if for some reason redevelopment of the site was not possible (for example if planning consent was refused), rather than leaving the site vacant the owner has the

opportunity to receive some immediate return by letting the floorspace for which there is a market, on a temporary basis. The rental return is likely to be limited, as the space available is in poor condition. Any let would be on a temporary basis and would not be viable in the long term future of the site. For this reason the TA reasonably assumes in the baseline scenarios that parts of the existing floorspace could be re-occupied. This effectively reflects what the situation would be if there were no appetite or consent for redevelopment of the site.

This approach to the modelling has been previously agreed with TfL and is in line with national transport assessment guidance. It should also be noted that Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement included a sensitivity test assuming a baseline scenario with none of the buildings being occupied.

With regard to the ability to retain the existing buildings, as explained above if they were to be retained in B2 use they are only likely to be partially occupied and the market would be limited because of the nature of the space available. This would mean that the rental return would be substantially lower than would be achieved with modern, bespoke B2 buildings.

The potential for conversion of the buildings to residential use has been investigated by De Metz Forbes Knight Architects Ltd and a separate report on this has previously been submitted to LB Hillingdon, which is also enclosed. The footprint of the existing buildings are very deep, as typical for industrial buildings of the era, and as a result do not lend themselves to economic conversion to residential use. In particular, there would be issues with natural light within the residential units.

The justification for demolition of the buildings is therefore not wholly dependent on their structural integrity or whether there is market for them. The issue is that there would be a limited market for the space in its current condition. The modernisation / conversion of the existing buildings for industrial or residential uses has been demonstrated to not result in an economically viable scheme, as they would not allow for a scheme that would have a broad market appeal.

Substantial Harm

We note that officers remain of the view that the Proposed Development would lead to substantial harm to the conservation area.

As stated in our letter dated 18 August 2017 and Turley's letter dated 17 August 2017 (enclosed), if harm is discerned (and without prejudice to our position that on consideration and balance of impact on significance as a whole and as found today that no overall harm arises), it would fall at the lower end of the scale and be justified under paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, i.e. the proposals will lead to a less than substantial harm. An extract from Turley's letter is as follows:

"In these terms, harm – if discerned (and without prejudice to our position that on consideration and balance of impact on significance as a whole and as found today that no overall harm arises), would fall at the lower end of the scale. Indeed, after due assessment this is the conclusion drawn by both Historic England and the GLA.

It is also useful to note that in practice, the meaning of substantial harm has been considered in the case of Bedford BC v Secretary of State [2014] EWHC 2847 (admin). Here, it was noted that significance may be harmed through alteration of the asset or may be lost through destruction of the asset. It was concluded that for harm to be substantial, the impact on significance was required to be serious, such that "very much, if not all, of the significance was drained away". It was concluded that one was looking for an effect which would have such a serious impact on

significance of the asset that its significance was either "vitiating altogether or very much reduced".

This further strengthens the case that the application proposals, on objective assessment of the relative nature, extent and level of significance as found today – as opposed to the physical scale of proposed change, would clearly not 'vitate altogether' the relative significance of the conservation area. Historic England specifically note that much demolition and particularly the removal of the unsightly modern accretions to the Truscon Building will "help better reveal significance rather than cause harm". With respect to the Truscon Building itself, Historic England further state "we do not consider that the internal demolition of the would substantially harm the character of the Conservation Area, particularly as the external envelope would be retained on sides".

On the basis of these considerations we urge that should officers on balance of relevant considerations conclude that harm is discerned to significance, that it can at worst, be no more than a 'less than substantial' level. This would trigger the policy requirements of paragraph 134 of the Framework – i.e. that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Officers can draw support for such conclusions from the assessments made by Historic England and the GLA in this respect. Historic England specifically recommend that "it will be for your Authority to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the scheme in accordance with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF".

This approach has been endorsed by Historic England, the GLA and in advice provided by Rupert Warren QC in conference. In correspondence dated 17 October 2017, Historic England concludes:

"We do, however, maintain that some harm to the Conservation Area will inevitably be caused to the overall integrity of the site and particularly the Truscon building in the proposed land uses. It is for the Local Planning Authority to be convinced that this harm is justified, and outweighed by public benefits in accordance with Paragraphs 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework respectively."

Also enclosed is correspondence from the GLA and Historic England, confirming this. An extract from the GLA Stage 1 report states:

"Following an iterative process of design review undertaken at pre-application stage, GLA officers are of the view that a favourable balance has been struck between the loss and retention of Locally Listed Buildings within the Botwell: Nestle Conservation Area."

The key test provided in Paragraph 134 is that any less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, the public benefits flowing directly from the proposed development are:

- The redevelopment of a redundant, brownfield site in a strategic location that seeks to positively contribute to the wider area and meet the principles of strategic planning policy and Housing Zone aspirations within the Hayes opportunity area;
- The development of a masterplan that considers the site in context with surrounding development sites, with its layout promoting permeability and linkages with neighbouring sites, particularly to Hayes town centre, the train station and Crossrail service;
- The layout of the masterplan is already compatible for future development proposals for adjoining land owners;

- The enhancement of the conservation area and on-site heritage assets, to include the retention of locally listed buildings, structures and main factory building façades;
- High quality architectural design responding to the constraints and opportunities presented by the site, providing an exemplar of how residential uses successfully co-exist with industrial/employment uses;
- A very generous amount of publicly accessible open space (over 3 hectares) is proposed, opening up the previously private factory gardens to public access for the first time as well as children's playspace, semi-private courtyards and private amenity areas;
- A new canalside walkway and access to the Grand Union Canal will be created which will provide a new pedestrian route along the canal, increasing activity and further enhancing the use of and connection to the canal, meeting the aims of the Blue Ribbon Network;
- The new buildings comprise high quality architectural design and will provide an attractive and safe place for people to live, work and visit;
- The delivery of 1,381 new homes, a significant proportion of the new homes to be delivered in the designated Housing Zone. A mix of unit sizes are proposed including family dwellings;
- The delivery of affordable housing, the applicants are seeking to provide 35% by habitable room, overall. The tenure split is proposed to be 30% low cost rent (London Affordable Rent), 30% intermediate product (shared ownership) and 40% intermediate (shared ownership);
- The proposed residential units have been designed to be high quality and to comply (and where possible to exceed) with the National Technical Standards and the Mayor's Housing Design Standards;
- The provision of 0.6 car parking spaces per residential unit, with an overall site total of 997 spaces in podium undercroft, basement and on street, as well as 2,258 cycle parking spaces;
- 22,663 sq m of employment floorspace, comprising light industrial, research and development, warehousing, data centre and ancillary offices, which will provide up to 536 full-time equivalent employment opportunities for local people;
- The provision of onsite employment and construction training;
- The industrial units will be of a high specification and will achieve BREEAM Very Good;
- The provision of supporting uses to create a sense of community and place, to include a children's day nursery, a gym, café, small scale office suites, a flexible use community space;
- The high-quality landscape scheme and the proposed planting, will enhance the public realm increase the ecological benefits of the site and contribute to local biodiversity; and

- The Proposed Development will also generate a range of financial benefits including New Homes Bonus, Council Tax generation, Business Rates, Zero Carbon Homes, local and Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other site specific planning mitigation measures.

The public benefits listed above therefore outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area.

Heritage/Demolition

A comprehensive pack of information was submitted on 18 August 2017 that explains the demolition strategy for the main factory building. Expert consultants, Capita and Elliot Wood have both demonstrated how the main factory building facades will be retained, using retention frames that are common and widely used to successfully protect facades during demolition. This method of retention will not compromise the facades. We would welcome an additional meeting to talk through our proposals, should officers require this.

The design team has investigated the retention of the facades and the first two bays of the south and west sides of the Truscon building structure, however, the following conclusions were drawn:

- The columns of the existing structure do not currently work with the apartment layouts as designed. We also anticipate that the overall width of the building will need to increase by a minimum of 100mm to maintain a wheelchair accessible communal corridor. A number of columns, as yet undetermined, would also need to be removed and the structure altered in such a way as to allow this.
- The interface between the retained slab and the retained façade creates a thermal bridge (a continuous insulated cavity is not possible), thus whilst this can be insulated to a certain degree, it is not feasible to match the thermal performance of a retained façade, insulated cavity and new structure behind.
- The interface between the retained slab and the retained façade also creates a direct route for moisture ingress into the building, again this cannot be feasibly avoided and as such the external envelope would need to be suitably waterproofed. The NHBC Standards dictate that a paint finish alone is not sufficient and as such a render system must be applied to the external façade. The lifetime cost of the building is thus also increased to ensure this render finish is maintained to a suitable level, to ensure moisture ingress does not become an issue.
- The existing roof slabs are not capable of carrying the loads imposed by the proposed additional two storeys and must either be removed and new slabs cast or a new steel deck installed above the existing roof slabs. The new steel decks would increase the storey heights by 250mm per floor. Additional steel posts would be required to transfer the loads from the steel deck to ground level, where the upper floor is set back as they are not on a column line. These posts would require new foundations. The cost of installing new foundations within the existing structure will be prohibitive to the development.
- The condition of the ground floor slab has not yet been fully surveyed, however, the areas that have been surveyed have shown levels of corrosion that would indicate that the ground floor slab would need to be removed.
- The existing foundations are struggling to accommodate the proposed loadings, as such we would have to use lightweight methods of construction for the additional storeys, most likely timber frame. However timber frame is not suited to carrying cantilevered balconies

as currently designed, as such additional steel structures would need to be designed to carry any balconies, however this in turn increases the load on the structure and has not yet been designed and may be found to be unfeasible.

- The depth of the proposed F1 Block is approximately 2 and a ½ bays, as such steel posts would need to be installed to pick up the beams and slabs along the cut line. New foundations would have to be installed to pick up these posts. Again, the cost of such foundations will be prohibitive.
- The size of any new foundations would need to be such that no settlement would occur to limit the possibility of differential settlement between existing and new structures, further increasing the cost of the foundations within the existing structure.
- The existing structure would need to be adapted to accommodate builders work openings for services, lifts, stair cores, smoke vent shafts etc. This will be time consuming and costly. Initial surveys have shown that the existing concrete is weak and substantial temporary works and permanent strengthening of the structure will be require to allow such alterations to be made.
- Additional bracing would be necessary to provide lateral stability to the structure.
- The level of corrosion and calcification in the existing structure has not yet been fully surveyed and may make the retention of the structure unfeasible.
- A considerable amount of investigation works will be required to justify that the existing structure is physically capable of the proposed conversion and that it would provide a minimum of 60 years life span required under the NHBC standards. Until such an investigation has been completed, the extent of the required remedial works cannot be quantified or valued.

All the above points carry significant risks both to the financial viability and structural feasibility of the project and as such the proposed approach is considered to be robust in the overall context of the scheme. The proposals bring significant benefits and re-use of the facades of the Truscon building limits the impact on the conservation area to less than substantial harm and is supported by Historic England.

Disabled Parking Strategy

The overall parking numbers have been increased to provide 0.6 spaces per residential unit, which has been agreed with officers. In total 139 disabled spaces have been allowed. On day one of occupation 18 M4(3) bays are provided within the podium for Blocks B and C to cater for the wheelchair parking requirements of the affordable housing M4(3) units. A further 121 spaces have been allowed for at grade as part of the future expansion of the scheme (see plan). In addition, 26 blue badge spaces will be located within the external parking areas, close to the various building cores.

Barratt London through discussion with LB of Hillingdon has sought to maximise the amount of car parking, whilst minimising the impact on landscaping and public realm. This is achieved by providing 121 standard car parking spaces that can be converted to dedicated wheelchair spaces if required.

This is possible by converting two standard spaces in to one wheelchair space and a replacement space being brought into use in the landscape areas that have been identified for this purpose, ensuring that 0.6 spaces are provided.

As explained previously, whilst the lease to the spaces will be sold, there will be a provision within the residential occupiers lease to allow the relocation of their space within the site to enable this arrangement.

The applicants are proposing that a clause is included within the S106 Agreement to cover this point to demonstrate its commitment to the conversion/provision of disabled spaces as demand arises. BRAM, Barratt's management company will be responsible for the long term management of the site once developed and it will manage the on-site car parking strategy for residents and supporting uses.

As the additional M4(3) spaces can be located anywhere within the external parking zones there is complete flexibility in locating them in close proximity to the unit that requires the space. This can be seen from the drawings that were submitted as part of the Design and Access Statement, identifying the different external parking zones. A drawing to show the strategy is enclosed, ref: MP 721.

Modelling

Initial comments on some of the signal junction models have been received, these are currently being taken on board and a detailed response will be issued to TfL shortly on each of the models.

It is understood that the review of the WeLHAM modelling is currently being undertaken by TfL.

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.

The MTS bus link scheme is at an early stage of design by LBH. It does not form part of the Proposed Development although the applicants are prepared to safeguard an area of land to ensure that, subject to LBH obtaining all necessary consents and approvals (which would include undertaking its own modelling of the transport impacts), LBH has the ability to deliver it in the future.

At this stage, it is currently not known how many buses would use Nestles Avenue or their proposed frequency. Given the bus scheme is not committed, there is no information available regarding the numbers of buses being proposed and no detail regarding any proposed physical junction layout changes that would be required to accommodate it. It is therefore neither possible

nor appropriate for this to be assessed as part of the Nestle Site proposals as it is not a committed scheme.

Additional responses to Project Centre's comments has been sent under separate cover.

Disabled Access Matters

The Council's Access officer's comments were received and have been reviewed by David Bonnett Associates. The enclosed document sets out a response and resolution to each individual consultation comment received.

Waste Facility Provision

AECOM has produced a Waste and Recycling Response Note to address the comments received from LBH regarding the May 2017 Operational Waste and Recycling Management Strategy. This note is enclosed with this letter.

SEGRO Units Redesign

Revisions to the facades of the industrial units were submitted to the Council on 13 October 2017, drawing references and a summary of the design changes is as follows:

- MS200 & MS201 Elevations for Units 1, 2 & 3 – The pistachio colour has been introduced on 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.

Flooding/Drainage

The flood water management officer comments were received on 17 October 2017. Responses are below:

Residential Development

Hydrock, on behalf of Barratt London, has reviewed the comments received and a response is enclosed with this letter. Revised catchment drawings are also provided, refs: C151867-C-101 P8 and 104 P4.

Industrial Development

It is noted that LBH does not require any further information in relation to the industrial development as officers are satisfied with the surface water runoff rate and with the foul drainage proposals.

Capita has contacted LBH's drainage officer for clarity on observations made in relation to LBH encouraging the use of green roofs. It was confirmed that the design team has carefully explored green roofs and their viability as an option, however they are simply not appropriate for this scheme. Further explanation of this is set out in our letter dated 13 October 2017.

Any drainage condition in relation to the industrial development should be worded to achieve implementation in accordance with the submitted strategy.

In relation to the landscape issue raised in the drainage comments, it states on page 9 that the shared cycle footway widths do not conform with Sustrans recommendations. Enclosed with this letter is the Sustrans Technical Note 19, referring to page 3 under the heading "widths", there are 3 scenarios with recommendations. TALA, SEGRO's landscape consultant, proposes that the third scenario is the most appropriate. The paving along the Canalside, as illustrated on landscape drawing ref: LT100 (enclosed), widens at intervals to allow for safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists, without creating a wide boulevard of paving. This retains the scale for its likely usage and utilising as much area as possible for planting.

Page 9 of the consultation response states that the Trim Trail (parallel with North Hyde Gardens) to be particularly narrow. This has been designed at 3.0m width, bordered with low groundcover planting for visibility along its length. To meet the minimum Sustrans shared use standard, the path should be 3.5m width. Passing places could be provided at intervals by narrowing the plant beds if it is judged the path will be in frequent use. A copy of Sustrans' advice note is enclosed.

Data Centres

SEGRO has confirmed that planning permission will only be sought for a data centre use in one of the industrial units, Unit 1. The following condition wording is proposed to control the data centre use:

"Data centre use to be limited to Unit 1 in the industrial development, unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority."

Design

The Sandow building elevation has been amended to reflect officers' comments, which included reverting the design back to the originally submitted proposal although retaining the amended fenestration. This drawing was submitted on 13 October 2017, see drawings ref: DM-2-00 and DM-6-01.

Air Quality Matters

As noted above, we are working with TfL to agree the modelling and trip generation. Following agreement to this, the traffic data changes will be remodelled to reflect the impacts.

Canalside Moorings

Jonathan Webb requested in email correspondence dated 18 October 2017 that the applicant confirm its position on the provision of residential moorings on the bank of the Grand Union Canal.

SEGRO met Mark Blackwell of the Canal & River Trust on 18 October 2017 to discuss this issue. SEGRO and C&RT have previously considered permanent residential moorings (which require planning permission much like any residential development), although a potential problem with noise was identified. This is because residential canal boats do not have the noise attenuation to allow comfortable internal conditions in noisy locations. The SEGRO industrial scheme will operate 24/7 and the external yards are located next to the canal, whilst the industrial scheme has been designed to ensure that residents to the south and new residents to the west will not be adversely affected by noise, the scheme is not designed to prevent noise affecting permanent residents living in boats on the canal to the north.

With this in mind, SEGRO and C&RT have agreed that leisure and commercial moorings would be more appropriate for this part of the canal and details are being worked up for a pontoon facility

which would facilitate these. This is in the knowledge that the pontoon facilities could potentially be used for permanent residential moorings in the future if the noise concern goes away. There will also be a reed-lined aquatic margin which will bring environmental benefits.


C&RT has advised that it has statutory powers to implement leisure and commercial moorings, planning permission is only required for residential moorings. As the former is proposed, the canal moorings do not form part of the planning application.

Re-consultation

To confirm, LBH will re-consult on all amended material submitted for approval, in one 21 day consultation. Our understanding is that if there are further minor/non material changes, this will require a 14 day consultation, which can take place until the day of the planning committee, where any updates can be reported to members in an update report.

I look forward to reaching an agreed position.

Yours sincerely



Daniel Osborne
BARTON WILLMORE

Enclosures (in order of topic):

Affordable Housing

- Drawing Pack – Ref: MP 702 & MP 800-809
- Affordable Housing Provision Schedule

Nestle Avenue Widening

- Drawing Ref: MP 725 – Maximum area of safeguarded land for an emerging LB Hillingdon multi-modal transport proposal on Nestles Avenue
- Drawing Ref: 30710/5501/SK003 – Illustrative revised turning head layout, submitted for information not approval

Baseline Traffic

- dMFK Nestle Factory Conversion Analysis, June 2016
- Savills Viability of Existing Factory Building, May 2016
- Elliott Wood, Structural Survey Report, May 2017

Substantial Harm

- Turley advice letter, 17 August 2017
- GLA Pre-Application Report, 24 October 2017
- GLA Stage One Report, 19 July 2017
- Historic England Pre-Application Responses, 12 May 2016, 8 September 2016 & 17 October 2016

Disabled Parking Strategy

- Drawing Ref: MP 721 – Masterplan Cycles & Car Parking, Waste & Services

Disabled Access Matters

- David Bonnett Associates, Access Officer Response, October 2017

Waste Facility Provision

- AECOM, Waste and Recycling Response Note, October 2017

Flooding/Drainage

- Hydrock Response to Drainage Officer comments, October 2017
- Drawings Ref: C151867-C-101 P8 and 104 P4 – Revised Drainage Catchment
- Landscape Drawing Ref: LT 100 – Layout
- Sustrans Technical Note 19 – Segregation of shared use routes

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