



Daniel Watney LLP
165 Fleet Street
London
EC4A 2DW

Planning Applications Team
London Borough of Hillingdon
Civic Centre, High Street
Uxbridge

Tel: 01895 250230
Case Officer: Johanna Hart
Email: jhart@hillington.gov.uk
Date: 20th November 2018
Our Ref: 51175/PRC/2018/151

Dear Daniel Watney LLP

RE: Redevelopment to provide 83 build to rent apartments, employment floorspace and associated car parking

SITE: Stanford House, 9 Nestles Avenue Hayes

I refer to your request for pre-application planning advice dated 29th June 2018 and our subsequent meeting on 23rd August 2018 relating to the above development. The advice provided is based on the following drawings and documents issued to the Local Planning Authority for consideration:

Plan Numbers: Pre-Application Report (Revised), prepared by Brimelow McSweeney Architects, date
Covering Letter provided by Daniel Watney dated 29/06/18 - received 29 Jun 2018
Technical Note, prepared by i-Transport dated 28/06/18 - received 29 Jun 2018
Pre-Application Document, prepared by Daniel Watney - received 21 Aug 2018

Outlined below is a preliminary assessment of the proposal, including an indication of the main issues that should be addressed should you choose to submit a formal planning application. Please note that the views expressed in this letter represent officer opinion only and cannot be taken to prejudice the formal decision of the Council in respect of any subsequent planning application, on which consultation would be carried out which may raise additional issues. In addition, the depth of analysis provided corresponds with the scope of information made available to Council officers.

The Site and Surrounds

The enquiry site comprises an approximately 0.2 hectare rectangular plot located on the north east side of Nestles Avenue in Hayes. It currently accommodates Stanford house, a two-storey industrial building with associated sheds, accesses and car parking.

To the south west, on the opposite side of Nestles Avenue, lies a predominantly residential area, largely characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties.

The site currently falls within the Nestles Avenue Industrial and Business Area (IBA), the Hayes/West Drayton Corridor and an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) as designated in the Hillingdon Local Plan. It also falls within the Hayes Housing Zone and the Heathrow Opportunity Area, as designated in the London Plan (2016). It is immediately bounded to the south east by Botwell/Nestles Conservation Area.

The Hayes Town Centre Housing Zone, is a 238 ha area which was selected in March 2016 by the Mayor of London as one of 31 new Housing Zones in London. The Council's emerging Local Plan: Part 2 identifies this as one of three sites (this forming a part of site B) along Nestles Avenue, due to be released from their current Industrial and Business Area (IBA) designation and allocated for mixed-use redevelopment. The principle of the development will be discussed in Part 7.1 of this report. However, it is notable that planning permission (ref: 1331/APP/2017/1883) was granted earlier this year for the comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the former Nestle Factory site (Site A), to provide 1,386 dwellings; office, retail, community and leisure uses (Use Class A1/A3/A4/B1/B8/D1/D2); commercial floorspace (Use Classes B1c/B2/B8); a Data Centre (sui generis); amenity and playspace; allotments; car parking; and associated development. Planning applications are also under consideration relating to the comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of nos.3 & 233-236 Nestle Avenue (Site C) (ref: 73238/APP/2018/1145) and 3 Viveash Close (part of site B) (ref: 36678/APP/2017/1774).

The Proposal

This proposal seeks the redevelopment of Stanford House to provide a 4 - 10 storey building comprising 83 residential units, with ground floor commercial use, roof-top amenity space, 15 car parking spaces and ancillary development.

In total, the development would provide 41 one-bedroom units, 31 two-bedroom units and 11 three-bedroom units.

467m² of commercial space is proposed.

Planning Policy

The proposed development would be assessed against the Development Plan Policies contained within Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1, Saved Unitary Development Plan policies, the London Plan 2015, the NPPF and supplementary planning guidance prepared by both LB Hillingdon and the GLA.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.CI1	(2012) Community Infrastructure Provision
PT1.E1	(2012) Managing the Supply of Employment Land
PT1.E3	(2012) Strategy for Heathrow Opportunity Area
PT1.E6	(2012) Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SME)
PT1.EM1	(2012) Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation
PT1.EM11	(2012) Sustainable Waste Management
PT1.EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
PT1.EM8	(2012) Land, Water, Air and Noise
PT1.H1	(2012) Housing Growth
PT1.H2	(2012) Affordable Housing
PT1.T1	(2012) Accessible Local Destinations

Other Policies:

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE3	Buildings or uses likely to cause noise annoyance - mitigation measures
OE5	Siting of noise-sensitive developments
OE7	Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures
OE8	Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures
OE11	Development involving hazardous substances and contaminated land - requirement for ameliorative measures
H4	Mix of housing units
H5	Dwellings suitable for large families
H6	Considerations influencing appropriate density in residential development.
LE1	Proposals for industry, warehousing and business development
LE2	Development in designated Industrial and Business Areas
LE4	Loss of existing industrial floorspace or land outside designated Industrial and Business Areas
R17	Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of recreation, leisure and community facilities
AM1	Developments which serve or draw upon more than a walking distance based catchment area - public transport accessibility and capacity considerations
AM2	Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact on congestion and public transport availability and capacity
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM8	Priority consideration to pedestrians in the design and implementation of road construction and traffic management schemes
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
AM13	AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people and people with disabilities in development schemes through (where appropriate): -

- (i) Dial-a-ride and mobility bus services
- (ii) Shopmobility schemes
- (iii) Convenient parking spaces
- (iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street furniture schemes

AM14	New development and car parking standards.
AM15	Provision of reserved parking spaces for disabled persons
LPP 2.2	(2016) London and the wider metropolitan region
LPP 2.3	(2016) Growth Areas and Co-ordination Corridors
LPP 2.7	(2016) Outer London: Economy
LPP 2.8	(2016) Outer London: Transport
LPP 2.13	(2016) Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas
LPP 2.18	(2016) Green Infrastructure: the multi functional network of open and green spaces
LPP 3.3	(2016) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.6	(2016) Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
LPP 3.7	(2016) Large residential developments
LPP 3.8	(2016) Housing Choice
LPP 3.9	(2016) Mixed and Balanced Communities
LPP 3.10	(2016) Definition of affordable housing
LPP 3.11	(2016) Affordable housing targets
LPP 3.12	(2016) Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes
LPP 3.13	(2016) Affordable housing thresholds
LPP 3.15	(2016) Co-Ordination of Housing Development and Investment
LPP 3.16	(2016) Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
LPP 4.1	(2016) Developing London's economy
LPP 4.2	(2016) Offices
LPP 4.3	(2016) Mixed use development and offices
LPP 4.4	(2016) Managing Industrial Land and Premises
LPP 5.1	(2016) Climate Change Mitigation
LPP 5.2	(2016) Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
LPP 5.3	(2016) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 5.7	(2016) Renewable energy
LPP 5.10	(2016) Urban Greening
LPP 5.11	(2016) Green roofs and development site environs
LPP 5.12	(2016) Flood risk management
LPP 5.13	(2016) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.14	(2016) Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
LPP 5.15	(2016) Water use and supplies
LPP 5.17	(2016) Waste capacity

LPP 5.21	(2016) Contaminated land
LPP 6.1	(2016) Strategic Approach
LPP 6.2	(2016) Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport
LPP 6.3	(2016) Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
LPP 6.5	(2016) Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
LPP 6.9	(2016) Cycling
LPP 6.10	(2016) Walking
LPP 6.11	(2016) Smoothing Traffic Flow and Tackling Congestion
LPP 6.12	(2016) Road Network Capacity
LPP 6.13	(2016) Parking
LPP 7.2	(2016) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.3	(2016) Designing out crime
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character
LPP 7.5	(2016) Public realm
LPP 7.6	(2016) Architecture
LPP 7.7	(2016) Location and design of tall and large buildings
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
LPP 7.13	(2016) Safety, security and resilience to emergency
LPP 7.14	(2016) Improving air quality
LPP 7.15	(2016) Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes.
LPP 7.19	(2016) Biodiversity and access to nature
LPP 7.21	(2016) Trees and woodlands
LPP 8.2	(2016) Planning obligations
LPP 8.3	(2016) Community infrastructure levy
LPP 8.4	(2016) Monitoring and review
NPPF- 2	NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF- 5	NPPF-5 2018 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF- 6	NPPF-6 2018 - Building a strong, competitive economy
NPPF- 8	NPPF-8 2018 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
NPPF- 9	NPPF-9 2018 - Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF- 11	NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 14	NPPF-14 2018 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF- 15	NPPF-15 2018 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Main Planning Issues

1. Principle of development

As mentioned above, the site currently falls within the Nestles Avenue Industrial and Business Area (IBA), the Hayes/West Drayton Corridor and an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) as designated in the Hillingdon Local Plan. It also falls

within the Hayes Housing Zone and the Heathrow Opportunity Area, as designated in the London Plan (2016).

The Hayes Town Centre Housing Zone, is a 238 ha area which was selected in March 2016 by the Mayor of London as one of 31 new Housing Zones in London. The Council's emerging Local Plan: Part 2 identifies this as one of three sites (this forming a part of site B) along Nestles Avenue, due to be released from their current Industrial and Business Area (IBA) designation and allocated for mixed-use redevelopment.

As discussed at our meeting, planning permission (ref: 1331/APP/2017/1883) has already been granted for the comprehensive redevelopment of plot A (the former Nestles Factory Site). Details of that application can be viewed on the Council's website. Notwithstanding this, planning permission has very recently been refused for the proposed redevelopment of no.3 Viveash Close, which forms the northern part of site B. Similar to the proposals under consideration as part of this pre-application enquiry, that application sought the redevelopment of that site to provide a predominantly residential development with commercial floorspace at lower levels. As that scheme also forms a part of site B and is for a similar type of development to that now proposed, it is considered to be directly relevant to this scheme.

With regard to the principle of development, the officer report for that scheme states:

"Policy 2.13 of the London Plan notes that Hayes forms part of the wider Heathrow Opportunity Area which is identified as having capacity to accommodate a minimum of 9,000 new homes and 12,000 additional jobs. The London Plan also specifically recognises the Hayes-West Drayton corridor as offering a range of redevelopment opportunities - including small business parks, logistics and mixed uses.

This 0.2 hectare site forms part of the Squirrels Trading Estate which is located within a wider 34 hectare expanse of employment land south of the railway at Hayes and Harlington known as the 'Nestles Avenue Industrial Cluster'. All 34 hectares of this cluster is currently subject to designation as a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL). London Plan Policy 2.17 seeks to promote, manage and, where appropriate, protect SILs. Further to this, the latest evidence of strategic demand (London industrial land demand study 2017) suggests that boroughs need to intensify industrial land and retain overall levels of floorspace in order to safeguard future capacity to service the London economy and its growing population. This new evidence underscores the importance of a carefully managed plan-led approach to employment land management in line with London Plan Policy 2.17.

Hillingdon Council's Emerging Local Plan: Part 2 (2018) proposes the release of 16 hectares of SIL from the Nestles Avenue Industrial Cluster (including this site as part of the wider Squirrels Trading Estate). However, this release is predicated on a requirement within Emerging Policy SA 5 of the Site Allocations Plan (Proposed Modifications 2018) to re-provide a specified proportion of employment space as part of any mixed use redevelopment. The key drivers for the proposed release of SIL land at the Nestles Avenue Industrial Cluster (rather than elsewhere in the borough) are: the proximity of this land to the Hayes and Harlington Crossrail station and, the potential for comprehensive redevelopment of this land to support sustainable suburban intensification of homes and jobs and the regeneration of Hayes town centre, in line with Policy 2.15 of the London Plan (2016).

As part of the coordinated approach to SIL consolidation discussed above, the Emerging Local Plan: Part 2 seeks to ensure that a minimum of 50% of each site at Squirrels Trading Estate contains employment generating uses (including B1 office and suitable B2 light industrial). This policy has been drafted so flexibility may be applied in terms of land area or floorspace. In practice, however, given the ambition to deliver high density genuinely mixed use development adjacent to the Crossrail station, the Local Plan target is being implemented on a '50% re-provided floorspace' basis for Squirrels Trading Estate and other sites within the Emerging Site Allocation SA 5 (Proposed Modifications 2018).

The site is currently occupied by a food distribution business and provides a total of 2,335 sq.m. of Class B8 employment space. The applicant is proposing to provide approximately 1,620 sq.m. of Class B1 employment floorspace in the form of office space for small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs). This provision equates to a 64% reprovision of existing employment floorspace, and therefore accords with the Emerging Local Plan. However, it is vital to note that this relates to the site in isolation. Whilst, in principle, a flexible approach to how the Emerging Local Plan reprovision target is met across the Squirrels Trading Estate as a whole may be considered, the absence of a sufficiently comprehensive proposal at this stage makes delivery of this policy objective significantly uncertain. Accordingly, although the proposed provision of employment space at this site does comply with the planned approach to consolidating the Nestles Avenue SIL, in accordance with London Plan Policy 2.17, it may well not do so when taken as part of a more strategic approach.

The Site Allocation SA 5 within the Emerging Local Plan Part 2 makes clear that the Council seeks to incorporate the Squirrels Trading Estate (identified as Site B within the wider SA 5 land allocation) as part of a wider, comprehensive redevelopment of the land south of the railway. Indeed the GLA has also strongly supported the thrust of this approach and note that in general, comprehensive redevelopment is essential to ensure that the challenges and incentives of brownfield land development are shared evenly in order to achieve coherent growth and regeneration - whilst integrating delivery of the infrastructure necessary to support sustainable communities.

Whilst the principle of mixed use redevelopment of the Squirrels Trading Estate is supported, in the absence of a comprehensive scheme there are major strategic concerns that allowing this site to come forward in isolation could undermine the delivery of wider policy and design objectives that may well require cross-subsidy as part of a larger and more viable scheme.

In the absence of a comprehensive scheme, the development of this site in isolation would result in a piecemeal development that would fail to safeguard the satisfactory redevelopment of this strategic site 'B' identified within Policy SA 5 of the Emerging Local Plan: Part Two (October 2015). The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy H1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012); Policy BE14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012); and Emerging Policy SA 5 of Site Allocations (Proposed Modifications 2018)."

These comments, particularly those regarding the need to provide an adequate quantum of commercial floorspace and the those relating to the need for a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site B site are considered to equally

comply here. Indeed, as discussed at our meeting, significant concern is raised over the piecemeal redevelopment of site B and the resulting constraints this poses to each adjoining development site. Indeed the comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site would enable matters such as floorspace, parking, amenity space, residential amenity, etc, all of which present their challenges to each site, to be considered as a whole allowing for a better interrelationship between the different spaces required and also ensuring development potential can be maximised whilst also complying with relevant policy requirements.

Amongst the reasons for refusal for 3 Viveash Close, was the following:

"In the absence of a comprehensive scheme, the development of this site in isolation would result in a piecemeal development that would fail to safeguard the satisfactory redevelopment of this strategic site 'B' identified within Policy SA 5 of the Emerging Local Plan: Part Two (October 2018). The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy H1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012); Policy BE14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012); and Emerging Policy SA 5 of Site Allocations (Proposed Modifications 2018)."

It is notable that in their assessment of that scheme the GLA raised similar concerns regarding allowing the site to come forward in isolation, which could undermine the delivery of wider policy and design objectives in the area.

In light of the above, should planning permission be sought for the redevelopment of Standord House as proposed, it is considered the same concerns would apply and the scheme could not be supported.

Notwithstanding the above, should you choose to submit an application, regardless of the Council's significant concerns regarding the piecemeal approach to the redevelopment of site B, then careful consideration would need to be given to the proposed housing mix and provision of affordable housing.

Unit Mix:

Local Plan: Part 1 policy H2 identifies a need for more larger affordable units. Local Plan: Part 2 policies H4 and H5 seek to ensure a practicable mix of housing units are provided within residential schemes. One and two bedroom developments are encouraged within town centres, while larger family units are promoted elsewhere. London Plan Policy 3.8 states that new developments should offer a range of choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types. The Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) generally supports larger units where there is demand.

The Council's Emerging Development Management (Local Plan Part 2) Policy DMH2 'Housing Mix' requires a more balanced housing mix reflecting its latest information, which shows a high need for more family sized accommodation, particularly 3 and 4 bed units. Hillingdon's published Housing Market Assessment confirms this need. This document has recently been subject to an Examination In Public and therefore it is entirely possible that the policy, or at least a version of it, may be in force should an application be forthcoming on this site. In any case provision for a significant proportion of family housing, i.e. 3 and 4 bedroom units should be made across the site.

Affordable housing;

The London Plan sets the policy framework for affordable housing delivery in London. Policies 3.10 -3.13 require that Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential schemes, having regard to their affordable housing targets. Policy H2 of the Local Plan: Part 1 proposes that schemes will aim to include 35% of on-site affordable housing on developments of 10 or more units. This would be secured by way of a S106 Legal Agreement.

If less than 35% affordable housing is proposed, any application will need to be supported by a financial viability appraisal. Financial appraisals may be referred to the Council's specialist Consultant for comment. The applicant will be asked to meet the Council's costs prior to any such action. The provision of zero affordable housing on a scheme of this size would be totally unacceptable.

Notwithstanding the above, whilst at the time of writing not yet adopted, the Mayor of London is nevertheless consistently applying considerable weight to the Draft London Plan. In this regard your attention is drawn to the Mayor's Stage II comments relating to the previously mentioned 3 Viveash Close scheme. These advise that, in accordance with Draft London Plan policy H5 a minimum affordable housing threshold of 50% should be applied to industrial sites where there is a net loss of industrial capacity. Where this is not proposed, in accordance with Draft London Plan policy H7, a viability assessment must be provided for independent review.

2. Design

Local Plan: Part 2 Policies BE13 and BE19 seek to ensure that new development complements or improves the character and amenity of the area. The scale, bulk and siting of buildings are key determinants in ensuring that the amenity and character of an area is not compromised by new development. Policy BE4 seeks to ensure that development within or on the fringes of a Conservation Area preserve or enhance the architectural and visual qualities of that Conservation Area.

Emerging Local Plan: Part 2 policy SA5 relates specifically to sites along the northern side of Nestles Avenue and seeks to ensure the comprehensive redevelopment of sites A, B and C to ensure high quality mixed use developments can be successfully delivered.

Concern is raised that the development of this site in isolation could significantly constrain/ prejudice the neighbouring sites within 'Site B' (emerging policy SA5), which it is considered are likely to come forward for redevelopment in the near future, particularly given that applications have already been received (albeit not all approved) for several of the sites the rest of the sites along Nestles Avenue, including sites A and C, in addition to 3 Viveash Close. Therefore, it is very likely that it will only be a matter of time before the rest of the Squirrels Industrial Estate (SIE) landowners will want to realise the value of their land.

To avoid the disproportionate provision of development on individual sites, without any thought of community infrastructure uses or external public amenity areas, for example, which will have to be taken up by the remaining sites, proposals for SIE will need to be comprehensively planned and coordinated, which is currently not the case. The lack of a joined up approach to development here risks constraining the development viability of neighbouring 'Site B' land parcels and reduces opportunities for the provision of vital infrastructure, which needs to be carefully considered in the

context of all new development for Nestles Avenue to ensure satisfactory delivery (SA5). These principles are clearly mapped out in the Local Plan Part 2. Therefore the application breaches policy BE13 (saved UDP) and Local Plan: Part 2 policy SA5, which having been submitted for Examination in Public, is carrying increasing weight.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the development seeks to provide some set-back from Nestles Avenue and the adjoining former Nestle Factory site to the south east, the proposed development footprint is nevertheless very large for a relatively small site (0.23ha). The proposed building sits very close to its boundaries, particularly to the north west, and leaves no 'breathing space' around the perimeter of the development to allow the curtilage sites to take their own course with regards to future redevelopment. This will clearly constrain development opportunities for the 'Site B' land parcels to the north east and north west of Stanford House. It also triggers questions regarding 'agents of change' (Draft London Plan) i.e. will the proposed development mitigate the effects of proximity noise, odours, shared access with industrial vehicles, etc, or will it constrain the majority of the remaining industrial uses on Viveash Close - i.e. highways and noise complaints (statutory nuisance) will compromise the commercial operation of those existing (active) industrial units. Without an agreed comprehensive masterplan or development strategy in place, the large footprint is unacceptable in its current form. Therefore it will need to be pulled in significantly from the redline boundary area and reduced in scale.

With regards to a masterplan, heavy reliance appears to be given to a 'draft Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF),' which was produced by the GLA and which Hillingdon were not consulted on and have not endorsed or adopted. Also, the process of drafting an OAPF was ceased by the GLA towards the end of 2017. As it was not supported by an adopted evidence base it is considered incomplete. Even if regarded as 'non-statutory guidance' it is clear the Local Plan, which has undergone the correct consultation and adoption procedures, takes precedence over this 'draft masterplan.' It is also worth noting that the plans for Nestles Avenue have evolved far beyond this 'draft masterplan,' which was never deemed 'fit for purpose' by LBH. The other applications along Nestles Avenue have taken on board the Council's comprehensive planning advice and this is reflected in their proposals. The only relevant element of the GLA proposed draft OAPF plan is that a comprehensive approach to development must be taken for all Nestles Avenue sites.

You are strongly encouraged to engage with the neighbouring landowners to ensure a comprehensive and robust masterplan is devised in consultation with the Council. This is the positive approach that the other applicants have achieved and ensures a comprehensive development which benefits all involved, rather than the development of sites in isolation, which have the potential to significantly hinder and compromise adjoining development potential. For this reason, the principle of development (residential uses) is not an appropriate solution for the [current] industrially active SIE, until it is planned comprehensively as 'Site B' and resilient with regards to phased development and future options/ scenarios.

A ten-storey blank elevation against the north east boundary with the Squirrels Industrial Estate, is a concern, as it will be highly visible from Nestles Avenue (and beyond), due to scale of the proposed scheme, particularly given the low-scale nature of the adjoining buildings within 'Site B.' A large blank facade of such size, would overdominate development to the north east and north west and is not an adequate solution or positive contribution to the townscape setting. Also, future adjoining development will have to step back considerably in order not to compromise the

outlook and/or sunlight/daylight to occupants of this or future adjoining developments, considerably constraining the future development opportunity for the neighbouring/ adjoining land within 'Site B.'

Use of brickwork, broken up by fenestration, balconies and feature panels is supported and assists in adding some articulation to the building to break up its mass. Nevertheless, its overall size, scale, height and mass is still considered to represent a disproportionately large, dominating and incongruous form of development which would be unacceptable in this location. Whilst it is acknowledged that large scale buildings have been approved as part of the former Nestle Factory site, they formed part of a comprehensive development scheme and were carefully considered as part of a much larger site rather than in isolation, which is the case here.

The stepping of the roof form as shown is not considered to work particularly well in this location and emphasises the overall height and scale of development proposed. The introduction of more gradual stepping would not only soften the visual impact of the building but would also enable the creation of more usable podium decks for amenity use.

Concerns are also raised that the provision of amenity space predominantly at upper storey level results in a lack of active frontage at ground floor level, particularly along the north west boundary. The proximity of this elevation to the boundary and the lack of active frontage increases concerns over the potential constraints this development could place on adjoining sites and emphasises the need for a joined up and comprehensive approach to development across the whole of site B.

3. Amenity

Policies BE20, BE21, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seek to safeguard the residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupants. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Residential Layouts sets out more detailed guidance aimed at avoiding developments which are overdominant or which cause unacceptable levels of overlooking or overshadowing.

Floorspace

In terms of the internal floorspace, the London Plan (2016) policy 3.5 and the DCLG Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015) set out minimum internal space standards which must be achieved, relating to room sizes, ceiling height and internal floor space requirements. The standards also set out minimum acceptable room sizes for single and double or twin bedrooms. Please note that these standards supersede those minimum floor areas set out in the Council's SPD on Residential Layouts.

The floor plans provided indicate that whilst the units proposed would appear to comply with minimum overall floorspace standards, that individually, some of the rooms appear to be undersized (eg, the smaller bedroom in flat 9.1) (please note that not all rooms in all flats have been measured). It must be demonstrated in any application submitted that the proposed development would fully comply with the relevant minimum standards in all respects.

Amenity space

The Council's SPD on Residential Layouts confirms that "developments should incorporate usable, attractively laid out and conveniently located garden space in relation to the flats they serve. It should be of an appropriate size, having regard to the size of the flats and the character of the area." It confirms minimum usable external amenity space standards for houses and flats, dependent on the size of the units proposed. 20m² should be provided for studio and one-bedroom flats, 25m² should be provided for two-bedroom flats and 30m² should be provided for three bedroom flats or larger. Small areas of private garden or patio areas should be provided to ground floor units to protect the privacy of their occupants.

Based on the accommodation schedule provided, and in accordance with the above mentioned standards, a minimum of 1,925m² external amenity space should be provided. The submitted accommodation schedule suggests that only 1,255m² of external amenity space would be provided (including private, communal and play space), a significant shortfall of 670m². This is indicative of overdevelopment of the site and unlikely to be found acceptable unless robust justification can be provided.

The submitted plans indicate that amenity space would be provided by way of balconies and roof terraces. The roof terraces, whilst providing attractive landscaped areas, are limited in their usability and practicality when compared to ground level space and the complete inability of the development to provide any level of sizeable surface level space is telling when considering that proposed at adjoining developments. Again, this is indicative of overdevelopment of the site.

Some of the units would also appear to have relatively poor outlook, which is confounded by the lack of set back of the development from the site boundaries. It will need to be demonstrated in any application submitted that attractively laid out and usable amenity space can be provided in accordance with Council guidelines. In the case of balconies, it should be demonstrated that these will not be overdominated or unacceptably overshadowed by adjoining developments.

It is worth noting that lack of sufficient amenity space, in terms of quantity and quality, featured as a reason for refusal for the nearby 3 Viveash Close scheme. Clearly, if a comprehensive rather than piecemeal approach was taken to the redevelopment of site B then this could assist in ensuring matters such as amenity space are properly addressed on a site wide rather than plot by plot basis, enabling a higher quality and potentially higher density, overall development.

Overlooking/light, etc

It will need to be demonstrated in any application submitted that all habitable rooms receive adequate levels of daylight and are not subject to an unacceptable degree of overlooking from other units within the development or from adjoining properties. The Council's SPD on Residential Layouts confirms that "where a two or more storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible overdomination." It goes on to confirm that 15m will usually be the minimum acceptable distance. The plans indicate that the building will sit close to the site boundaries. Therefore, bearing in mind the existing adjoining uses, and the lack of a site wide Site B masterplan, careful consideration will need to be given to the site layout to ensure that future occupants are not adversely impacted by existing or proposed adjoining development and that, equally, the proposed development does not so adversely constrain adjoining sites that no realistic prospect of redevelopment is viable.

The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Layouts confirms that new residential development should seek to ensure adequate privacy for its occupants and that of adjoining residential properties. A distance of not less than 21m should be retained between facing habitable room windows. "From windows above ground floor an angle of 45 degrees each side of the normal is assumed in determining facing overlooking distances."

It will need to be demonstrated that this does not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking between internally facing habitable room windows. Consideration also needs to be given to any potential overlooking which could occur from adjoining developments. Any units directly facing shared amenity space should be provided with defensible space to allow some privacy.

Density

In relation to density, the site currently has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3. The Council's SPD on Residential Layouts confirms that habitable rooms over 20m² will be counted as two rooms. Accordingly, for the purposes of the calculations, the one-bedroom flats have been regarded as having three habitable rooms; the two-bedroom flats have been regarded as having four habitable rooms; and the three-bedroom flats have been regarded as having five habitable rooms.

The London Plan 2016 (Policy 3.4) range for residential sites with a PTAL of 2-3, which fall within an urban area, is 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare (hrph) and, based on an average of 3.6 habitable rooms per unit, 55-145 units per hectare. As such, based on a total site area of approximately 2300m² the site would have a density of approximately 273 units per hectare and 910 hrph.

This exceeds London Plan standards and is indicative of overdevelopment of the site and the resulting issues raised throughout this report. The argument raised at the meeting that the PTAL could increase following the future implementation of transport improvements along Nestle Avenue (a significant contribution towards which was secured via the former Nestle Factory scheme) is noted. However, even with the highest PTAL rating the development would exceed London Plan density standards of 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare and 55 - 225 units per hectare. This is considered to be unacceptable in this location, particularly in light of the developments shortcomings in respect of other planning policy and guidance requirements, as highlighted throughout this report.

4. Highways

Local Plan: Part 2 policies AM2 and AM7 seek to safeguard highway and pedestrian safety and ensure that developments do not have an adverse impact on the surrounding highway network. Policies AM14 and AM15 seek to ensure appropriate levels of car parking are provided.

The submitted plans indicate that a total of 15 parking spaces (including 8 disability standard spaces) would serve the development. It is understood that two of these would serve the commercial premises and the remaining 13 would serve the residential units.

The submitted plans suggest that flexible commercial space for office or light industrial use would be provided. The current Local Plan: Part 2 sets different standards for B1, B2 and B8 uses, but this broadly equates to around 1

space/100m². Similar standards apply in the emerging Local Plan: Part 2 (Appendix C). Therefore, based on a commercial floor area of 480m² approximately 5 spaces should be provided.

In terms of residential parking provision the Council's current parking standards require 1.5 spaces per unit (125 spaces). The emerging Local Plan: Part 2, although not yet adopted, allows slightly lower provision with a minimum of one space to be provided for 1 and 2 bedroom units and 2 spaces to be provided for 3 and 4 bedroom units (94 spaces).

Whether taking existing or emerging Local Plan parking standards the proposed provision of 13 spaces to serve the 83 units proposed clearly presents a significant and totally unacceptable underprovision of parking spaces.

Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that in granting planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Nestle Factory site (Site A), that a parking ratio of 0.6 spaces per unit, a provision significantly below the Council adopted and emerging parking standards, was agreed. This was reluctantly accepted by Members at the time largely because the overall benefits of the scheme were considered to outweigh the perceived lack of parking provision. Given the much smaller scale of the Stanford House scheme, especially if developed in isolation from the remainder of site B, it is unlikely such an argument regarding the overall benefits of the scheme could be successfully construed such that the significant shortfall in parking could be justified.

Notably, a parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit was proposed in the recent planning application for the redevelopment of 3 Viveash Close. In assessing that scheme the Council's Highway Engineer commented as follows:

"That level of car parking equates to 0.5 spaces per flat which is a lot less than that agreed on the adjacent Nestles factory site. The proposed level of car parking provision would not allow any form of visitor car parking which would result in further overspill parking on the already over-subscribed roads.

The proposed level of on-site car parking is far below that set out in the Council's car parking standards and that approved at the adjacent Nestles Factory site. Given the proximity of the Nestles development, parking standards for both developments should be the same."

Refusal reason no. 5 states:

"The proposal fails to provide sufficient parking provision for the proposed development (residential and commercial) and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where such parking is at a premium thereby leading to conditions which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts."

The Stanford House scheme proposes a ratio of just over 0.1 spaces per unit which, in view of the above, would be considered totally unacceptable and could not be supported.

It is acknowledged that TfL, and in turn the GLA, are likely to request lower parking ratios than the Council. However, you are reminded that TfL is the highway authority for the A412 while LB Hillingdon is responsible for the rest of the road network in this area. TfL and the GLA have also accepted the higher parking ratio of 0.6 units per unit at the former Nestle Factory site and supported the Council's reasons for refusal relating to 3 Viveash Close.

A unified and collaborative approach between the three Nestle Sites is required. You will need to coordinate an approach in relation to Highways matters, particularly car parking, traffic surveys and traffic modelling.

Cycle parking will also need to be provided in line with London Plan requirements.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (20% active and 20% passive) should be provided. Motorcycle spaces (one space per 20 car parking spaces) should also be provided.

Clear and legible streets and linkages were approved as part of the Site A scheme, which offer the ability for that site to connect to other sites as they come forward. These include the creation of an east-west linear park and also the set back of the site from the Nestles Avenue frontage to allow for future road widening and better transport links. These links are also proposed as part of the current proposals, under consideration, relating to site C and are fundamental to the long term vision, connectivity, amenity and transport linkages between the sites. The proposed development must not compromise the ability to deliver these links in the future.

5. Other

· Accessibility

The London Borough of Hillingdon is committed to achieving the highest standards of access and inclusion. All buildings that are open to the public must be constructed according to the policies and design details as outlined in London Plan (2016) policies 3.8 and 7.2 and the Council's SPD on Accessible Hillingdon (Sept 2017) (available on the Council's website <https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/article/9108/Design-and-accessibility>).

For any queries relating to accessibility issues, please contact Ali Kashmiri on 01895 250230 or via email (AKashmiri@hillingsdon.gov.uk).

· Flood Risk

The site does not fall within a flood zone or a critical drainage area. However, notwithstanding this, Sustainable Drainage systems (SUDS) should be utilised, in accordance with the hierarchy set out in London Plan policy 5.13, to ensure surface water run-off can be appropriately managed. Furthermore, the scheme should incorporate grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting systems to minimise potable water use, in compliance with London Plan policy 5.15. If not proposed, full justification must be provided.

Details on LBH requirements can be found on the Council website, where a Design and Evaluation Guide as well as a detailed proforma to speed up review of technical submission can be found. <http://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/article/12578/Sustainable-drainagerequirements-for-planning-applications>

As a minimum, where applicable, the following is likely to be required:

a) Suds features:

- i. incorporating sustainable urban drainage in accordance with the hierarchy set out in Policy 5.15 of the London Plan. Where the proposal does not utilise the most sustainable solution, justification must be provided,
- ii. calculations showing storm period and intensity and volume of storage required to control surface water and size of features to control that volume to Greenfield run off rates at a variety of return periods including 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30, 1 in 100, and 1 in 100 plus Climate change,
- iii. overland flooding should be mapped, both designed and exceedance routes above the 100, plus climate change, including flow paths depths and velocities identified as well as any hazards, (safe access and egress must be demonstrated).

For any queries relating to flooding and drainage issues, please contact Vicky Boorman on 01895 250230 or via email (VBoorman@hillingdon.gov.uk).

· Sustainability and renewables

The Local Planning Authority expects the design of developments to take into account the requirements of energy conservation. Applicants are advised to consult the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction (available at http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/guides/spg/spg_04.jsp) to assist in achieving a sustainable development.

You are advised to submit an Energy and Sustainability Statement in support of the application to demonstrate that the scheme would incorporate sustainable building measures and features to reduce energy demand, in accordance with the hierarchy set out in London Plan Policy 5.2, which seeks new residential development to be zero carbon and non-domestic buildings to be as per building regulations requirements.

The incorporation of green roofs and green walls, in compliance with London Plan policy 5.11, assist in reducing surface water run-off, enhancing the biodiversity of the site, aiding energy efficiency, and enhancing the visual appearance of the building. Accordingly, their incorporation into the design is strongly encouraged. If not proposed, strong justification for this should be provided.

The Council's Planning Specialists Manager, Ian Thynne, can assist you with any further queries. He can be contacted on 01895 250230 or via IThynne@hillingdon.gov.uk.

· Landscaping

Local Plan: Part 2 Policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate.

Albeit but for some hedge and tree planting along its front boundary, the existing site appears to be devoid of any landscape features of merit, which could pose a constraint to development. Indeed, typical of such sites, there is a general lack of soft landscaping across the wider plot. The redevelopment of this site is considered to offer an opportunity to significantly enhance its visual amenities and those of the

Nestles Avenue streetscene. A high quality landscaping scheme, to include new planting, should be provided, particularly along the site frontage.

The application should incorporate opportunities to enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment. A high quality landscaping scheme should be provided which responds to the local site context and makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape.

A comprehensive landscape assessment and clear landscape design objectives should be set out in the Design & Access Statement - or a separate Landscape Strategy document. This should be supported by a Landscape Masterplan with indicative hard and soft landscape details.

The Council's Principal Landscape Architect, Robert Reeves, can be contacted at reeves@hillington.gov.uk should you wish to discuss trees or landscaping matters in more detail.

- Crime Prevention

The design and layout should have regard to secured by design principles. You are advised to contact Robert Palin of the Metropolitan Police at robert.palin@met.pnn.police.uk to discuss means of ensuring community safety by design.

- Refuse provision

Policy 5.17 of the London Plan sets out the Mayors Spatial Policy for Waste Management, including the requirements for new developments to provide appropriate facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling. Whilst the methods for waste management would ultimately be down to the operator's discretion, it must be demonstrated that satisfactory waste disposal and recycling facilities would be provided. Any refuse or recycling stores should be located within an appropriate distance of the vehicle collection point to enable easy servicing by refuse vehicles.

- Air Quality

The site falls within a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

The NPPF at para. 123 states that planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan.

London Plan (2016) policy 7.14 advises that:

"Development proposals should:

a) minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality (particularly within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) and where development is likely to be used by large numbers of those particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, such as children or older people) such

as by design solutions, buffer zones or steps to promote greater use of sustainable transport modes through travel plans (see Policy 6.3)

b) promote sustainable design and construction to reduce emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings following the best practice guidance in the GLA and London Councils' 'The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition'

c) be at least 'air quality neutral' and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality (such as areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)).

d) ensure that where provision needs to be made to reduce emissions from a development, this is usually made on-site. Where it can be demonstrated that on-site provision is impractical or inappropriate, and that it is possible to put in place measures having clearly demonstrated equivalent air quality benefits, planning obligations or planning conditions should be used as appropriate to ensure this, whether on a scheme by scheme basis or through joint area based approaches

e) where the development requires a detailed air quality assessment and biomass boilers are included, the assessment should forecast pollutant concentrations.

Permission should only be granted if no adverse air quality impacts from the biomass boiler are identified."

An Air Quality Assessment should be submitted in support of any application submitted to demonstrate compliance with the above mentioned policy requirements.

For any queries relating to air quality issues, please contact Val Beale on 01895 250230 or via email at vbeale@hillingdon.gov.uk.

· Noise

With regard to noise and other environmental impacts, Local Plan: Part 2 policy OE1, seeks to safeguard development from the detrimental impacts of traffic, congestion, noise, vibration, dust, smell and other pollutants. Policy OE5 seeks to ensure noise sensitive developments, such as residential dwellings, are not subject to unacceptable levels of noise or vibration.

Whilst the site is located within a designated IBA/SIL where noise generating uses are generally considered acceptable, and it is recognised that various noise generating sources exist around the site, including industrial and commercial uses such as 'The Lounge' opposite, adjoining industrial uses and the nearby railway, it nevertheless also lies within relative close proximity to residential properties on the opposite side of Dawley Road. Accordingly, any application submitted should be supported by a noise impact assessment to demonstrate that noise levels from the site would not exceed existing background noise levels, to the detriment of residential amenity.

· Contamination

Given the existing and historic use of the site for industrial purposes contamination is likely to be present and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to ensure no harm to future occupants. A desk top study confirming known or potential contamination issues should be submitted in support of any application submitted.

Further information can be found in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Land Contamination', which is available on the Council's website.

6. Planning Obligation and CIL (Mayor and LBH)

S106 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), requires that where developments generate the need for additional facilities, financial contributions will be sought.

The following planning obligation requirements were sought in respect of the recent scheme for the redevelopment of 3 Viveash Close. The proposed development is considered very likely to generate similar requirements:

- * Affordable housing
- * Highway/S278 works
- * Car parking permit restriction for future residents
- * Contribution towards extension of the parking management zone
- * Contribution towards Bulls Bridge improvements
- * Contribution towards additional bus capacity
- * Travel plan (including £20,000 bond)
- * Contribution towards Nestles Avenue road widening works
- * Contribution towards Cranford Park improvements
- * Employment and training Strategy for construction phase and commercial development
- * Contribution towards air quality improvements
- * Contribution towards carbon offset fund
- * Management and monitoring sum (equivalent to 5% of total cash contributions)

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Please be advised that as from 1 April 2012, all planning approvals for schemes with a net additional internal floor area of 100m² or more will be liable for the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (Mayoral CIL), as legislated by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011. The liability payable will be equal to £35 per square metre. The London Borough of Hillingdon is a collecting authority for the Mayor of London and this liability shall be paid to LBH in the first instance.

In addition the development represents Chargeable Development under the Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy, which came into effect on 1st August 2014. The liability payable will be £95 per square metre.

Should you require further information please refer to the Council's Website www.hillingdon.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=24738

It is important to note that this CIL liability will be in addition to the planning obligations (s106) that the Council may seek from your scheme.

FINANCIAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS (FVAs)

Applicants are advised that two versions of the FVA must be submitted as part of a planning application:

- 1) A full FVA, used for full consideration of financial implications.

2) A redacted FVA removing any commercially sensitive information alongside a signed statement confirming that your viability appraisal has been prepared in accordance with best practice and the RICS guidance (paragraph 4.5.4 RICS Financial Viability in Planning), with a clear explanation of why the redaction is appropriate having regard to the tests in the Act (for the purposes of FOI).

7. Application Submission

The following should be provided in support of any application submitted:

- Completed application forms and certificates;
- Completed CIL forms;
- Site location plan;
- Existing and proposed drawings;
- Design and access statement;
- Planning statement;
- Landscape Strategy and Landscape Masterplan;
- Transport Assessment & Travel Plan;
- Energy/Sustainability statement
- Air quality assessment;
- Noise assessment;
- Contamination assessment;
- Drainage Strategy
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
- Ecology Survey

Please note that the above list is not exhaustive and other information may be sought as the scheme progresses.

8. Conclusion

The redevelopment of Site B requires a more comprehensive approach, with the entire site being redeveloped as a whole. A master plan for the whole of Site B, with careful consideration of the two adjoining sites (Sites A and C) including the impact any proposals may have on the setting of the Nestle Conservation Area.

The proposed car parking ratio of 0.82 spaces per unit is significantly below the Council's parking standards. This under provision would have to be robustly justified through a Transport Assessment. At present the proposal is unacceptable in this regard. You are encouraged to liaise with the owners of Nestle Site's A and C to agree a unified and comprehensive approach to the Transport Assessment.

Should the site be redeveloped for residential purposes, the provision of a satisfactory residential environment should be ensured. This includes the provision of an appropriate level of amenity space and compliance with HDAS guidance. Landscaping proposals should be presented as part of the main application.

Please be advised that the Council require confirmation that you wish to enter into a PPA as soon as possible, in order to ensure the necessary resource are in place to meet the terms of the PPA.

Thank you for entering into the Council's pre-application advice service and I trust you have found this service of assistance.

Johanna Hart
Planning Officer
Major Applications Team
London Borough of Hillingdon

Planning Guarantee

For complex applications which are likely to exceed the statutory timeframes, the applicant is encouraged to enter into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to allow for the negotiation of complex cases. Central Government encourages the use of PPAs for larger and more complex planning proposals to bring together the developer, the Local Planning Authority and key stakeholders to work in partnership throughout the planning process.

Providing a PPA helps ensure that major proposals progress through the application process in a timely fashion and result in high quality development but the service is both time consuming and costly. The charge for all Planning Performance Agreements will ensure that adequate resources and expertise can be provided to advise on major development proposals, the charges are determined on a site by site basis.

Hillingdon are committed to ensure the best possible service provision to all of our applicants. In order to ensure this, we will not be able to facilitate negotiation which would result in an application being determined outside of statutory timeframes, unless the applicant has entered into a Planning Performance Agreement.