

Richard Phillips

From: Faye Hammer <fhammer@ardent-ce.co.uk>
Sent: 04 March 2022 10:55
To: Nick Sutton; Richard Phillips
Cc: ben.howard@i-transport.co.uk; Richard Nordgreen; Phil Curwen; Surinder Jagdev; Rajvinder Jagdev; Neil Crawford; Matthew Williams
Subject: RE: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

Hi both,

Please see below response to the Water and Flood Management Officer comments.

'A Flood Risk and Drainage strategy has been produced by Ardent consulting engineers dated December 21. Slight amendments needed prior to acceptance.

This proposes controlling run off rates to 2ls is an arbitrary figure considering green field run off rates are 0.5ls. 1ls has been achieved and is provided on other development sites and should be achieved.

The proposals to provide this control through living roofs and permeable paving, though further controls should be integrated into any landscaping at ground level.

As detailed in Section 5 of the Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy we consider that we have maximised the use of SuDS within the development with the provision of permeable paving, green roofs and attenuation tanks. The value of 2.0 l/s was chosen as the greenfield run off rate is too low to be practically achieved and lower discharge rates would introduce a risk of flooding due to potential for blockages in the flow control device. Thames Water have also agreed that they have sufficient capacity within the Network to take the 2.0 l/s from the development, and have no objection to the proposals as detailed within the correspondence included in Appendix J.

Although this is a discharge of conditions - it appears that there are many issues such as the connection to the TW sewer which are yet to be confirmed and may require alteration resulting in changes to the proposal. It would be preferable to ensure this survey has been undertaken so that we know this proposal is achievable.'

There appears to be some confusion with the application as this is not a discharge of conditions. As mentioned above, correspondence have been carried out with Thames Water included in Appendix J of the Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy who have stated that if the surface water hierarchy has been followed (which is also demonstrated within the Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy), and if the flows are restricted to 2.0 l/s, then Thames Water would not have any objections to the proposal.

Many thanks,

Faye

Faye Hammer
Engineer

ARDENT
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

An Employee Owned Company
Infrastructure | Transport Planning | Flood Risk | Acoustics | Air Quality

T | 020 7680 4088 E | fhammer@ardent-ce.co.uk
Third Floor | The Hallmark Building | 52-56 Leadenhall Street | London EC3M 5JE



From: Nick Sutton <nick.sutton@mavenplan.com>

Sent: 03 March 2022 13:51

To: Richard Phillips <RPhillips@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>

Cc: ben.howard@i-transport.co.uk; Richard Nordgreen <r.nordgreen@proseedcapital.co.uk>; Phil Curwen <p.curwen@proseedcapital.co.uk>; Surinder Jagdev <surinder@jagdev.com>; Rajvinder Jagdev <rajvinder@jagdev.com>; Faye Hammer <fhammer@ardent-ce.co.uk>; Neil Crawford <neil.c@createdesign.org>; Matthew Williams <matthew@createdesign.org>

Subject: Re: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Richard,

Thanks for your email.

By copy of this email I will ask the transport and drainage consultants, both copied in, to look into these issues and we will come back with responses to each.

RE the tree and landscape comments, an urban greening assessment is within the submitted Design & Access statement.

Please note I'm on leave in Australia until 20 March so will only be checking my emails occasionally.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Nick Sutton | Director
Maven Plan

E: nick.sutton@mavenplan.com

T: 020 3397 0357

M: 07984 323293

www.mavenplan.com

303a Riverbank House
1 Putney Bridge Approach
Fulham, London
SW6 3JD

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain information that is legally privileged. It is prohibited to disclose, copy or distribute any information contained in it if you are not the intended recipient. Please delete it immediately and inform the sender.

From: Richard Phillips <RPhillips@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>

Sent: Thursday, March 3, 2022 1:51 am

To: Nick Sutton

Subject: RE: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

Nick,

Thank you for your email and the attached revised Sunlight / Daylight Report which I am seeking a quote on and will get back to you.

I note the concerns raised by your clients as regards review fee quotes and have passed this on to the consultants for their views but I think I know what the answer will be and if your client has concerns now as regards review of the initial FVA, this does not bode well if subsequent work is required as we know the fees can be hefty.

I have also received comments from various internal specialists. Most significant which require revisions / clarification are:-

Highways Engineer:

'Brief Description of Proposed Development by the applicant:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2 blocks of flats comprising 41 units (4 x studio, 7 x 1-bed, 20 x 2-bed and 10 x 3-bed) with 5 disabled parking spaces and vehicular access off North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent.

Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site will be taken directly from North Hyde Road. A separate pedestrian access will be taken from Sandow Crescent and Nestles Avenue.

The site has two existing vehicular accesses onto North Hyde Road and an existing vehicular access onto Sandow Crescent. It is proposed to upgrade and widen the existing vehicle crossover on the eastern side of the site frontage onto North Hyde Road, allowing the existing vehicle access on the western side of the site frontage and onto Sandow Crescent to be closed to vehicular traffic and only be used for access by sustainable modes.

The vehicle access is proposed to be in the form of a vehicle crossover and will be 4.8m in width to allow two cars to pass by one another.

The only car parking on-site will be five blue badge parking spaces, which equates to 12% of dwellings being provided disabled parking. This is in accordance with the London Plan requirement to provide 10% of units with one disabled space (with 10% equating to 4.1 spaces).

A total of 86 cycle parking spaces will be provided on site, comprising 38 two tier racks and five Sheffield Stands. Whilst external, the 38 two tier racks can be conditioned to be sheltered and secure. This would exceed the cycle parking requirements set out in the London Plan.

Highways Comments:

The proposal involves providing 41 flats consisting of 4xstudio flats, 7x1bed flats, 20x2bed flats and 10x3 bed flats, split across two blocks, with 5 car parking blue badge spaces and cycle parking for 86 cycles.

The London Plan: Policy T6 car parking (2021): requires developments sited within areas of PTAL 5 and 6 (very good to excellent accessibility to public transport), that no on-site car parking is to be provided, except for disabled parking.

The site has a PTAL rating of 5 and the applicant is proposing to provide a car free development except for 5 disabled car parking spaces in compliance with the London Plan parking standard, and therefore acceptable.

Whilst the car and cycle parking provisions comply with the London Plan and DMT6, however the vehicle access is shown without pedestrian visibility splays. The applicant is proposing to utilise the existing vehicle access however this is a new build and higher standards of design and safety are required to be applied and therefore the existing vehicle access will need to be moved to provide pedestrian visibility splays on both sides of the vehicle access.

For pedestrian safety reasons in all new vehicle accesses, it is necessary to maintain within the site areas measuring 2.4m by 2.4m, with no obstruction more than 0.6m high, either side of where the vehicle access meets the back edge of the footway, known as pedestrian visibility splays, within which unobstructed visibility is available for drivers to see and be seen by pedestrians on a footway to avoid a potential hazard in time. The splays must be wholly within the site's curtilage and physically protected (dwarf wall/ped gate) from being driven over thereby undermining their necessity.

The relocating of the vehicle access will require the reappraisal of where the applicant has suggested moving the pedestrian island, the applicant will be required to robustly demonstrate where the island can be safely sited and still meet pedestrian crossing requirements.

The standalone disabled parking bay is located too close to the access bellmouth and would create obstruction, parking bays should be at least 5m from the access bellmouth.

Where car parking is provided in new developments, provision should be made for infrastructure for electric. All residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles, both active/passive.

The applicant has stated that a total of 86 cycle parking spaces will be provided on site, comprising 38 two tier racks and five Sheffield Stands, the use of two-tier bike racks are generally not acceptable for new residential developments, many of these styles are difficult to use when bicycles are fitted with baskets and child seats and usually require lifting. This can be difficult for the less able or those with heavy bicycles, therefore a mix of parking facilities is recommended with the majority of the easy to access type like Sheffield cycle racks. All long term cycle parking should be secure and sheltered, visitor cycle parking should be covered.

In car-free developments, at no time should any on-site space marked on plan for future disabled persons parking be used for general parking. Through Parking Design and Management Plans, applicants should provide details of how initial and future provision of disabled persons parking spaces will be made, managed and enforced.

As surety that the Travel Plan will be implemented, and targets achieved the Highway Authority requires that the developer provides a £20,000 bond. In the event of the Travel Plan not being delivered the Highway Authority will use this bond to implement the Travel Plan itself. This should be secured by way of a S106 agreement. If the Travel Plan is successful the bond will be returned.

Recommendation:

Refuse

Reasons for Refusal:

For the reasons stated above the application has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory policy and design-led approach to the vehicle access layout, pedestrian crossing island, no provision of EV charge points and on-site cycle parking storage facility, contrary to policy DMT6 and the London Plan.

Furthermore, this is contrary to Paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018, which seek new development to provide safe and suitable access for all, and to create safe and secure layouts minimising conflicts between traffic and pedestrians.'

Water and Flood Management Officer:

'A Flood Risk and Drainage strategy has been produced by Ardent consulting engineers dated December 21. Slight amendments needed prior to acceptance.

This proposes controlling run off rates to 2ls is an arbitrary figure considering green field run off rates are 0.5ls. 1ls has been achieved and is provided on other development sites and should be achieved.

The proposals to provide this control through living roofs and permeable paving, though further controls should be integrated into any landscaping at ground level.

Although this is a discharge of conditions - it appears that there are many issues such as the connection to the TW sewer which are yet to be confirmed and may require alteration resulting in changes to the proposal. It would be preferable to ensure this survey has been undertaken so that we know this proposal is achievable.'

Tree Officer:

'This scheme (over 10 residential units) should be supported by an Urban Greening Factor calculation with a target score of 0.4. No UGF appears to have been submitted.'

I will forward other comments from specialists as I receive them.

I also need to go through the submission and hopefully I will be able to come back to you shortly.

Regards,

Richard

From: Nick Sutton <nick.sutton@mavenplan.com>

Sent: 22 February 2022 10:52

To: Richard Phillips <RPhillips@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>

Cc: Richard Nordgreen <r.nordgreen@proseedcapital.co.uk>; Phil Curwen <p.curwen@proseedcapital.co.uk>; Rajvinder Jagdev <rajvinder@jagdev.com>; Surinder Jagdev <surinder@jagdev.com>

Subject: RE: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

Hi Richard,

Thanks for your email.

Please find attached the Sunlight/Daylight Report for the apartments within the development as requested. You will note in concludes:

The numerical results demonstrate that the proposed development design achieves a very high level of compliance with the BRE recommendations. Whilst a small number of rooms and outdoor amenity areas do not meet the recommendations, the results are not unusual in the context of an urban location. In our professional opinion, the proposed design will provide the development's future occupiers with adequate levels of natural light. We consider the proposed development to be consistent with the NPPF, which requires developments to provide acceptable living standards whilst making efficient use of land.

In respect of the external Noise Review, my clients have asked if there is any scope for the fee to be reduced as it was not expected or identified in the attached pre-application advice. Also, although the quote says it would be payable on the issue of the report to the Council they have asked if it could be paid on determination.

In respect of the external Financial Viability Review, my clients have asked if there is any scope for the fee to be reduced as it is higher than anticipated and comfortably exceeds the fee's they paid for the original report and cost plan to be prepared. Again, they have also asked if it could be paid on determination.

I look forward to your thoughts on these matters.

Nick Sutton | Director

Maven Plan

E: nick.sutton@mavenplan.com

T: [020 3397 0357](tel:02033970357)

M: [07984 323293](tel:07984323293)

www.mavenplan.com

303a Riverbank House
1 Putney Bridge Approach
Fulham, London
SW6 3JD

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain information that is legally privileged. It is prohibited to disclose, copy or distribute any information contained in it if you are not the intended recipient. Please delete it immediately and inform the sender.

From: Richard Phillips <RPhillips@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>

Sent: 22 February 2022 08:38

To: Nick Sutton <nick.sutton@mavenplan.com>

Subject: RE: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

Nick,

A third party review of the noise assessment is required as we do not have the expertise in house and we ask for this on all relevant major applications.

So apart from noise and the FVA, the only other review required by a third party is the daylight / sunlight assessment.

Regards,

Richard

From: Nick Sutton <nick.sutton@mavenplan.com>

Sent: 17 February 2022 17:07

To: Richard Phillips <RPhillips@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>

Cc: Sean Dell <sdell@hillingdon.gov.uk>; Richard Nordgreen <r.nordgreen@proseedcapital.co.uk>; Phil Curwen <p.curwen@proseedcapital.co.uk>; Surinder Jagdev <surinder@jagdev.com>; Rajvinder Jagdev <rajvinder@jagdev.com>

Subject: RE: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

Hi Richard,

Can you confirm that an external review of the noise report is necessary ? This is the first time I've ever had this request from a local authority.

Can you also confirm what other third-party assessments will be required ?

I have chased the sunlight/daylight report – it should be issued early next week.

Nick Sutton | Director

Maven Plan

E: nick.sutton@mavenplan.com

T: [020 3397 0357](tel:02033970357)

M: [07984 323293](tel:07984323293)

www.mavenplan.com

303a Riverbank House
1 Putney Bridge Approach
Fulham, London
SW6 3JD

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain information that is legally privileged. It is prohibited to disclose, copy or distribute any information contained in it if you are not the intended recipient. Please delete it immediately and inform the sender.

From: Richard Phillips <RPhillips@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>

Sent: 16 February 2022 11:26

To: Nick Sutton <nick.sutton@mavenplan.com>

Cc: Sean Dell <sdell@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Subject: Former Victoria PH, 32 North Hyde Road and rear garage court areas accessed from Sandow Crescent, Hayes - 21432/APP/2021/4649

Nick,

My apologies for the delay in forwarding these quotes for the review of the Noise Assessment and the FVA – things have been rather busy of late.

Can you please take a look and let me know.

Do you know when we can expect the revised daylight / sunlight assessment?

Kind regards,

Richard

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.