



MEETING NOTE

HYDE PARK HAYES

25 APRIL 2012 AT 14:00 AT HILLINGDON CIVIC CENTRE

Attendees:

Adrien Waite (AW)	London Borough of Hillingdon
Matt Kolaszewski (MK)	London Borough of Hillingdon
Brian Whiteley (BW)	London Borough of Hillingdon (part of the meeting)
Ludo Mackenzie (LM)	Melford Capital
Jim McKerlie (JM)	3D Reid
Jason Lowes (JL)	Rapleys LLP

1.0 Introduction

1.1 After initial introductions, LM confirmed that he had received interest from a number of parties potentially seeking office space at Hyde Park Hayes. In these terms, he was keen to secure planning permission for new office buildings at HPH4 and 5 at the earliest possible juncture in order to minimise the delivery time of a new building/buildings. Further, in discussions with potential occupiers for the proposed office buildings, and for the floorspace still available within existing buildings at HPH, it has become clear that the park would be more attractive as an office location if it could offer complementary uses (a hotel and A3 uses) by way of amenity.

1.2 In these terms, JL confirmed that the earliest possible positive resolution was sought in respect of the extant application to extend the outline permission at HPH5, as well as approval of reserved matters and discharge of all outstanding conditions. In addition, full planning permission for office development was sought on HPH4, with all conditions to be discharged at the earliest opportunity. Finally, outline consent was sought for a hotel and A3 floorspace at HPH6, with all matters reserved for subsequent approval, apart from access.

2.0 Areas of Agreement

2.1 It was agreed that the proposed **approach to the submission and processing of applications** across the three plots was acceptable. Everybody agreed that reducing the scope of conditions requiring the approval of further information was a worthy aim, and AW advised that the submission of Phase II contamination information, and details regarding landscaping (including species/maintenance arrangements) would be beneficial in this regard.

- 2.2 In terms of **land use**, it was confirmed that office space was supported by planning policy, and therefore the proposals at HPH4 and 5 were acceptable in principle. Further information was requested to support the proposed uses at HPH6 (detailed in paragraph 3.1 of this note).
- 2.3 The block sections within the pre-application submission indicating **proposed building envelope**, were confirmed as acceptable in respect of HPH4 and HPH 5, subject to detailed design. Officers provided feedback in respect of the proposed building envelope of the hotel element of HPH6 (detailed in paragraph 3.2 of this note).
- 2.4 As Millington Road is not an adopted road, AW advised that the “red lines” for the applications at HPH4 and 6 should include access on Millington Road to the public highway (North Hyde Road, or the Dawley Road roundabout). JL understood this, and confirmed that the “red line” for the applications at HPH5 had included Millington Road, up to the Dawley Road roundabout. In these terms, AW also confirmed that the **access arrangements** fixed by the outline permission at HPH6 would only be access to North Hyde Road (confirmed by way of the “red line”). On this basis, the locations of access from HPH6 onto Millington Road could be confirmed subsequently, through the reserved matters process.
- 2.5 In terms of **plans**, it was confirmed that floor plans and elevations would be sufficient to consider the full application for HPH4 and the reserved matters for HPH5. Further, it was agreed that parameter plans indicating zones of development, including building heights, would be sufficient to consider HPH6 outline application.
- 2.6 In terms of the **scope of supporting study for the applications at HPH4 and HPH6**, JL confirmed that transport, contamination, air quality and energy statements were being prepared, and were being informed by parallel discussions with the appropriate officers within the Council. AW and MK welcomed this, and confirmed that these reports would be sufficient to register the applications. However, they also requested a little further information in respect of sustainability, most notably in respect of electric vehicle charging points.
- 2.7 In terms of **discussions with third parties**, AW confirmed that the London Mayor, and therefore TfL, would not be involved in the planning process for the three proposals. As such, pre-application discussions with these parties would be unnecessary. JL confirmed that LM’s contamination consultants were liaising with the EA in the preparation of the Phase I and II investigations, which AW and MK confirmed was acceptable.
- 2.8 In terms of **public consultation at pre-application stage**, AW confirmed that it was not necessary to carry out a public consultation exercise in advance of

submission of any planning applications. However, he recommended that local amenity groups be informed, by way of a mailshot, to ascertain if they wished to review and comment on the proposals.

2.9 In terms of **timescales**, JL requested whether it would be helpful to submit the applications with a target committee date in mind. In these terms, AW advised that aiming to submit the application two months before a target committee date was realistic.

2.10 In terms of the extant application to **renew the outline permission at HPH5**, JL's discussions with MK on behalf of the previous owners of the site had indicated that the only outstanding matter preventing permission being granted was that of a request for a financial contribution of £25,000 towards air quality, by way of a planning obligation. On this basis, and in order to secure the earliest possible consent, LM confirmed that Melford were prepared include the requested contribution within the s.106 agreement.

2.11 AW and MK advised that the application had been passed to another officer, but they agreed to liaise with the new case officer to assist bringing this application forward as quickly as possible. In these terms, they advised that it might be possible for this application to be presented to the 14 June Planning Committee. JL requested confirmation from the case officer, at the earliest possible opportunity, that there were no outstanding issues with the application preventing it to be positively presented to the planning committee. In terms of reserved matters, AW and MK advised that the Council could informally accept and review information in respect of the **reserved matters**, but that formal consideration could not begin until the outline decision notice had been issued. **[Post meeting note: the case officer for the renewal application, Gareth Gwynne, confirmed on 8 May that the application would be presented at the 14 June Planning Committee]**

2.12 The proposal at HPH5 allows for 14,000 sqm of office space. AW agreed that – in terms of the reserved matters – this **floorspace** figure would only include floors which accommodated office floorspace, and exclude floors which did not (for example, those accommodating undercroft/basement car parking). Notwithstanding this, AW confirmed his understanding that the total floor space of the building, including floors not accommodating office space, would be included in calculations in respect of the Mayoral CIL.

3.0 **Matters for Further Work/Investigation**

3.1 **Principle of the C1 and A3 uses proposed at HPH6** – BW requested further information in respect of the principle of the uses proposed at HPH6, in particular:



- 3.1.1 Additional commentary in respect of planning policy, including the NPPF and Core Strategy and relevant policies within the 1998 UDP;
- 3.1.2 The relationship of the proposal to existing and proposed office space in the rest of the Hyde Park Hayes campus (in particular, confirmation that the uses proposed will assist in the beneficial occupation of the remaining, available, office floor space at HPH, and that it will also assist in bringing forward new employment floor space at HPH);
- 3.1.3 Commentary in respect of the why the development proposed is more appropriate than “B” class uses at HPH6 (particularly in the context of paragraph 3.12), and why the uses proposed would not be more appropriately located within Hayes town centre, and
- 3.1.4 The benefits of the proposed uses in terms of urban design (in particular in respect of interface between the employment area and residential development to the north, and improving linkages to the station and town centre).

3.2 **Design matters at HPH6** – it was recognised that outline permission was sought, and that issues such as layout would be addressed at a later date. However, AW and MK suggested setting development slightly further back from North Hyde Road, to provide a wider landscaped strip on the boundary with the public highway. In addition, it was suggested that the tallest parts of the development be moved away from North Hyde Road, towards the southern part of the site.

4.0 **Closing Discussions**

4.1 JL confirmed that he would prepare a note of discussions, and AW and MK also advised that they would be providing a formal response to the request for pre-application advice in due course.

4.2 Notwithstanding discussions at the meeting, JL also requested that, if:

- 4.2.1 Further information was necessary to register the applications at HPH4 and 6, or
- 4.2.2 There were issues with the application to renew the HPH5 outline consent

Feedback be provided at the earliest opportunity, as it was hoped that applications would be submitted in May.