

SKM Colin Buchanan

New City Court

20 St Thomas Street

London

SE1 9RS

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)20 7939 6100

Fax: +44 (0)20 7939 6103

Web: www.skmcolinbuchanan.com

Mr Gareth Gwynne
London Borough of Hillingdon
Civic Centre
High Street
Uxbridge
Middlesex, UB8 1UW

14 November 2012

Dear Mr Gwynne,

Hyde Park Hayes (HPH) Units 4 and 5, Millington Road – Transport Assessment and Travel Plan

I am writing to provide further information in response to comments received on the above from TfL and LB Hillingdon Officers. For ease, I have followed the headings used within TfL's responses.

Car Parking

TfL acknowledge that the London Plan policy for B1 uses allows for parking in the range of one space per 100sqm to 600sqm. In this location they suggest that one space per 300 sqm would be appropriate. We do not agree with this view. The Outer London location of the site means that all existing B1 space in the area already has higher level of parking than are being proposed, which would make the development less attractive to occupiers, and endanger the delivery of this employment generating scheme, which is key to the regeneration and improvement of Hayes. LB Hillingdon's maximum parking standards for B1 use are one space per 100 sqm.

However, in light of TfL's comments, and as part of the evolution of the scheme design, some changes to car parking numbers have occurred, with a reduction of 18 spaces in total from both sites (16 from HPH5 and 2 from HPH4). This results in an overall provision of 194 spaces for both sites. The average provision across the two sites is therefore one space per 107 sqm. This is within LB Hillingdon's maximum standards and within the maximum standard allowable within the London Plan.

Cycle Parking

We acknowledge TfL's confirmation that the proposed cycle parking provision is in line with the London Plan standards.

PERS / Walking

Sinclair Knight Merz (Europe) Limited The SKM logo is a trade mark of Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd.

Registered in England & Wales 3371550. Registered Office 4th Floor, Metro, 33 Trafford Road, Salford Quays, Manchester M5 3NN

SKM Colin Buchanan is part of the Sinclair Knight Merz Group. Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd. ABN 37 001 024 095



TfL have requested that a PERS audit is undertaken. We have discussed this and agreed that this can be covered off in the S106 Agreement, provided it is needed at the time and has not already been undertaken by other development coming forward in the area. **Trip Generation**

TfL suggest that a higher bus mode share than identified in the TA may be appropriate, but indicate that even with this considered there is sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate demand.

Highway Impact

TfL state that the Transport Assessment does not demonstrate how the adopted models have been validated. Full technical notes covering the validation of signal models are included within the TA Appendices. I have contacted TfL to make them aware of this. Information on the extent of cumulative and planned development has also been requested and the section of the TA covering this has been identified to them.

With regard to LB Hillingdon's comments we understand that it is agreed that the only location that the development would have an impact that requires mitigation is the Station Road / North Hyde Road signals. We also understand that even though it is accepted that the development impact alone would only require changes to the signal timings at this junction and no physical changes to the layout would be needed, that the cumulative impacts of development in the area would result in further improvement being required. My client is therefore satisfied with the principle of providing an appropriate contribution towards the delivery of these, subject to final agreement of the wording of a relevant S106 Clause.

Bus Stops

TfL have identified that an audit of bus stops should be carried out. Again, this can be covered in the S106 Agreement, provided it is needed at the time and has not already been undertaken by other development coming forward in the area.. **Travel Plan**

TfL have identified that the funding stream for the TP has not been identified. This is because the final occupier of the buildings is not known. However, TfL are happy that finalising the TP can be dealt with under the S106 Agreement / by planning condition.

A number of comments have also been provided by your colleagues. Again, many of these are areas of detail that will only be answerable when the building is occupied (for example, the number of staff). In our view all of these comments can be addressed prior to occupation of the building and suitable clause in the S106 Agreement will enable this. In these terms, I note that no amendments are required to the Travel Plans in advance of planning permission being granted.

Deliveries, Servicing and Freight



TfL identify the need for a Delivery and Servicing Plan and a Construction Logistics Plan for the sites. As these matters will, in large part, be dependent on the identity of an occupier (and in terms of the latter, a contractor to implement the development), we are happy that these can be dealt with by conditions / S106 Agreement.

CIL / Crossrail

My client is aware of the requirements for this and is anticipating that the S106 Agreement will cover these.

I hope that the above covers the outstanding issues, but please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or require any further information.

Yours sincerely

J Baker

Technical Director

Phone: 02079396131

E-mail: jbaker@globalskm.com