Hotel Development
Terminal 4

Planning Statement

August 2013

BDP.

Heathrow
Making every journey better

Planning Statement

Proposed Hotel Development
Swindon Road, Terminal 4
London Heathrow Airport

Date: 30 August 2013

Prepared by: Stephen Allen, Planning Manager

Status: FINAL Version 3.0

Heathrow
Making every journey better

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

1.1.1. This Planning Statement supports a planning application for a terminal linked hotel development at the current S4 car park, Swindon Road, near Terminal 4, Heathrow Airport. The Statement describes the key planning considerations against the adopted national, local and regional policy context and goes on to describe why the development is acceptable against this prevailing policy context.

1.2 The Proposal

1.2.1. The application seeks planning permission for the following:

Part outline, part full planning application for a proposed hotel development of up to 660 bedrooms with ancillary café, bar and restaurant facilities, parking, service access, courtyard space, landscaping and improved ground level pedestrian access in outline and a perimeter veil structure in full detail.

1.2.2. The full detail element of the proposal consists of an architectural veil that encircles the main hotel development. The veil provides the outward appearance of the development and is predominantly made up of vertical perforated steel cylinders. These are arranged in five main bands around the site.

1.2.3. The hotel can be delivered as one large hotel or two separate hotels. Either solution will be arranged around an single public space for hotel guests or other visitors using the hotel facilities. This comprises the outline element of the scheme and a series of parameters will govern the final design solution.

1.2.4. Integral to the success of the scheme is the link between the hotel and Terminal 4. The hotel will have direct terminal access at ground level via an improved pedestrian environment. The design intent is described in the application, however full details will be secured as a reserved matters condition.

1.2.5. The development of the proposal has been informed by discussions with the London Borough of Hillingdon, the Metropolitan Police, CABE and NATS. This Planning Statement sets out how the proposal has responded to discussion with these authorities and complies with the adopted policy context.

2   Existing Site Context

2.1   Location

2.1.1   The site is located approximately 200 metres to the south east of Terminal 4, Heathrow Airport.

2.1.2   The site is currently known as the S4 car park and it utilised by airline staff that are located at Terminal 4. The car park contains 133 spaces but is temporary only. At present, a pedestrian route is marked beneath the departures level vehicle exit ramp between the site and the terminal.

2.1.3   The site is bounded on two sides by Swindon Road to the north and Southern Perimeter Road to the south east. Swindon Road exists as a service road to the terminal but experiences low traffic volumes. In contrast, Southern Perimeter Road is a route for airport traffic, linking the facilities of Hatton Cross to the east with the World Cargo Centre to the west, via Terminal 4 in between.

2.1.4   A large, vegetated embankment forms the western boundary of the site. This carries Stratford Road, which is the exit route for traffic from the Terminal 4 departures forecourt.

2.1.5   The site is very well connected by public transport via Terminal 4 and the local road network. The A30 is accessed from the Southern Perimeter Road via Snowdon Road which forms part of a junction at the north eastern corner of the site. The A30 provides access to central London to the east and the M25 to the west.

2.1.6   The site's location is illustrated on drawing P5000557 20(A101) Location Plan.

2.2   Setting

2.2.1   The surrounding area is dominated by airport structures and hard landscaping, however perhaps the most dominant building in the site setting is the Hilton Hotel located on the opposite side of Southern Perimeter Road. This hotel rises to six storeys and is clad in white panelling with an offset glass frontage overlooking a water feature and landscaping. Built in 1990, this award winning design has been a feature of Terminal 4's landscape since it opened.

2.2.2   Pedestrian access between the Hilton and Terminal 4 is achieved via an elevated and enclosed pedestrian walkway, which follows Swindon Road along the northern side of the site. The walkway passes over airport infrastructure to the north of the site including the airport's perimeter security fence, the disused Control Post 21 and various airport related buildings and facilities. In the backdrop to the Hilton pedestrian link and to the north of the site is Terminal 4's Victor Pier.

2.2.3   The south west and western boundary of the site is a landscaped embankment primarily grassed and topped several small trees. This screens the site from the Terminal's multi-storey car park, although the flank of the car park and part of the terminal departures level can be seen from the northern side of the site.

2.3 Constraints

2.3.1 The site is an island sitting amongst a network of roads serving the terminal and wider airport. Therefore, each side of the site will be clearly visible, i.e. the site doesn't have any back or flank that can be treated as a secondary frontage in terms of its design.

2.3.2 The height of any structure on this site is restricted by the 10cm radar located around 250 metres to the north east of the site. NATS have confirmed that the maximum allowable height will be 24 metres above ground level without infringing the Radar Safeguarding Zone.

2.3.3 Investigations have revealed that a number of existing services run through the site. The most critical of this is a 6 inch gas pipeline and a gas governor.

2.3.4 Swindon Road provides service access to Terminal 4 and formerly provided access to Control Post 21 when this was in use. In practice, Swindon Road is rarely used. Be this as it may, the scheme needs to maintain full access to the terminal.

2.3.5 At present, a delineated route starts at the terminal arrivals level and takes pedestrian beneath the vehicle ramp from departures level then along Swindon Road to the site. Although clearly marked, the route takes pedestrians through an aesthetically poor environment of concrete and motorcycle parking. Additionally, the change in ground levels combined with over-sailing vehicle ramp means that the site is first seen from the northern end of the terminal, rather than the main concourse at arrivals and departures levels.

2.4 Opportunities

2.4.1 The location of the site presents a great opportunity for a hotel development. In the first instance, being so close to an international air terminal is a huge draw for a hotel operator. Additionally, the site is within easy walking distance to an excellent public transport node at Terminal 4, served by the Piccadilly Line Underground and Heathrow Express Rail services as well as local and regional bus and coach services immediately in front of the terminal.

2.4.2 When considering the spread of hotel accommodation across the airport, most of it is located along Bath Road to the north as well as a premium offer linked to Terminal 5. The hotel offer at Terminal 4 is far more limited. The only terminal linked hotel to the terminal is the Hilton which is four star quality. The only other hotel on the southern side of the airport is Jury's Inn near Hatton Cross. Therefore, the opportunity exists to provide more hotel accommodation south of the airport. The site is an ideal location for this, particularly considering that additional modes of transport between the terminal and the site will not be required.

2.4.3 The site also has the potential to deliver a high quality design that will enhance the linkage between the site and the terminal and complement the existing Hilton Hotel. As mentioned earlier, the site can be viewed from all sides and at various different levels, such as the Terminal 4 roundabout, multi-storey car park and the surrounding road network. The design of the hotel therefore has the potential to infill a corner of the Terminal hinterland with an eye catching and unique approach to its external appearance.

3 The Proposed Development

3.0.1 The proposal takes the form of a hybrid application seeking part detailed and part outline planning permission. The detailed element of the application is the external 'veil' wrapped around the building, which will be the most evident design feature of the development. Inside this veil, the hotel development is presented as a series of maximum and minimum building parameters, i.e. in outline only. It is intended that a future hotel operator will bring forward the detailed design of the hotel as reserved matters but within the parameters set by this scheme.

3.1 Description of the Development

3.1.1 The description of the development is as follows:

Part outline, part full planning application for a proposed hotel development of up to 660 bedrooms with ancillary café, bar and restaurant facilities, parking, service access, courtyard space, landscaping and improved ground level pedestrian access in outline and a perimeter veil structure in full detail.

3.1.2 This approach is intended to provide certainty on the external appearance while giving any future hotel operator an acceptable degree of flexibility in which to deliver their product.

3.1.3 Full details of the veil and the outline parameters are contained in the Design and Access Statement and the Planning Drawings.

4 Consultation

4.1 London Borough of Hillingdon and Metropolitan Police

4.1.1 There have been two meetings involving Hillingdon Council and the Metropolitan Police, the first on site and the second at Hillingdon's offices. A third separate meeting involved Hillingdon without the Metropolitan Police.

Initial Site Meeting

4.1.2 The site meeting took place on the 31st of January 2013 and involved the Planning Officer and Urban Design Officer from Hillingdon and two representatives from the Metropolitan Police responsible for the areas of Secured by Design and Counter Terrorism.

4.1.3 The clear message from Hillingdon was that the site requires a building of high design quality. The hotel should be a 'statement building' and create a local landmark. The wider public realm also needed to be considered, particularly the pedestrian route between the terminal and the site.

4.1.4 The servicing of the hotel was also discussed in some detail, particularly around the location of the existing gas governor. Hillingdon advised that all service yards would need to be adequately screened from public view. Additionally, the requirement for onsite car parking was considered by Hillingdon to be minimal given the public transport connections to the site.

4.1.5 Hillingdon officers also stated their preference for a full application, rather than outline, as it was considered that the full detail would give the Council greater certainty that a high quality development would be delivered. However, Hillingdon's Design Officer stated that the parameter approach may be appropriate if the Design and Access Statement could establish the design 'flavour' of the scheme.

4.1.6 The representatives of the Metropolitan Police were generally content with the scheme at this stage. In summary, they considered that:

- The low footfall around the site indicated low security risk;
- The route from the terminal to the site was acceptable;
- Further information would be required to understand any design solutions that involve the gas substation;
- Parking provision should meet 'Park Mark' standard;
- There is a need to address access control and undercroft, with appropriate elevation treatment incorporating ventilation to undercroft parking areas.

Initial Design Presentation

4.1.7 The second meeting took place on the 16th of July 2013 and was held at Hillingdon's offices. The purpose of the meeting was to present the latest designs to the relevant officers, taking on the comments raised at the January site meeting.

4.1.8　The Metropolitan Police representatives were particularly interested in the design of the veil structure and gave specific advice on how this should be considered in designing out crime. Specifically, advice was given on the 'scalability' of the veil and appropriate fittings that should be used in its installation. A review of the gas governor strategy would also need to be provided.

Refined Design Presentation

4.1.9　The third meeting took place on the 23rd of July and involved Hillingdon's planning, design and sustainability officers. In the first instance, the pedestrian link between the terminal and the hotel was highlighted as an integral part of the scheme and there was some concern that insufficient detail would be provided if this element were to be provided in outline only. HAL understands these comments and has provided supporting information that indicatively shows how this link will be delivered.

4.1.10　Hillingdon provided useful recent examples of the standard of design and documentation they expect with outline applications, particularly where the landscape and public areas are in outline. The proposal has used these examples as 'best practice' benchmark in producing the application.

4.1.11　The amount of car parking intended for the scheme caused some concern to Hillingdon. Initially, the level presented to Hillingdon was 1 space for every 4 bedrooms. Hillingdon's response was that this level was too high and a ratio of 1:10 was suggested. While HAL was willing to reduce the level of car parking, a ratio of 1:10 was considered too low to agree during the meeting, therefore a ratio of 1:6. The reason for this ratio is explained at Chapter 9.

4.1.12　In terms of the veil, the design approach was generally accepted, however the spacing of the vertical cylinders was questioned. This spacing underpins the transparency of the veil, therefore HAL agreed to review this, along with the proposed materials, as the scheme progressed.

4.1.13　Hillingdon advised of other documentation to accompany the application, including a Phase 1 Habitat Survey and a Flood Risk Assessment.

4.2　CABE

4.2.1　On the 9th of May 2013, HAL presented the initial concepts to a CABE design workshop. Also attending the workshop were representatives of Hillingdon Council.

4.2.2　Overall, the design approach incorporating a veil to create a landmark building was supported by CABE, however the delivery of the scheme in outline was questioned. In this respect, it was suggested that a hybrid scheme with the veil in detail and the hotel in outline would be an appropriate way forward. Hillingdon were supportive of this approach and this has been adopted in the application.

4.2.3　The pedestrian route between the terminal and the hotel was seen as a critical component of the scheme. The existing condition of the link was acknowledged to be unsatisfactory. To overcome this constraint, it was suggested that a clear visual connection is required along this pedestrian route, which may involve using elements of the veil as markers for wayfinding.

4.2.4   It was suggested that the scheme could be brought forward without any car parking. This has been investigated and is not feasible, however a reduced car parking provision has been offered.

4.2.5   While the concept of the architectural veil was lauded by CABE, there was also concern that the veil may suffer 'value engineering' at the development is progressed. To this end, CABE suggested that the veil should be brought forward as a detailed application, which as discussed earlier, the application provides. Additionally, it was suggested that the veil could add value in other ways, such as environmental screening and lighting.

4.2.6   The approach to the core buildings was also supported. In particular, the delivery of two separate buildings framed around an internal courtyard was recognised as having the potential to create a feeling of enclosure from a harsh surrounding environment.

4.2.7   CABE's written response to the workshop is provided at Appendix 1.

5 Planning Policy

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework

5.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted in March 2012 and replaced a suite of national planning guidance and statements on individual areas of planning considerations. The prevailing theme through the NPPF is the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. This means that planning authorities must approve development that accords with the local development plan without delay, and where the plan is absent, silent or out of date, approve proposals unless the adverse effect of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In this respect, Hillingdon's Local Plan Part 1 is the most up to date policy document and contains strategic policies that refer generally to the location of hotels around Heathrow.

5.1.2 Although high level guidance, the positive approach to sustainable development found in the NPPF lends support to the proposal. It makes specific reference to the siting of major development in areas close to public transport infrastructure and emphasises the need for planning authorities to make quick, positive decisions where schemes are in line with local policy.

5.2 The London Plan

5.2.1 The London Plan is the spatial policy strategy for greater London and has to be taken into account by London Boroughs when determining applications for planning permission.

5.2.2 Chapter 4 of the London Plan deals with London's economy and it is here that clear support for an hotel at this location can be found. Specifically, Policy 4.5 states that:

"…new visitor accommodation in appropriate locations … focused in town centres and opportunity and intensification areas where there is good public transport access to central London and international and national transport termini."

5.2.3 The proposal meets the criteria set out in Policy 4.5 as the site is within an 'opportunity area', as identified on Map 2.4 in Chapter 2 of the London Plan, and is located within easy walking distance of good public transport access to central London via London Underground and National Rail links, while sitting alongside international and national transport termini in the Heathrow Airport itself, along with its, bus and coach access.

5.2.4 Chapter 6, the London Plan sets out the Mayor's policies on strategic transport and generally seeks that major developments are located where they can be easily access by public transport, which further supports the above position.

5.2.5 Policy 6.6 deals specifically with aviation and although it is clear that the Mayor does not support an increase in air traffic movements at Heathrow, part B(b) of the policy supports the enhancement of facilities for passengers in other ways. This scheme is an example of where passenger user experience will be enhanced through the delivery of a new hotel development providing additional hotel rooms within walking distance of several modes of public transport and an international airport terminal.

5.2.6   Chapter 6 also contains an addendum that relates specifically to car parking standards. The general approach is to express parking standards as a maximum considered appropriate to the site and land use, dependant on its access to public transport accessibility. However, the London Plan does not set a maximum standard for hotel uses. Instead, it states that parking should be limited to 'operational needs' in areas with a PTAL of 4-6, with provision made for disabled parking, deliveries, taxis and coaches.

5.3   London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1

5.3.1   Part 1 of Hillingdon's Local Plan was adopted in November 2012 and forms the overarching strategic planning vision for the Borough. Its chapters set out a series of Core Polices which are of relevance to the proposal. Specifically, the chapters of relevance to the proposal relate to the economy, the built environment, environmental improvement and transport.

The Economy

5.3.2   The Local Plan Part 1 acknowledges that hotel based employment accounts for 8% of employment in the Borough and that this is principally due to the presence of Heathrow Airport. However, it also states that hotel growth should not be at the expense of employment land around the Airport. To this end, Policy E1 of the Local Plan Part 1 seeks to manage the supply of employment land for uses such as industrial, warehouse and office but not for other uses such as hotel accommodation. This management will be undertaken by protecting Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs), and allocating Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs) and Locally Significant Employment Locations (LSELs). The proposed site does not fall under any of these designations, nor is it proposed to be allocated as a LSIS or LSEL. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to be at odds with Policy E1.

5.3.3   Policy E2 sets out where the Hillingdon expects to see its employment growth. In general, employment based development will be directed to highly accessible locations where sustainable travel patterns can be utilised to reduce air quality impacts. With respect to hotel accommodation, locations on the Heathrow perimeter outside of employment land are encouraged, among other appropriate areas elsewhere. The site's proximity to public transport services and its location at the airport perimeter meet the intentions of Policy E2.

5.3.4   The Local Plan Part 1 goes on to discuss the strategy for a Heathrow Opportunity Area. This stems from the adoption of the London Plan, which first identified the need for a Heathrow Area Opportunity Planning Framework. The Local Plan identifies Heathrow Airport and its perimeter as one of a number of key sub-areas in a future Opportunity Area and will, presumably, include the area around T4 and the application site. Hotel development is identified as having the potential to place pressure on employment land and therefore, the future growth of hotel accommodation is set to be directed to locations outside the airport boundary and outside of employment areas. This position is reiterated in Policy E3 which states that a Local Development Document (LDD) will be prepared for the Heathrow area to achieve the Borough's growth aims. Policy E3 specifically states that land within the Heathrow Airport boundary should only be used for airport related activities. The application is within the Heathrow boundary and is not, strictly speaking, an airport related use (although the future patrons of the hotel will predominantly be

airport users). The case for a hotel development against Policy E3 is discussed in detail in Chapter 6 of this Planning Statement.

The Built Environment

5.3.5   Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 is a key part of the document overall, as it sets out the Borough's expectation that all new development will maintain and improve the quality of the built environment in order to create sustainable and successful neighbours.

5.3.6   Leading the objectives set out in Policy BE1 is that all development schemes are designed to a high quality. This relates to both the building being design and the public realm in which it sits. Ultimately, the new development needs to enhance local distinctiveness and enhance a sense of place. The Design and Access Statement in support of the application clearly sets out the design approach to the scheme. This is also reflected at Chapter 7 of this Planning Statement, particularly how this has responded to and complies with adopted policy.

5.3.7   Policy BE1 also seeks to ensure that new developments are appropriate in their context and setting and make a positive contribution to the area in terms of their layout, form, scale and materials. The scheme has responded to the surrounding context by taking its height parameters from the surrounding building infrastructure.

5.3.8   The scheme also involves improvements to the surrounding public realm environment, particularly the improvements to the pedestrian route underneath the terminal departures forecourt ramp. The scheme will also create a new public courtyard a the heart of the development which will enhance the quality of space available not only for hotel guests but also staff and other users of both the hotel and Terminal 4. Ultimately, the development will significantly benefit the surrounding area, completely changing the site from an open car park to a site that will be a destination in its own right.

5.3.9   The policy states the importance of Secured by Design principles and address resilience to terrorism in major developments. Pre-application discussions have been held with the Metropolitan Police, including members of the Counter Terrorism Unit. The comments received from the police have been incorporated into the scheme.

5.3.10 The London Plan's carbon reduction objectives are referenced and the Policy BE1 seeks to merge a range of sustainable design goals into a requirement measured against Code for Sustainable Homes, or as relevant to the hotel proposal, BREEAM. Sustainability measures will be incorporated into the scheme and the potential measures are set out with the application documents.

5.3.11 Ultimately, the development represents a significant improvement to the built environment and as such, the scheme is in accordance with Policy BE1.

Environmental Improvement

5.3.12 Policy EM1 outlines a range of sustainability and energy reduction measures to be incorporated into development schemes in order to meet the Borough's climate change requirements. The policy begins by adopting the general position that higher density developments should be located in town centres with good public transport accessibility. Although the proposal is not located within a town centre, the site's is ideally located for

public transport accessibility. This locational benefit serves to meet the second objective of Policy EM1, to encourage a modal shift away from the private motor vehicle towards a greater use of public transport.

5.3.13 The scheme will also seek to meet the objectives of EM1. As the scheme is in outline, an Energy Strategy will form part of a future reserved matters submission. This would include potential renewable energy technologies.

5.3.14 Climate change resilience is also a key part of Policy EM1, particularly in terms of flooding. In this respect, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which examines the likelihood of flooding and presents flood risk mitigation measures as well as potential sustainable drainage initiatives.

5.3.15 Policy EM8 deals with land, water, air and noise. With reference to air quality, EM8 identifies that the site falls within an Air Quality Management Area and therefore all new major development should demonstrate air quality neutrality. The application demonstrates how this can be achieved and it is expected that measures to comply with air quality neutrality could be secured by condition.

Transport

5.3.16 Among the key transport challenges identified in Part 1 of the Local Plan are traffic congestions causing delays and a high dependency on private vehicles with a corresponding low proportion of trips made using public transport, walking and cycling. A number of strategic policies seek to ensure that new development improves the existing transport situation for Hillingdon.

5.3.17 Policy T1 seeks to steer development to the most appropriate locations in order to minimise the impact on the transport network. In the case of the hotel proposal, the site's location near a choice of public transport modes and the easy pedestrian links from the terminal supports the proposal in the context of Policy T1.

5.3.18 Part 1 of the Local Plan doesn't provide specific car parking standards for hotel development, but refers to the relevant saved policy within the Unitary Development Plan for guidance. This will eventually be replaced by a Local Development Document in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

5.4 London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan

5.4.1 Adopted in 1998 and saved under direction of the Secretary of State in September 2008, the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is the current development management document until the Local Plan: Part 2 is adopted. The UDP contains a range of specific policies against which development proposals are assessed.

Built Environment

5.4.2 The built environment chapter of the UDP begins by explaining the importance of preserving archaeological remains in the Borough three policies, BE1, 2 and 3, seek to control development which may impact upon undiscovered archaeological remains. It is understood that the site falls within an Archaeological Priority Area and therefore a desktop archaeological assessment has been provided in support of the application.

5.4.3   In terms of new development, Policy BE13 states that new development will not be permitted unless the layout and appearance harmonises with the surrounding environment and street scene. In this respect, the scale and massing of the proposal will not be out of place with the surrounding area, while the detailed design itself will introduce a contemporary element into an area of modern buildings.

5.4.4   Also relevant to the design approach of the proposal is Policy BE25 which seeks to ensure the modernisation of existing industrial and business locations through the design and landscaping of buildings and spaces. The policy continues by stating that it seeks to improve pedestrian and vehicular access. The modernisation of the area and the improvement to pedestrian access are two of the key aims of the proposal.

5.4.5   Policy BE38 relates to trees and landscaping and seeks that development proposal retain and utilise topographical and landscape features of merit where appropriate. To ensure this is achieved, the policy requires that development proposals include an accurate tree survey. To this end, the application is supported by a tree survey detailing the condition of existing trees along with those to be removed. The scheme's landscaping proposal is discussed in greater detail at chapter 11 of this Planning Statement.

Airports and Aviation

5.4.6   The UDP adopts a policy position of resisting any expansion of Heathrow Airport and requiring strong justification for any capacity increase. In terms of the proposal, the airport's size and capacity will remain the same whether the hotel were to be built or not.

5.4.7   Policy A4 of the UDP deals specifically with new development on airport land. It states that new development directly related to the airport should be located within the airport boundary, while development not directly related to the airport will not be permitted within the airport boundary. This policy is considered in detail in the case for the proposal at Chapter 6 Land Use Principle.

Tourism

5.4.8   Policy T2 of the UDP relates directly to hotel accommodation and conferencing facilities, encouraging such facilities to be located on sites easily accessible from Heathrow Airport, public transport facilities and from the main road network. It is clear that the proposed site meets the criteria of this saved policy.

5.4.9   Policy T4 goes on to provide more specific guidance on hotel accommodation, listing five criteria that need to be met in order for hotel accommodation to be acceptable. The first is that hotel accommodation is located within a mixed use area. Although the site is not strictly within a mixed use area, the surrounding uses clearly support an hotel at this location, particularly the airport terminal and public transport infrastructure.

5.4.10 The second criteria is that the development is located on or near and primary or secondary road, or rail or underground station. The proposal can be said to be accessible to all these modes of transport.

5.4.11 The third criteria is that the proposal does not result in the loss of amenity to neighbours through noise and other operations. The surrounding built context of multi-storey car parking, airport infrastructure and another hotel will not be affected by the proposal.

5.4.12 The fourth criteria is that parking standards can be met within the curtilage of the site. A car park is to be provided beneath the development and parking standards are to be met.

5.4.13 The fifth and final criteria seeks that any potential on-street parking can be accommodated. As stated in response to the fourth criteria, all parking will be accommodated on site.

Accessibility and Movement

5.4.14 This chapter of the UDP aims to manage trip generating land uses, reduce travel demand, restrict parking and encourage non-private vehicle usage.

5.4.15 Policy AM1 deals with developments that will draw upon a catchment beyond local walking distance. By its nature, the hotel proposal will fall into this category, as all of its guests and most of its staff will arrive from outside a walking catchment. The policy states that such proposals will only be allowed if it will draw the majority of its employees and visitors by way of public transport and that the public transport capacity is sufficient to absorb these journeys. Most, if not all, hotel guests will arrive at the site by a means of public transport, be it the train, underground, bus or taxi services available or arriving/departing on a flight from Terminal 4. There is also adequate capacity on public transport services to accommodate the proposal.

5.4.16 Policy AM14 states that development proposals will only be permitted where they meet the Council's car parking standards, which are contained within Annex 1 of the UDP. With respect to hotels with more than 30 bedrooms the standard is:

"On an individual basis but a benchmark of 1 space per bedroom for hotels on key arterial road outside of central locations."

5.4.17 The standard for cycle parking is 1 stand per 20 rooms for guests and 1 stand per 3 members of staff. Cycle and motorcycle parking is currently available beneath the departures level vehicle ramp between the terminal and the site, however the opportunity exists for enhanced facilities either on site or with the detailed design of the pedestrian link to the terminal.

5.4.18 The approach to car parking will be discussed in detail at Chapter 9 of this Planning Statement and reflects the levels of parking considered reasonable for hotels around the airport, as approved by Hillingdon in the recent past.

6 Land Use Principle

6.1 Policy Position on Hotel Development

6.1.1 Chapter 4 of this Planning Statement has set out the policy considerations for the hotel proposal at this location. Overall, the scheme has general policy support at national, regional and local level, with the exception of the local policies on airport related development. Policy E3 of Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 1 states the intention of the Borough to prepare a Local Development Document (LDD) that will, among other considerations:

"…help to manage development and protect land within Heathrow Airport's boundaries for airport-related activities."

6.1.2 At the time of writing, the LDD has not been adopted and to the best of our knowledge no preparatory work has commenced.

6.1.3 Policy A4 of the UDP seeks that airport related development should be provided within the airport boundary, and that proposals not directly related to the airport will not be permitted within the airport boundary. It suggests that airport related development includes:

- Passenger and cargo terminals;
- Maintenance facilities;
- Oil storage depots;
- Administrative offices;
- Warehousing;
- Storage and distribution;
- Car parking; and
- Catering facilities.

6.1.4 The proposed hotel is located on airport land, however a hotel use does not fall under any category for airport related development. However, by its very nature a hotel directly linked to an airport terminal will gain the vast majority of its trade from passengers using that terminal facility. Therefore, it is fulfilling a demand for accommodation which directly arises from the airport's activities and does so in a sustainable way given its location next to the source of the demand. Given the wider prevailing policy context it is considered that a hotel on this site is acceptable.

6.1.5 In the first instance, Policy E3 of the Local Plan: Part 1 does not strictly prohibit non-airport related development on airport land. Although it is clear that the intention of a future LDD is to direct hotel development outside of the airport boundary and away from employment areas, the policy is also clear in stating that it will *"…help to manage development … within Heathrow Airport's boundaries…".* This approach is in line with the accepted decision making process of weighing the benefits against the disbenefits of any development proposal. Therefore, in applying this approach to the development proposal and in the absence of an adopted Heathrow Area LDD, the development needs to be assessed against the other adopted policies relevant to hotel uses as well as the requirements of the NPPF and London Plan.

6.1.6   As discussed previously in Chapter 4, the national, regional and other local level policies lends support for hotel proposals at locations that are highly accessible to modes of transport other than private vehicles. This is set out in the NPPF, while London Plan Policy 4.5 is specific to the location of hotel accommodation, clearly setting out a list of criteria that are each met by this proposal.

6.1.7   Hillingdon's saved UDP Policy T2 relates to the location of hotel development. Among the locations considered appropriate for hotel development include those that are easily accessible to Heathrow Airport. Policy T4 of the UDP provides more specific guidance by way of five criteria that a hotel development must meet in order to be found acceptable. These criteria are discussed in Chapter 4, along with the reasons why each are met.

6.1.8   In terms of the more up to date Local Plan: Part 1, with the exception of Policy E3, all other land use policies support the proposal at this location. The preceding Policy E2 states that the council will support development in highly accessible locations to support sustainable travel patterns. It also seeks an additional 3,800 hotel rooms in the Borough on locations outside of locally significant employment sites and other employment land, on the Heathrow perimeter and 'other sustainable locations'. The proposal will assist Hillingdon in achieving this hotel room target while also locating the development in a sustainable location.

6.1.9   While the land use principle of the development has clear policy support, it is acknowledged that the intention behind Local Plan: Part 1 Policy E3 and UDP Policy A4 was to prevent the proliferation of hotel uses on airport land, which in turn could cause airport related uses to relocate in employment areas thereby placing pressure on the supply of employment land. Therefore, beyond the policy support for the scheme, other reasons for a hotel at this location should also be considered. These are discussed at 6.2 and 6.3.

6.2   Demand for Hotel Development

6.2.1   The basis of the approach to the hotel policies in the Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 1 stems from the Hillingdon Tourism Study 2007 and the Greater London Authority Hotel Demand Study 2006. These two documents provided the evidence base for the tourism chapter and, while the documents pre-date the 2008 financial crisis, the findings and trends contained within them are still considered to be relevant to this proposal. In June 2012, TRI Hospitality Consultants undertook a Heathrow Hotel Study on behalf of HAL to inform the decision to proceed with a planning application for a hotel on this site. The Study generally supports the trends of Hillingdon's 2007 and the GLA's 2006 Studies.

6.2.2   The Hillingdon Tourism Study made a number of observations that are relevant to the proposal. The first was regarding hotel demand which found that Monday to Thursday occupancy rate for Heathrow hotels is 83% and drops Friday to Sunday. However, at peak levels, such as around international events in London or operational delays, hotels around Heathrow are at capacity. The study also identified that hotel accommodation is concentrated along Bath Road and is dominated by 4+ star offers.

6.2.3   The Hillingdon Tourism Study went on to recommended a scenario where potential sites for hotel development would be identified but the market would be allowed to operate freely for non-designated sites. The approach, referred to as 'Scenario 3' in the document, was intended to steer development towards sites that would maximise the

benefits of tourism while also being in sustainable locations. The scenario was described as being not 'totally specific' so that market opportunities for development could be realised. The policy position adopted by Hillingdon is more prescriptive than the scenario suggested, however the Study did not consider whether employment land uses around the airport would require protection.

6.2.4   The GLA Hotel Demand Study is seven years old however, the trends identified are still considered to be valid, namely that west London will have the biggest demand for hotel accommodation outside central London. Within west London, Hillingdon and Hounslow are expected to be the Boroughs that will accommodate much of this growth, obviously attributed to Heathrow. The proposal would obviously respond to the demand identified in this Study.

6.2.5   The 2012 Heathrow Hotel Study, commissioned by HAL, indicates that there are 44 hotels within a five mile radius of the airport. This equates to 11,494 rooms with an average of 241 rooms per hotel. Of these 44 hotels, 19 are a budget offer and 17 are four star. Although there has been an increase in the amount of budget accommodation since Hillingdon's Hotel Study, the increase is not reflected in the number of rooms per hotel. The 19 budget hotels amount to 3,221 rooms, whereas the 17 four star hotels provide 6,526 rooms in total. Therefore, four star hotels still dominate the hotel offer around Heathrow, representing 56.8% of the total rooms compared with 28% for budget accommodation.

6.2.6   In terms of occupancy rates, the findings of the Heathrow Hotel Study shows that to March 2012, budget hotels were on average 85% occupied during mid-week periods, with peaks beyond 100% (rooms used more than once a day) and weekend averages at 80%. These occupancy rates are slightly higher than the dominant four star hotels in the area, which average at 80% occupancy. The combined occupancy of the two dominant hotel types are in line with the 2007 Hillingdon Hotel Study, showing that demand for hotel development is still high around Heathrow.

6.2.7   While it is clear from the information presented that demand for hotel accommodation is strong, the site will also have a distinct locational advantage. Hotel accommodation around Heathrow is mostly concentrated along Bath Road, which serves the Central Terminal Area well and is easily accessible from Terminal 5. However, access from these hotels to Terminal 4 is poor, despite there being a free rail service between the CTA and T4. Therefore, the hotel offer at T4 is currently limited to the four star Hilton and to a lesser extent, the budget Jury's Inn Hotel on the A30. This shows that the future occupancy rates for the proposed hotel will be high due to the limited hotel offer at T4.

6.2.8   The site's location also has a distinct advantage in being terminal linked. The 2012 Heathrow Hotel Study undertook a survey of terminal linked vs. non-terminal linked hotels from London Heathrow, Paris Charles De Gaulle, Frankfurt Airport and Amsterdam Schiphol and found that over a 12 month period to April 2012, terminal linked hotels were on average occupied 5.2% more than non-terminal linked hotels. At present, Heathrow Airport falls significantly behind its European hub airport competitors on the provision of terminal linked hotel beds per passengers. This factor, coupled with the lack of room stock near T4 and the overall demand for hotel accommodation present a strong opportunity for a hotel at this location.

6.3 Potential for Alternate Uses

6.3.1 Although the demand for a hotel at this location is clear, the delivery of such a use should not be at the expense of an airport related use. As previously discussed, Hillingdon's concerns that the loss of land within the airport boundary may lead to airport related uses being redistributed outside the airport and in turn placing pressure on employment land availability. With this concern in mind, an assessment has been undertaken to establish whether there is potential for an airport related use to be located on this site.

6.3.2 Of the airport related uses defined under T5 condition A76(4), it is considered that only an office use could potentially be delivered on this site. Air cargo transit sheds, flight catering, freight forwarding and airport industry and warehousing are all uses that require larger land take and would also be in the wrong location if developed on this site. The location of the site could potentially be well suited to a car hire operation, however the site is not large enough to accommodate the scale of on-airport car hire facility Heathrow and is poorly located to serve the other Heathrow terminals. Therefore, the assessment of airport related uses has been limited to office use only.

6.3.3 An assessment of existing office occupancy rates has been undertaken and can be reviewed at Appendix 2. Office space at T4 is provided in the T4 main building with 3,914sqm of floorspace, Spiral House (which is contained within the Terminal 4 multi storey car park ramp) with 409sqm and Aviation House (located to the east of the site along the Southern Perimeter Road) with 1,043sqm. Overall, these offices have a vacancy rate of 4%, with T4 having 52sqm vacant and Spiral House 183sqm. This in itself shows that the existing office accommodation is not being fully utilised, albeit only by 4%. However, it is expected that the demand for office accommodation will decline, rather than increase, principally based on the opening of the new Terminal 2 and the relocation of airlines to the new facilities, namely United Continental and Malaysian Airlines.

6.4 Land Use Principle Conclusion

6.4.1 This chapter has set out several factors that support the principle of locating an hotel at this location. In policy terms, it has been acknowledged that the Local Plan: Part 1 seeks to protect airport land for airport related uses, however in this particular case it has been demonstrated that a range of other policies support the location for a hotel use. Therefore, in determining the application, these policy considerations must be weighed against one another to determine the most appropriate outcome.

6.4.2 There is no doubt of the demand for a hotel at this location. This has been established in Hillingdon's evidence base for the Local Plan: Part 1 and revisited in HAL's own Hotel Demand Study.

6.4.3 The location of the site also supports the proposal, being on the southern side of the airport where there is a limited range of hotel stock and number of bedrooms, when compared with the concentration of hotels to the north of the airport. The site's location also means that a hotel will be terminal linked, which also presents a particular locational advantage over hotels that do not have a direct terminal link. Given that the majority hotel guests will be Terminal 4 passengers as well as being drawn from the other terminals, it can be argued that the proposed use is airport related in its function.

6.4.4   Finally, the site does not lend itself to any of the defined range of airport related uses. While the size of the site may accommodate an office development, the site is too small and/or in the wrong location for air cargo transit sheds, car hire facilities, flight catering, freight forwarding and airport industry and warehousing.

6.4.5   Therefore, it is considered that, the proposed hotel use at this location is acceptable in principle.

7   Design Approach

7.0.1   As discussed in Chapter 4 of this Planning Statement, discussions with LB Hillingdon and CABE have led to the decision to submit a hybrid scheme, comprising of a full detailed proposal in respect of the external appearance and an outline with regard to the internal building parameters. This approach has given all parties the confidence that a high quality appearance will be delivered as well as achieving the flexibility in the final building dimensions required for a hotel operator.

7.0.2   Full details of the design approach can be found in the enclosed Design and Access Statement.

7.1   The Veil

7.1.1   From the initial stages of the project, HAL has sought a design solution that will be a unqiue local landmark in its own right. Additionally, the design is intended to complement the improvements to the Terminal 4 departures forecourt and check in area while improving the environment around the terminal.

7.1.2   The most striking feature of the veil is the vertical perforated metal columns. Each is crescent shaped when viewed in plan and can be arranged at various angles depending on the desired levels of visual permeability and shading. This arrangement also gives a depth to the veil that differs depending on the angle from which it is viewed.

7.1.3   The columns are stacked in five bands that travel around the hotel buildings and are vertically offset by a column width in each band. This further enhances the impression of depth and visual interest while creating a level of screening sufficient from the outer environs.

7.1.4   It is proposed to use three distinct colours to emphasise the different elements of the veil, which could also match the branding of a hotel operator if desired. This could be to enhance the vertical and horizontal plains of the veil while adding shaded of colour to articulate the depth and dimension of the structure.

7.1.5   The lighting of the veil is also critical to the success of the veil. Various lighting proposals have been considered however the lead solution involves the columns being internally lit while the horizontal bands are emphasised.

7.1.6   As set out in Chapter 3 of this Planning Statement, the veil element forms the full detail part of the application. HAL share the opinion of Hillingdon and CABE that the external treatment of the hotel needs to be provided in detail to ensure the design objectives are met and delivered. HAL also acknowledges that further fine tuning of the design may also be required before this stage of the planning process. We are therefore willing to accept a planning condition that requires details of materials, colour scheme and lighting of the veil to be provided prior to the commencement of this part of the development.

7.2   The Outline Parameters

7.2.1   The hotel element of the scheme has been shown as a series of outline parameters. The decision to proceed in this way is based upon the needs to provide a flexible 'shell' for a hotel operator to deliver at the reserved matters stage. Although the outline element

provides for flexibility in the size and massing of the structure, the parameters themselves are far from being an arbitrary box in which a future building is to be designed. Rather, the parameters have been specifically sized to allow different hotel standards to be delivered in the same parameters. For example, a 3 star hotel with smaller rooms could be delivered in the same space as a 4 or 5 star hotel with larger rooms with minimal changes to the scale parameters between the different standards. The main change will be in the number of rooms each offer can deliver; more for a budget with smaller rooms, less for a full service with larger rooms.

7.2.2   The parameters have been achieved by applying a grid across each vertical face of the hotel, as well as each of the floor plates. The grid provides a modular approach in which room sizes of between 16sqm for a budget offer and 25sqm full service can be delivered within the parameters. If the budget hotel were to be delivered, a maximum of 660 bedrooms could be provided on site. For the larger, full service offer, the bedrooms would number around 344.

7.2.3   The parameters of the buildings are also designed to deliver two separate hotels, or one large single hotel, around an internal courtyard. These are to be contained within the veil so that the outward appearance of the buildings will in effect be the veil and the inward elevations and internal courtyards will be the subject of a future reserved matters application.

7.2.4   The outer building footprint parameter is fixed to ensure the integrity of the veil is maintained. This has meant that any flexibility in the building footprint comes from the internal dimensions, rather than changing the alignment of the veil within the site boundaries. However, as the internal courtyard is a key feature of the proposal, the courtyard area must maintain a dimension of between 23 metres x 23 metres to 35 metres to 35 metres (or any combination in between). This prevents the buildings from 'infilling' the courtyard space without providing additional storeys.

7.2.5   The maximum height parameter is 47.6 metres AOD and the minimum 44.6 metres AOD. The range between minimum and maximum height is one storey height. The purpose of this range is to provide a hotel operator with the option of providing more rooms with a maximum height parameter or less hotel rooms with the minimum without affecting the internal dimensions of the courtyard or internal building lines. In other words, the flexibility in room numbers can be adjusted by adding or subtracting a storey height. The outward appearance of the hotel is not affected, as the veil height is fixed.

7.2.6   The Design and Access Statement provides examples of how a variety of different hotel options can be delivered.

7.3   Design Approach Conclusion

7.3.1   The hybrid approach taken to the scheme may be considered unorthodox for a scheme of this size, however it delivers the best balance of design detail with scheme flexibility to take the proposal forward. Importantly however, the approach delivers against the design objectives and policy adopted at a local level.

7.3.2   As set out in Chapter 4 of this Planning Statement, Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 1 and Unitary Development Plan both seek to ensure that new development harmonise with the surrounding environment while also making a positive contribution to the surrounding

area. As stated above and shown in the Design and Access Statement, the veil will be a structure of architectural merit that will ultimately become a point of visual interest in the Terminal 4 hinterland. The result is a vast improvement to the existing use of the site as a car park and the surrounding environment dominated by terminal infrastructure and a multi-storey car park.

7.3.3   Although in outline, the scale of the outline element is governed by specific parameters that respond to the type of hotel offer that could be provided. This provides the certainty that the scale and massing of the proposal will be suitable for the site, while maintaining key features of the proposal such as the alignment of the veil and the size of the internal courtyard.

7.3.4   When appraising the design approach against policy, the proposal complies with the intentions of Policy BE1 of the Local Plan where it requires developments to be designed to a high quality, enhance local distinctiveness and be appropriate in terms of its layout, form, scale and materials.

7.3.5   In terms of the UDP, the development harmonises with the surrounding environment in that its scale and massing is not out of place with the surrounding area, as required by Policy BE13. The design of the development, particularly the veil, will introduce a contemporary style to the area, which is an additional aim of policy BE13.

7.3.6   The scheme is considered to respond to, and comply with, the adopted design policies at a local level.

8 Pedestrian Access

8.1 Existing Situation

8.1.1 A defined safe walking route runs from the site to the terminal. This follows Swindon Road then turns beneath the vehicle ramp, segregated from adjacent cycle and motor cycle parking before meeting the northern end of the arrivals forecourt. Although the path is clear and wide, the route is dominated by the vehicle ramp and roads either side. This fulfils the practical purposes for access to the staff car park, but the opportunity exists to greater improve the environment for guests walking between the terminal and the hotel.

8.1.2 Physical way-finding will be an important consideration for improvements to the pedestrian environment. The Hilton Hotel has resolved the terminal linkage by constructing an enclosed aerial walkway from the hotel to the terminal. However, a far greater opportunity exists for the application site to improve the ground level environment to create a more inviting gateway to the site.

8.2 Proposal

8.2.1 The proposed pedestrian route between the terminal and the hotel is shown in the Design and Access Statement. Although this element is submitted in outline, the intention for the route is to progress the same hard landscaping detail of the hotel's internal courtyard along the edge of Swindon Road and beneath the departures vehicle ramp. Additionally, the route beneath the vehicle ramp is to be given a pedestrian priority, rather than being a delineated route as currently exists. This approach, coupled with street furniture, wayfinding and potentially some elements of the veil are aimed at creating an environment that is inviting and a transition zone between the terminal and the hotel.

8.2.2 The overall strategy for the pedestrian link is presented in outline for the purpose of the application. HAL acknowledges that further detail is required to finalise the specific details of this link to ensure the best solution is delivered. To this end, HAL will provide full details of the pedestrian link prior to the commencement of the development, and are content to accept a condition to secure these details. HAL are also committed to the delivery of the link as it is seen as a key component of the success of a hotel in this location.

8.2.3 Pedestrian access to the site is not only limited to the link between the terminal and the hotel. There currently exists a pedestrian crossing of the Southern Perimeter Road which provides onward pedestrian routes past the Hilton Hotel. While it is not intended to provide further crossings of the Southern Perimeter Road, the site frontage will be improved to provide a more favourable pedestrian environment for those accessing the site and Terminal 4.

8.3 Pedestrian Access Conclusion

8.3.1 The proposals for pedestrian access to the hotel will transform the existing environment along Swindon Road and at the northern end of the Terminal 4 arrivals forecourt.

Although full details are to be provided at the detailed design phase of the development, the design intent clearly meets the Local Plan: Part 1 Policy BE1 objective of improving the public realm environment.

9 Vehicular Access and Parking

9.0.1 The application is supported by a Transport Statement which provides information on the existing transport situation and the impact of the development upon highway, traffic and transportation in the vicinity of the site. The Transport Statement concludes that there will be no discernable impact on the surrounding area in this respect.

9.1 Vehicular Access

9.1.1. As stated in Chapter 2 of this Planning Statement, and explained in detail in the Transport Statement, the site has excellent access to the local highway network. Access to the site will be provided from Swindon Road, which currently experiences low traffic volumes. The access will ramp down to a semi-basement car park and service yard.

9.1.2. A coach layby is to be provided on the site frontage with Swindon Road and the disused Control Post 21 provides sufficient manoeuvring space for coaches to exit Swindon Road in forward gear.

9.1.3. In addition to the site access arrangements, provision has been made for a layby on Southern Perimeter Road for access to the repositioned gas governor. This is not intended to be a permanent parking bay, but only a bay for gas company vehicles.

9.2 Parking

9.2.1 As set out in Chapter 4 of this Planning Statement, there is currently no defined parking standard for hotel uses at a local or regional level. Following discussions with Hillingdon, it has been determined that a semi-basement car park with a parking ratio of 1 space for every 6 bedrooms is the most appropriate solution for the site.

9.2.2 A car parking ratio of 1:6 will result in a net reduction in parking space from the existing S4 car park. The parameter plans govern that the maximum number of hotel rooms will be 660. If the ratio of 1:6 were to be applied to this number of rooms, a total of 110 parking spaces will be provided. Therefore, the result is a minimum net reduction of 23 spaces.

9.2.3 Although the site has access to a range of public transport options, these cannot be relied upon as the only means of access to the site. A Hotel Demand Study undertaken by TRI Hospitality Consulting has examined the requirement for car parking on site. This has underlined the fact that Heathrow is an important commercial location for conferences and for accommodation demand for business located in key catchment areas such as Hounslow, Brentford, Uxbridge, Ruislip, Hayes and the wider Thames Valley along the M4 as far as Newbury. Additionally, leisure destinations such as Windsor, Kew Gardens, Legoland and Thorpe Park are all a relatively short distance from Heathrow. Therefore, the benefit of onsite car parking goes beyond transport to and from the airport. Other journeys that are only feasible by car are also anticipated, whether for business and networking reason or for use of the hotel as accommodation for the surrounding leisure attractions.

9.2.4 The alternative to on-site car parking is to utilise the existing parking facilities around the airport. For this site, the parking locations would be the short stay parking at Terminal 4 or long stay parking located on Scylla Road to the south of Terminal 4. Neither of these

locations can be relied upon for a hotel use. The short stay parking would not be attractive to any guest due to the cost accrued in staying for a prolonged period. Additionally, this car park experiences capacity pressures during early morning and evening due to the profile of flights arriving and departing from Terminal 4 at these times.

9.2.5   Heathrow's long stay parking facilities also do not represent a feasible alternative to onsite parking. In the first instance, use of the long stay car park for hotel parking would be more detrimental to the air quality environment than if the parking was on site. This is because the guest needs to make bus journeys to and from the car park in addition to their original car journeys. An onsite car park would mean that the journeys are directly to and from the hotel. Therefore, the amount of air pollution per guest is less than if they utilised the bus journey.

9.2.6   The proposed car parking ratio of 1:6 is not significant when comparing other hotels around Heathrow. The most comparable hotel to the proposal is the Sofitel at Terminal 5, as this location is directly terminal linked. The parking ratio at this hotel is 1:1.5. In terms of other hotels, examples include the Premier Inn T5 (1:5), the Premier Inn Bath Road (1:2), the Hotel Ibis (1:2), Holiday Inn (1:2), Park Inn (1:1.4), Renaissance Hotel (1:1), Mariott Hotel (1:1.4), Sheraton Heathrow (1:2) and the Sheraton Skyline (1:1). Therefore, the 1:6 parking ratio proposed for the hotel is lower than other hotels around Heathrow, including the terminal linked Sofitel Hotel and Terminal 5.

9.3   Vehicle Access and Parking Conclusion

9.3.1.   Although the Southern Perimeter Road is a principle traffic route around Heathrow Airport, vehicle movements are free flowing and there is little to no congestion. Swindon Road is very lightly trafficked and is not a through road. Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 1 policy seeks to steer development toward locations to minimise the impact on the transport networks while encouraging alternate transport modes other than the private vehicle. In this case, the site's surrounding free flowing road network coupled with the easy access to multiple public transport options are in line with Policy T1.

9.3.2.   The policy position on car parking is less clear cut. The overriding position in terms of hotels is that each proposal will be assessed on its own merits. The London Plan states that parking should meet 'operational needs' while the Hillingdon UDP states that parking will be assessed on an individual basis. Although the UDP also sets a benchmark of one space per bedroom on key arterial roads, clear guidance from Hillingdon Officers indicates that this is not an appropriate ratio. Therefore, given the likely demand for car parking at this site, the level of accessibility to public transport facilities and having a directly comparable example of the Sofitel at Terminal 5, the parking ratio of 1:6 is an acceptable amount of parking for this location and will result in a net reduction in the number of car parking spaces from the existing S4 car park.

10 Sustainability and Energy

10.1 Sustainability

10.1.1. The proposal's location assists in meeting local and regional climate change and sustainability objectives, being in a location where a high number of hotel guests will transit using public transport facilities. While not designated as a town centre, Terminal 4 has a greater throughput of people and a similar range of facilities to many centres in outer London. Therefore, locating a hotel use adjacent to a hotel terminal can be compared with locating in or adjacent to a town centre, which is considered a sustainable location for a hotel use.

10.1.2. It is acknowledged that the proposal is located within an Air Quality Management Area. On the basis of the outline details submitted, the proposal in not anticipated to worsen the existing air quality conditions in the area above the existing use of the site as an open car park with 133 spaces. Further air quality considerations will be delivered with the detailed design of the hotel buildings at the reserved matters stage.

10.1.3. A key element of sustainable development is resilience to climate change. In this respect, a Flood Risk Assessment has been provided with the application. This concludes that the site is a low risk of fluvial flooding, sewer flooding and pluvial flooding. Therefore, the site is considered suitable for the proposed development.

10.2 Energy

10.2.1. The Design and Access Statement considers the various component of a hotel development where energy efficient measures can be incorporated. In general terms, these are considered to be the guest areas, public areas and services areas. Each of these zones presents its own specific energy consumption characteristics and challenges. For example in guest areas (bedrooms, bath- rooms) the major focus may be energy control in response to room usage, water conservation, daylight, etc. For public areas, the focus needs to be on the efficient reaction to rapidly changing usage patterns and control of air flows to/from the external environment via entrance lobbies. In service areas, including kitchens and laundries, activities can be potentially energy intensive, warranting particular attention in terms of energy conservation.

10.2.2. On the exterior of the hotel, the veil will fulfil an energy reduction role through the management of solar gain and natural light.

10.2.3. Full details of an energy strategy will be submitted with the reserved matters application, including various options for sustainable and centralised energy systems. HAL's aspiration is that these details will demonstrate that the development will achieve and BREEAM rating of at least 'Very Good'.

10.3 Sustainability and Energy Conclusion

10.3.1. Policy EM1 of Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 1 sets out the sustainability and energy objections for the Borough. The above has set out how the proposal will comply with this policy, however it is acknowledged that much of the detail will be delivered with the reserved detailed design phase.

11 Landscape and Ecology

11.1 Landscape

11.1.1. The existing landscaping of the area surrounding the car park consists of trees that are of low amenity value, being of a semi-mature age group and relatively small in size, not exceeding 40cm diameter. The trees do not have high bio-diversity value since they are mainly non-native ornamental trees planted when the site was redeveloped as a car park.

11.1.2. The outline proposal incorporates the following elements:

- New planting schemes along Swindon Road with native species;
- New planting schemes along Southern Perimeter Road with native species and insect boxes;
- Planting will be provided in the new public square;
- Vertical planting will be encouraged within the public square;
- The first floor terraces will be "green roofs" (for example - sedum);
- Local biodiversity expertise will be retained for the design stage to help identify species of local biodiversity importance;
- Adoption of horticultural good practice (e.g. no, or low, use of residual pesticides);
- Installation of insect boxes at appropriate locations on the site;
- The proper integration, design and maintenance of SUDs; and
- The selection of species will be consistent with HAL environmental and operational requirements.

11.1.3. A full landscaping scheme will be the subject of a future reserved matters application. This landscaping scheme will be subject to Heathrow's environmental policies and review prior to submission of reserved matters.

11.2 Ecology

11.2.1.   In general terms the ecological value of the existing landscape is considered to be low. However, the pre-application discussions with Hillingdon revealed that the site may have the potential to be a bat habitat due to its location near the Duke of Northumberland's River and with the site containing a number of trees. Given this potential, HAL has commissioned a Phase 1 Habitat Survey and this is submitted with the application. The Survey revealed there to be existing nesting opportunities for birds and roosting opportunities for bats. Furthermore, there may also be suitable forging habitat for terrestrial mammals such as badger and hedgehog. The Survey makes a number of recommendations for the development of the proposal which are anticipated to be secured by planning condition.

11.2.2.   For completeness, HAL commissioned a further Initial Bat Survey. This focused on the existing gas governor substation building but found no evidence of bat roosting in the structure.

11.3 Landscape and Ecology Conclusion

11.3.1. The full details of the outline landscape plan is found in the Design and Access Statement and the Phase 1 Habitat Survey with recommendation accompanies the application. These show that the proposal will improve the existing landscape conditions and benefit local ecology and biodiversity.

12   Conclusion

12.0.1 This Planning Statement has identified the need for additional hotel accommodation at Terminal 4 and that the S4 car park at Swindon Road is best placed to provide a sustainably beneficial terminal linked hotel.

12.0.2 The principle of the development has strong national, regional and local level support and will deliver a high quality hotel development that is the best utilisation of this land parcel adjacent to Terminal 4.

12.0.3 The approach to the design delivers a unique local landmark that is complementary to the recent improvements to Terminal 4. The veil fulfils both architectural and functional roles, while the outline elements of the scheme will deliver the degree of flexibility needed for a hotel operator to take on the site and deliver the further design detail.

12.0.4 The proposal will result in an improved pedestrian environment at ground level, particularly between the hotel and the terminal. Car parking has also been provided on site at an appropriate level given the site context and precedents elsewhere.

12.0.5 This Planning Statement has provided the detailed considerations of how and why the proposed development accords with all levels of adopted policy. Ultimately, the proposal will be of benefit to both passengers using Terminal 4 and regional visitors, will be of architectural merit and will result in environmental improvements to the wider area.

Appendix 1: Correspondence from CABE

Heathrow Terminal 4 Hotel, Hillingdon
Design Workshop
Notes from Thursday 9 May 2013

Thank you for attending Cabe's Design Workshop on Thursday 9 May 2013. We welcome the opportunity to offer our advice to develop the proposal and look forward to engaging in future dialogue as the design develops. We commend the ambition of the design team, client and local authority in their approach to high design quality and the tendering process, for example. We also commend the overall vision to create a landmark building and support the idea of a protected space surrounded by a "veil". However, we are concerned that though the proposal is still at an earlier design phase, it is at risk of falling short of the aspired high design quality in the attempt to balance the planning and operational requirements. A hybrid planning application could be used to help ensure that the design concept and quality of specific architectural elements are retained. We offer the following suggestions in taking the proposal forward.

Public realm

The footfall from the airport requires a clear and pleasant strategy for pedestrians. We welcome the initial studies to embrace the public realm as part of the overall design strategy.

- Given the existing unsatisfactory state of the pedestrian access to the site, the success of the proposed hotel relies heavily on the ability to make this route both welcoming and safe. A clear pedestrian pathway should be established which is distinctly separate from the vehicular carriageway. We suggest that a visual connection to the hotel along this path would be helpful in attracting visitors and establishing a sense of direction. Think about how to enliven the blank wall façade along this route and create a signal to the hotel using design or material elements of the "veil", for example.

- Consider how the relationship between the Hilton Hotel and proposed site could be strengthened by addressing and extending the pedestrian access for both visitors and employees. We welcome how the design begins to establish a dialogue between the Hilton Hotel site and airport terminal via the proposed central public space.

Car parking

Whilst we welcome that the proposal provides basement parking so that cars are not visible on ground level, we question the need for car parking facilities on site.

- The design and vision of the landmark hotel should be used as a benchmark for future hotels. Thus, a successful model for car-free hotels could be initiated. Consider how onsite/offsite car hire facilities and pick-up/drop off points could be strategically located to

make most of the existing network of shuttle buses and public transport. We urge the local authority to provide the support and guidance needed to develop these options.

Architectural "Veil"

The strength of the proposal currently hinges on the success of the "veil" as an architectural concept. We thus believe that a strong commitment to this concept must be maintained throughout the delivery of the proposal.

- We are concerned that in the absence of a strong functional relationship between the "veil" and core, value engineering could threaten its quality and detailing, and the "veil" could be disposed of. We suggest that a detailed planning application should be used to help secure the aspired level of design quality. The design approach to match the core buildings and detailing of internal elevations should be addressed as these elements would become particularly apparent without the "veil". Think about how design options could be explored to help reduce costs from the outset, such as supporting the "veil" from the building, and reducing the span of the "veil" over entrances. Consider how the form and configuration of the "veil" and the core could also relate more closely.

- Think about how the "veil" could be used to provide additional value to the building and its users. In the case of sustainability, the "veil" could be designed to buffer sound to the north and provide daylight shading to the south, for example. Explore options of how the "veil" could also identify and accentuate specific elements of the buildings, such as entrances.

- We believe that the veil has great potential to be most captivating at night, using lighting mechanisms for example. We think, however, that the architectural form and detail should also be appealing when experienced in daytime.

Core Building

We welcome aspects of the initial design approach to the site, namely, internal courtyards, and provision of two separate buildings. We feel this design approach has the potential to create a feeling of enclosure and enjoyment in the midst of a harsh environment.

- We suggest that the external and internal architecture of the core building could be treated as detailed and outline planning applications respectively. This would ensure that the operator is offered more flexibility on the internal layout and specifications. Given the market demand for budget hotels, we strongly urge the client and local authority to enforce the design guidelines and standards with the chosen operator.

- The internal courtyard should be framed by the core building to establish a meaningful space, sense of greenery and a safe environment. While the "C" shaped building achieves this, we feel the "T" shaped building could be configured differently to relate better to the other proposed building and the site.

Attendees

Design Workshop Panel

Rab Bennetts (chair)
Neil Deely

Scheme presenters

Michael Mullen	BDP
Jamie Whitfield	Heathrow Airport Limited
Stephen Allen	Heathrow Airport Limited
Andy Wadham	Heathrow Airport Limited

Local authority

Adrien Waite	London Borough of Hillingdon
Gareth Gywnne	London Borough of Hillingdon

Design Council Cabe staff

Thomas Bender
Victoria Lee

Appendix 2: Office Occupancy Rates

HAL controlled existing landside offices at T4 and nearby
As at January 2013

Location	Total area sqM net	Area vacant sqM
T4 Main Building 14401:		
Landside office pod south	608	0
Landside office pod north	605	0
NE Extension third floor	330	52
NE Extension departures level 15	553	0
NE Extension mezzanine level	325	0
Mezzanine - main	850	0
Mezzanine - south end	643	0
TOTAL Landside Building 14401	3914	52
T4 Spiral House 14402:		
Level 1 (ground)	169	89
Level 2 (First)	94	94
Level 3 (Second)	52	0
Level 4 (third)	94	0
TOTAL Building 14402		183
Aviation House :		
Ground	325	0
First	355	0
Second	363	0
Total Aviation House	1043	0
Total T4 and locality	4957	
TOTAL vacant current		235
Vacant as % of total stock current		5%
Expected vacations- T4		262
Expected vacations-Aviation House		352
Total potentially becoming available		614
Current & Future Vacant as % of total stock current without impact of new lets		17%

Vacant schedule T4 Landside Offices January 2013:

Location	Location Code	Level	Unit number	Address	Type	Area sq M	Comments
Spiral House	14402	20	200/201	Spiral House first floor room	Office	94	
Spiral House	14402	0	108	Spiral House ground floor room	Office	89	
Main Building	14401	30	5900c	Room 5900C NE Extension	Office	52	
Aviation House							Nothing noted - but c.225 sqM ground floor may become available in 2013 with 100 sqm retained. HAL to vacate 1st floor West wing 127 sqM in 2014

T4 - Airline Relocations post T2 opening mean Malaysian Airlines (oneWorld) moving to T3 in 2015/2016 - 90 sqm landside offices to be vacated.

T4 - Airline Relocations mean Continental (UA) moving to T2 in 2014/15 - 172 sqm landside offices to be vacated.

Heathrow
Making every journey better