
FW: SIPSON GARDEN CENTRE - 67666/APP/2015/2413

1 message

Robin Buchanan <r.buchanan@pvprojects.com>
To: "kdafe@hillington.gov.uk" <kdafe@hillington.gov.uk>

21 October 2015 at 10:27

Dear Mr Dafe

Further to my email below, the applicant's highway consultant WSP has provided additional comments as follows:

- The Heathrow Villages ward has an average household occupancy of 2 persons, with the adjacent Pinkwell ward at 2.1 persons. Thus 53 dwellings might generate a population closer to 106-112 (rounded up) than the 133 persons indicated yesterday.
- Regarding the PTAL 1B score; the site is located on the edge of a recognised village where ordinarily residential development within the village, e.g. infilling, is unlikely to be unacceptable as a matter of principle. The Transport Assessment and Travel Plan refer to potential measures to enhance sustainability in relation to walking and cycling and accessing existing bus services.

Regards,

Robin

Robin Buchanan MRTPI | **T** 01794 368698 | **M** 07880 700888

Director **T** 01635 40184

PRO VISION PLANNING & DESIGN

GROSVENOR COURT, WINCHESTER ROAD, AMPFIELD, WINCHESTER, SO51 9BD

2 OLD BATH ROAD, NEWBURY, BERKSHIRE, RG14 1QL

www.pvprojects.com

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are privileged and confidential (within the meaning of applicable law) and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. Unauthorised dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify admin@pvprojects.com or telephone 01794 368 698 and delete it from your system. Whilst every endeavour is taken to ensure that our e-mails do not contain viruses, no liability can be accepted and the recipient should use their own virus checking software.

PV PROJECTS LTD - UK Registered Office -13 Malibres Road, Chandlers Ford, Hampshire, SO53 5DS. Reg No. 3296321

From: Robin Buchanan
Sent: 20 October 2015 17:50
To: 'kdafe@hillingdon.gov.uk' <kdafe@hillingdon.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: SIPSON GARDEN CENTRE - 67666/APP/2015/2413
Importance: High

Dear Mr Dafe

Further to my email dated 2 October, I provide below the applicant's Highway Consultants WSP response to highway issues raised by the Highway Officer (and in turn by the GLA and TfL). We refer to the Highway Officer's paragraph lettering:

A: "Details of proposed car parking layout / provision, and the size of the 53 residential dwellings should be provided". The application is outline and this level of detail was not required by the Council in the previous application – this is clear from the previous Officer Report under the heading "main planning issues", nor was it requested during the pre-application discussion with the Council's Highway Officer. The applicant's highway consultant WSP provided parking details in Chapter 5 of the Transport Assessment.

B: The Trip Generation levels are queried for the following reasons: not demonstrated that the selected sites are compatible in terms of location, car parking provision, size of dwellings, tenure and accessibility to public transport. The methodology adopted for the trip generation was the same as the previous application that was submitted for the site and previously accepted by Hillingdon. We agreed this approach – please see attached email. The two-way trip rates are 0.598 and 0.618 which are considered high so it is not clear why these are being questioned?

C: Notes that PTAL of site is 1B very poor. This is a general statement but not previously a reason for refusal.

D: Swept Paths: It is suggested that swept paths should have 300mm error margin – this is not something that has been previously required. Reference is made to refuse vehicles encroaching onto opposing traffic lanes (see attached). The junction is designed to the same standard to the junction that was agreed for the previous application and therefore there is no reason why this is not acceptable now. From the attached it can be seen that there is run-over but this was considered acceptable to the frequency of such movements and that good forward visibility is provided. If the Council insist on 300mm error margin and no over-run then the junction will need to be widened, which will make the junction wider and be to the detriment of pedestrians crossing the access; however, primarily this was not required previously and nor was it a reason for refusal.

E: It is suggested that it is not clear whether the internal roads are to be adopted or on-street parking to be managed. This is an outline application so it is not reasonable or necessary to request this level of detail at this stage. Again, none of this amounted to reasons for refusal previously.

F: It ought to be apparent to the Officer concerned that the site will be developed for only one quantum of development as described in the application; the precise siting and layout of development is a reserved matter.

G: A Construction and Logistics Plan should be provided. As noted / agreed by TfL, this should form a condition.

H: A Service and Delivery Plan should be provided. As noted / agreed by TfL, this should form a condition.

I to J: Relates to the junction assessment. The Junctions 8 files within the report are from the original scheme in the previous application that had a higher quantum of development. However, the junction is still forecast to operate well within capacity, with maximum RFC values of 0.099 and 0.105 during the AM and

PM peak hours respectively with the 2020 flows.

TfL

TfL are requesting detail on car and cycle parking numbers. See response at 'A' above. Parking is stated to be provided in accordance with the Council's standards.

The Travel Plan is said to have failed the ATTrBute assessment because it is not stated how the TP will be secured. As the Planning Officer will appreciate this is routinely secured through a suitable planning condition. It is not clear why the 'numbers of users' is required – this is a residential scheme not a commercial proposal or continuation of the garden centre use. However, if occupiers is required, then applying an average of 2.5 persons per household gives 133 occupiers. However, fundamentally this is not information that led to reason for refusal previously.

We hope you find this information helpful.

It does appear that the application is being scrutinised to a level of detail that is not reasonable or warranted for an outline application and/or that Officers and consultees are either failing to properly understand the application and the documents and plans that have been submitted and/or are seeking to raise issue that did not form reasons for refusal previously in circumstances where there has been no material change in circumstances since the previous application.

I appreciate that my colleague has already requested details from you regarding the intended Committee meeting but please could this be established as quickly as possible as we have been seeking this information for some time now.

Many thanks.

Regards,

Robin

Robin Buchanan MRTPI | **T** 01794 368698 | **M** 07880 700888

Director **T** 01635 40184

PRO VISION PLANNING & DESIGN

GROSVENOR COURT, WINCHESTER ROAD, AMPFIELD, WINCHESTER, SO51 9BD

2 OLD BATH ROAD, NEWBURY, BERKSHIRE, RG14 1QL

www.pvprojects.com

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are privileged and confidential (within the meaning of applicable law) and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. Unauthorised dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify admin@pvprojects.com or telephone 01794 368 698 and delete it from your system. Whilst every endeavour is taken to ensure that our e-mails do not contain viruses, no liability can be accepted and the recipient should use their own virus checking software.

PV PROJECTS LTD - UK Registered Office -13 Malibres Road, Chandlers Ford, Hampshire, SO53 5DS. Reg No. 3296321

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Paul Harrison <pharrison@hillingdon.gov.uk>

To: "Coleman, Adam" <Adam.Coleman@wspgroup.com>

Cc:

Date: Thu, 13 Nov 2014 08:18:10 +0000

Subject: Re: Heathrow Garden Centre, Sipson Road: Revised Application
Adam

Your proposals seem reasonable. However, further comments will be made once a formal planning application has been submitted.

Regards
Paul

On 10 November 2014 16:39, Coleman, Adam <Adam.Coleman@wspgroup.com> wrote:

Dear Paul,

We have recently started working on the transport assessment work for a revised planning application for the Heathrow Garden Centre site on Sipson Road. The consultants Milestone completed the previous site application (Ref 67666/APP/2013/1579) for a mixed use development.

The revised scheme is for a predominantly residential scheme (circa 100 units), with possible community land uses (such as a community centre).

It is my understanding that although the previous application was refused, the single transport related matter (regarding site access arrangement) was subsequently agreed. A copy of the proposed arrangement is attached.

The new proposal is for the site to be accessed via a single access to the north, with a similar arrangement to the attached proposed. We do not envisage a requirement for a second site access via the south as proposed with the previous application as this was for access to the retail and employment land uses that are no longer proposed.

Would you please confirm that the level of assessment work completed for the previous application is acceptable for the revised application? We will obviously update where necessary, such as accident data and trip rates but will use the same approach as before.

I did try calling you earlier to discuss the application. Please contact me if you require any further information.

Regards

Adam

Adam Coleman

Associate

WSP UK, Mountbatten House, Basing View, Basingstoke, RG21 4HJ

Tel: [+44\(0\)1256 318730](tel:+44(0)1256 318730)

Mob: [+44\(0\)7884 731127](tel:+44(0)7884 731127)

Fax: [+44\(0\)1256 318700](tel:+44(0)1256 318700)

Website: www.wspgroup.co.uk

WSP is one of the world's leading professional services firms, working with governments, businesses, architects and planners and providing integrated solutions across many disciplines. The firm provides services to transform the built environment and restore the natural environment. It has approximately 15,000 employees, based in more than 300 offices, across 35 countries, on every continent.

Confidential

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

WSP UK Limited Registered Office: WSP House, 70 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1AF Registered Number 01383511 England



If possible, please consider saving paper by not printing your e-mail.

Paul Harrison

Highway Development Engineer

Planning Services (Transportation)

Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services

London Borough of Hillingdon

Civic Centre, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

Tel: 01895 277420

Please note that the comments made in this email represent officer opinion and cannot be seen to prejudice the Local Planning Authority's formal determination in relation to any application or planning matter.

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

2 attachments

 **noname.eml**
18K

 **Transport Assessment_Final_Drawings.pdf**
243K