

**Our ref:** AF/TR/Q230135  
**Your ref:** 68663/APP/2023/1933  
**Email:** tim.rainbird@quod.com  
**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> October 2023



Mr M Briginshaw  
Principal Planning Officer  
Planning, Regeneration and Environment  
Hillingdon Council  
Civic Centre  
High Street  
Uxbridge  
UB8 1UW

### By email only

Dear Mr Briginshaw,

### Former B&M Unit, 217 High Street, Yiewsley, West Drayton UB7 7GN Planning Application Reference 68663/APP/2023/1933

We write on behalf of our client, TJ Morris Limited ('the Applicant'), in respect of the above pending application to regenerate the former B&M site at 217 High Street, Yiewsley ('the Application Site'). Specifically, we provide a response to the comments raised by Hillingdon Council's Urban Design Officer ('UDO') received via email on the 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

In reviewing this correspondence, it is significant to note that the UDO does not object to the application and confirms that the principle of the proposals is 'broadly accepted'. Instead, the UDO has provided comments / suggestions on potential changes to the scheme. Whilst we consider the pertinent matters raised, it is within the context that no objection has been raised that the UDO's comments must be considered.

## 1 Appearance

### Parapet Signage Feature

It is suggested by the UDO that the proposed entrance feature is proportionally too large compared to the overall building. In response to these comments the entrance feature has been reduced by approximately one metre, as illustrated in the updated Proposed Elevations enclosed (drawing reference 9864-107A).

### Proposed Entrance Location

The proposed relocation of the entrance at the southern edge of the front façade has been questioned by the UDO as the existing arrangement better aligns with pedestrian route.



The relocation of the entrance is proposed to ensure that the building's form aligns with the function of the retail operation proposed within it. A more central entrance has significant implications on the retailer's business model and would not be viable from an internal store layout perspective.

Notwithstanding, the relocated entrance is only marginally further from the pedestrian crossing than the current arrangement and pedestrian access will be achieved via a safe pedestrian walkway. We do not believe that customers will be inconvenienced by the proposed relocation of the store entrance. Indeed, for those using the blue badge spaces, the relocated entrance will be closer than the existing situation which is an improvement over the existing situation.

For these reasons it is not considered necessary or feasible to move the store entrance closer to the pedestrian crossing within the customer car park.

### **Covering of Proposed Roof Lights**

The UDO highlights that the proposed photovoltaic (PV) panels located on the roof will cover numerous window lights. As Home Bargains' retail model includes a suspended ceiling, roof lights do not achieve anything within the building. There are however significant sustainability benefits of installing PV.

To explain further, the building's roof is being replaced as part of the application proposals. This is being done to significantly improve its thermal performance and enable the installation of PV panels. Both measures will greatly improve the energy efficiency of the building in line with Policy DME1 2 of the Local Plan and in line with the objectives of the London Plan and the NPPF. These measures outweigh the limited benefits associated with retaining roof lights which in any event will offer no benefit to Home Bargains' occupation of the building.

### **Colour of Corrugated Roof**

In terms of the proposed colour of the corrugated roof this is an error on the submitted drawing. The correct colour should be Goosewing Wing (RAL 0807005) which has been corrected on the enclosed updated plans.

### **Perimeter Fencing**

It is suggested by the UDO that the proposed 4.2m high Heras fencing is not as robust as the existing brick and infill fencing and is considered to reduce the boundary treatment quality and increase any security risks. We do not agree with this assessment.

Trespassing, damage to the property and fly tipping has repeatedly occurred over the last 6 months. This has resulted in the destruction of large sections of the existing garden centre and fencing as shown in the photographs below. It is understood that initial access was achieved through using the existing low brick wall as a step to enter the Application Site.



As a result, it is necessary to replace the existing brick and infill fencing which is now structurally unsafe. A 4.2m high Heras fence, as proposed, provides the most appropriate and secure alternative. Similar security arrangements are provided at the majority of Home Bargains new stores. Replacing the existing brick and fill fencing on a like-for-like basis, where trespassers have already been able to access the Application Site on a number of occasions, does not provide an appropriate solution to the security issues. Instead, the proposed fencing provides the most appropriate solution to secure the Application Site – as has been supported by the existing security arrangements in similar stores elsewhere.

### Elevational Profiles

As requested, details of all elevational profile recesses have been provided in the enclosed drawing (reference 9864-111).

## 2 Layout and Landscaping

In considering the revised layout, the response from the UDO supports the provision of a dedicated pedestrian route from the High Street across the car park and the provision of more blue badge parking. Likewise, the landscape proposals are also supported by the UDO, as too is the removal of the existing car parking along the northern side of the access road.





The UDO also suggests the existing tree pits within the car park should be retained and planted with trees. A photograph of the existing situation is provided below illustrating that the tree pits do not include any trees and are overgrown.



Retaining the existing tree pits within the car park is not viable given it would adversely impact on car parking numbers together with causing potential issues and complexities with customer parking. For these reasons, it is not possible to retain the tree pits.

However, as set out in the application submission, the application does not propose the removal of any existing trees and instead proposes to plant 15no. new trees. The proposals will therefore result in an overall benefit in this respect.

### **3 Summary**

The UDO is broadly supportive and raises no objection to the application proposals. However, it is acknowledged that a number of comments have been raised. The Applicant has taken into account these comments and where viable and achievable these have been incorporated within the revisions to the scheme now being put forward.

We hope that this additional information and clarification is of assistance in your understanding of the matters raised and in the Local Planning Authorities determination of the planning application. However, should you wish to discuss any specific matter further please do not hesitate to contact us.



Yours sincerely,

Tim Rainbird  
Senior Director

Enc.

cc. TJ Morris Limited