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CAR CLUB SCHEME IN HOUNSLOW BOROUGH

Report by: Director of Street Management and Public Protection

Summary
Hounslow has started to implement a car club network within the borough. This report outlines the development that has taken place so far and describes potential future enhancements.

1.0 RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That members note the progress and future potential of the Hounslow car club.

2.0 BACKGROUND and COMMENT

2.1 Policy

2.1.1 A central focus of the Mayor of London’s transport strategy is sustainability, through the promotion of public transport and the reduction in use of the private car. However, the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (2001) acknowledges that the private car will continue to be many people’s preferred means of transport for particular journeys, especially in outer London.

2.1.2 Current transport policy promotes the development of car clubs as a way of helping cut congestion on streets. Hounslow has included a proposal in the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) “To continue to promote sustainable transport to encourage modal choice”. The LIP states that “car clubs provide people with the freedom and flexibility of using a car, but without the cost and hassle of owning a car. They are also a highly efficient use of kerbside space as research indicates that car clubs are very successful in discouraging car ownership. The Council is keen to seek funding to develop a city car club. Ideally the car club vehicles would include a significant proportion of electric fuelled cars and scooters”.

2.2 What is a car club?

2.2.1 A car club is very similar to car rental but works on a short-term, pay-as-you-drive basis, with cars available to collect from dispersed, unmanned locations. It provides a viable alternative to buying a car, especially for those people who only require the occasional use of a vehicle.

2.2.2 The benefits of a car club for the user include:
- the use of modern reliable cars;
- no servicing or maintenance costs;
- the convenience of a car in close proximity when needed;
- low overheads – typically £4.95 per hour and 18 pence per mile (inclusive of petrol).
2.2.3 Benefits for the community as a whole include:
- highly efficient use of kerbside space, as research indicates car clubs are successful in discouraging car ownership;
- reduction in car ownership: it is estimated that every car club car takes an average of six privately-owned cars off the roads. This is because members often sell or do not replace their own car when they join;
- reduction in vehicle mileage: research shows members choose to drive much less after joining a car club than before, as their use of other modes of transport increases. This will help to reduce emissions of CO2 and other pollutants.

2.3 Scheme development

2.3.1 Transport for London provided initial funding in 2005/6 from their Travel Awareness budget, for the establishment of a car club in Hounslow. This funding covers signs, lines and traffic orders for the car-club spaces and compensates the Borough for lost parking revenue. Further funding has been made available in 2006/7, to a two-year total of £50,000.

2.3.2 Officers initiated discussions with car club operator Streetcar in 2005, and arrangements were made to introduce two vehicles in car parks in the Chiswick and Brentford areas. Streetcar already operated a vehicle from neighbouring Hammersmith and it was felt that if cars could be located in Chiswick it would create a cluster effect where members could use one of two or three locations. The car club operator required parking spaces that had 24-hour access, were well-lit and safe and had a "reserved car club" sign in place.

2.3.3 The scheme commenced in January 2006, initially as a 3 month pilot. This proved successful and has now become more permanent.

2.3.4 TfL will not continue to fund the scheme in 2007/8 and discussions with Streetcar will now determine whether they will self-fund its continuation.

2.4 Car Club operation

2.4.1 Streetcar provides users with new Volkswagen Golfs that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for rent by the hour, day, week or month. Cars can be booked online 24 hours a day or by phone from 7am to 10pm. Club members access the cars from their reserved parking bays using their Streetcar smart card which they receive once they’ve joined. Once inside, the member types in a PIN number on the on-board computer (which releases the immobilizer), takes the keys from the glove compartment and drives away.

2.4.2 Hounslow residents can join Streetcar for a £150 returnable deposit and this will give them access to any of the 200 cars in the Streetcar fleet in London and elsewhere in the UK. To drive a Streetcar costs £4.95 an hour and 18 pence per mile, which covers all costs including local fuel. There are also special 24-hour, 5-day, weekly and monthly rates.

2.5 Usage

2.5.1 The first parking spaces reserved for Streetcar were in the Council’s car parks on Chiswick Common Road and at the Fountain Leisure Centre. The usage of the Chiswick Common Road vehicle proved to be so successful that a second vehicle was added, and one vehicle continues to be positioned at the Fountain Leisure Centre. Currently:
- The utilisation of the two vehicles at the Chiswick Common Road is 48%;
- The utilisation of the single vehicle at the Fountain Leisure Centre is 52%.
2.5.2 In October 2006, cars have been placed in Council car parks at Albany Parade
Brentford and South Street Isleworth. After a few weeks of operation:
• The utilisation of the single vehicle in the Albany Parade car park is 12%;
• The utilisation of the single vehicle in the South Street car park is 10%.

2.5.3 Streetcar has the following numbers of registered members living locally:
• Chiswick (W4) – 77 members’
• Isleworth (TW7) – 10 members;
• Brentford (TW8) – 9 members;
• Kew (TW9) using the Fountain Leisure Centre car park – 24 members.

2.6 Extension of the scheme

2.6.1 Off-street provision:
There may be opportunities to site cars in other Council owned car parks, provided
the operator believes there is a market for the service and is willing to rent the
spaces from the Council.

2.6.2 On-street provision:
It is intended to introduce four vehicles at on-street locations in Chiswick. Two
vehicles will shortly be placed on Netheravon Road near the junction with Chiswick
High Road and two cars on Sutton Court Road close to Chiswick Station.

2.6.3 Within developments:
Some developers are starting to include car clubs with their developments. The
Paragon development in Brentford is soon to have a car club in place as is the Key
Site 1 development in Hounslow town centre. These additions have resulted from
direct negotiations between developers and the car club operators, encouraged by
the Council. A car club is also proposed for the hotel development at Gillett
Corner.

2.6.4 Further expansion:
The long-term aim is to introduce car club vehicles into further areas and thereby
provide more comprehensive coverage throughout the borough. Officers have
commenced negotiations with other operators such as CityCar club to ascertain
options for extending the service on a competitive basis.

3.0 EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.1 The development of the car club project benefits many people in the borough who are
unable to own and operate their own private motor vehicle. The car club therefore
opens up travel options for a range of people and complements the public transport
network.

Background Papers: Working files including correspondence with TfL.

This report has been or is due to be considered by: Sustainable Development
Committee – 15 January 2007

This report is relevant to the following wards/areas: All
Location Off-Street
A - Fountain Leisure Centre
B - Chiswick Common Road Car Park (2 Cars)
C - Isleworth, South Street Car Park
D - Brentford, Albany Parade Car Park

Location On-Street
E - Sutton Court Road, near Chiswick Station (2 Cars)
F - Nethervon Road, near Chiswick High Road (2 Cars)
At a meeting of the Sustainable Development Committee held on Monday, 11 December 2006 at 7:30 pm in the Civic Centre, Lampton Road, Hounslow.

Present:
Councillor O'Reilly (Chair)
Councillors Barwood, Rajinder Bath, Cooper, Dakers, Bradley Fisher, Darshan Grewal, Hardy, Harmer, Harris, Hibbs, Hills, Oulds, Reid and Sangha

Apology for Absence
Councillors Pritam Grewal.

39. Declarations of interest under the Town Planning Code of Practice or any other communications from Members
All Councillors had received correspondence concerning the following applications:
Agenda item 4 -- Campion House, Thornbury Road, Isleworth
Agenda item 5 -- 210 Bath Road, Hounslow
Councillors Pritam Grewal, Hardy, Harris, O'Reilly and Sangha had received correspondence concerning agenda item 6 on Esporta Chiswick Riverside Club.
Councillors Bath, Bradley Fisher and Sangha had received correspondence concerning agenda item 7 on 305-307, Chiswick High Road.
Councillor Reid declared a prejudicial interest in connection with agenda item 8 on the Garages site, Chinchilla Drive, Hounslow. She left the meeting for discussion of this item.
Councillor Reid declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 concerning Campion House, Thornbury Road, Isleworth. Both declarations related to her membership of the board of the Primary Care Trust.

40. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2006
The minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2006 were confirmed subject to amending "she" in paragraph 8 of minute 35 to "he".

41. Addendum Report
An Addendum report was circulated in advance of the meeting, which contained additional information in relation to the following items:
Agenda item 5 -- 210 Bath Rd, Hounslow
Letters and petition in support of the application
Agenda item 6 -- Esporta, Chiswick Riverside Club, Riverside Drive, Chiswick
Additional responses to consultation and amendments to conditions proposed by the applicant.
Agenda item 7 -- 305-307 Chiswick High Road
Additional responses to consultation.
42. **Matter Arising -- circulation of supporting papers**

Mike Jordan, Director of Planning, stated that the notification letter sent to objectors and applicants from his department had now been amended. Individuals sending information directly to Councillors in support of their views were requested to always pass a copy to the Planning Office. Similarly if they were intending to present fresh evidence to the committee on the night of the meeting then they should provide an advance copy to the Planning Office. The Committee agreed that in the circumstances where individuals presented new information at the committee meeting itself then, if necessary, consideration of the relevant planning application would be deferred until later in the meeting to allow officers and other parties the opportunity to examine the new material. It might in some circumstances be necessary to defer discussion to a future meeting, however this would be discouraged. (Minute 35 refers)

No further action or advice was necessary regarding the potential code of conduct question raised at the last meeting. (Minute 35 refers)

43. **Campion House, Thornbury Road, Isleworth**

See report of the Director of Planning (agenda item 4).

With the permission of the Chairman, David Pavett, of Campion Concerns Monitoring Group, spoke as an objector to the application. He agreed with the concerns raised in the report of Officers and supported their recommendation for refusal of the application. He felt it was helpful for the reasons for refusal to be clearly stated as, hopefully, this would guide the developer in any plans for a further application. It was important that developments should meet sustainability standards and respect the environment in which they were placed. There were five specific issues, which he felt the committee should be mindful of. There was a need for greater clarity about density standards and the basis for measuring density of housing developments. The development should respect the local built environment and relative density compared with other housing in the local area should be considered. This development had to be considered in the context of other major developments in the local area and the combined impact that they would have. He calculated that there would be a 40% increase in the number of households in the Spring Grove Conservation Area, if this proposed development and the already approved proposal for the Brunel site were both to proceed. No account was taken in the application of the pressures on education, health and social care services. There was a lack of consultation and community involvement as part of preparing the development proposal. The proposal did not take adequate account of the strong character and historical heritage of the Spring Grove Conservation Area. There was a lack of focus in the proposal on sustainability. The residents wished to work positively with the developers to produce a proposal, which would enhance the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

Michael Jordan, Director of Planning, described the main issues relating to the application. The applicant had lodged appeals on the grounds of non-determination. The committee were therefore recommended to endorse the reasons for which the applications would have been refused had the appeals not been made. This would then form the Council's view at the planning appeal. Objectors or other third parties would have the opportunity to participate in the Planning Appeal and could separately give their views to the Planning Inspector. He reported that a new application for the site had recently been received by the Planning Office. He stated that the existing application had been subject to very thorough examination and there were a number of issues of fundamental concern, which gave rise to the officer's recommendation to refuse the application. These related to the scale, density, impact on the area and also to the use of open space.
There were various potential methods of calculating density, which produced figures varying between 240 to 650 habitable rooms per hectare, depending upon the element of open space that was used in the calculation. He suggested that, whichever method of calculation was used, there remained a concern about the overall impact on the area. The development would involve building on open space. There would be significant traffic generation. There would be a significant impact on the nature of the conservation area. In considering the reasons for refusal, he stated that officers had focused on what they felt were the insurmountable issues relating to the current proposal. There were however a further number of secondary issues, which could potentially be addressed by negotiation with the developer, but that would not overcome the former more fundamental problems.

Councillor Reid commended Campion Concerns for their thorough campaign and high-quality critique of the development proposals. She felt that the officers’ reasons for refusal as set out in the report were comprehensive and unequivocal. She also noted the fact that many of the concerns were shared by other agencies. She felt that the developer should have responded to the overwhelmingly negative views that were being expressed and withdrawn the application at an early stage. She stated that there was massive local objection. She accepted that, in principle, a residential development on the site was reasonable. However the current proposal had a very high density and the design was out of keeping with the character of the area. She was also concerned at the very high proportion of one and two bed flats. The area was basically one with family housing and the need in Hounslow was for family accommodation. She felt that the design issues were important, particularly in the context of a conservation area. She was concerned that there would be a reduction in the amount of open space. She regretted that the developers had been dismissive of the quality of the open space. She felt that a more positive approach would have been to put forward proposals which would have enhanced the open space area. She felt that there was inadequate information regarding some issues such as daylight, sunlight, privacy and refuse. She was concerned that the development would not meet the Lifetime Homes Standards. She felt that, for any development of this scale, it would be very important to ensure that there were appropriate contributions to health and education provision. She felt that the design and massing of the proposal would ruin the conservation area.

Councillor Reid stated that there were existing traffic congestion and parking problems in the Spring Grove conservation area. The new development, which had already received approval on the Brunel site, would add to these problems. Any residential development on the Campion House site would only add further to the difficulties. The increase in numbers of residents in the area as a result of the Brunel development and the proposals for Campion House would have been in the region of 2000 people. She felt that this increase was totally unsustainable and would have a very detrimental impact on the area.

Councillor Barwood was disappointed at the lack of information provided to Councillors on the proposals by the developer. She felt that a site visit would be helpful in considering any further application.

Councillor Harmer questioned the extent to which the planning authority could encourage any new application for the site to focus on family housing. Mike Jordan stated that the Authority was bound to consider any application in accordance with current planning guidance and Plans. However there was a high profile national debate currently underway regarding planning policy and new emerging national policy approaches which might impact upon any future application depending upon timescales.
Resolved -

That, had an appeal on the grounds of non-determination not been made, then:

(a) Planning application number 01119/M/P1 (for the retention of Campion House and the existing gate lodge to the south of the site, demolition of existing annexe and outbuildings and a redevelopment of the site including conversion of Campion House and erection of two new buildings ranging from 3 to 5 storeys to create 273 units with associated parking, access and landscaping to the site) would have been refused on the eleven grounds set out in section 9.2 of the report.

(b) Conservation Area Consent number 01119/M/CA1 (for the demolition of the existing extensions to Campion House and the associated outbuildings including the chapel, refectory, dormitories and classrooms) would have been refused for the reason set out in section 9.3 of the report.

44. 210 Bath Rd, Hounslow

See report of the Director of Planning (agenda item 5) and addendum.

With the permission of the Chairman, Paul Harbard, Director of Pocket Living, spoke on behalf of the applicant. The applicant had worked in close collaboration with the planning office and had attempted to address all the points that had been raised by both planning officers and councillors when the previous application was considered. The number of units, and massing of the development had been reduced. The number of on-street parking spaces had been increased to four. The applicant was also willing to pay the costs of providing two additional on-street parking places in Solway Close, which would be for the use of local residents rather than residents of the new development. Research by the applicants had shown that space was available to rent in local car park for residents of the new development if they wished. He referred to the fact that there were letters of support for the development from a number of local agencies, residents and businesses. The applicant had written to the objectors explaining the impact of the revisions to the scheme. He stated that the development would not affect the views of the local church. The applicant had also approached the neighbouring garage regarding the possibility of maintaining their frontage on Bath Road. 50% of the development would be affordable housing. One-bed flats would be available for £145,000. He felt the proposal was well designed and sympathetic to its surroundings and it met all the required planning standards. In response to questions from councillors regarding the car-sharing scheme, he stated that the scheme would be available to the local community not just residents of the new development. It would be operated by City Car Club who felt that the scheme was sustainable. In response to another question he stated that there was only one tree, which was actually in the grounds of the development site. A Tree Preservation Order protected it.

With the permission of the Chairman, Don Raffe, of Solway Close, spoke as an objector to the application. He referred to a petition opposing the development, which was signed by 161 local residents. He felt that there was not sufficient parking. He was concerned that the measures to deal with potential soil contamination of a former garage site were inadequate. He felt that the design of the proposal was inappropriate and referred to other more suitable designs for affordable housing. He stated that the development would lead to overlooking of neighbouring properties. He was concerned that the construction of the development would cause damage to the lime tree in the grounds. He noted that the flats for private sale were larger than the affordable housing element. He stated that the local planning notices had not been adequately displayed. He stated that the proposal was not energy-efficient. He referred to correspondence from Alan Keen, MP.
With the permission of the Chairman, Mr Vijay Thind, spoke as an objector to the application on behalf of his sister who was a neighbouring resident in Bath Road. He stated that the density of the development exceeded the guidelines in the Unitary Development Plan. He also stated that a number of the flats were below living space standards by a margin of up to 13%. He felt that the car club was unlikely to meet transport needs of the residents. He felt that the design of the development was very modern and out of keeping with the local area.

Mike Jordan, Director of Planning, presented the main issues relating to the application. In response to matters raised by the objectors, he stated that he was not aware of a petition, in opposition, being presented in relation to the revised scheme. The record of consultation was set out in section 6.1 of the report and additionally in the addendum, which included responses in support of the scheme. The revised scheme had reduced density, which was in the range acceptable in the London Plan. All the units met space and amenity standards. Two of the units met disability standards. The planning office felt that the design of the development did not have an undue impact on the area or affect the sunlight and daylight of adjoining properties or lead to any significant overlooking. He suggested that the tree in the grounds was fully protected by the Tree Preservation Order. The site had high transport access and the car club proposals, in addition to the four on-site car parking spaces, were felt to be sufficient provision. Officers would welcome the proposal for a payment towards on-street parking for local residents. It was a condition of the development for a land contamination study to be carried out and approved by the Authority before the development could proceed.

Councillor Cooper noted that, in theory, the lime tree was protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the conditions regarding construction, but he felt that in practice it was possible that damage could occur and he would wish to see the condition modified to require the applicant to replace the tree if it were to die within an agreed time period after completion of the new development. Mike Jordan, felt that the existing conditions were designed to prevent any damage being caused but that it would be reasonable to modify the condition to require replacement within a 10-year period.

Councillor Dakers noted that a sustainability checklist had been completed however he felt that there should be a condition relating to sustainability and particularly to water harvesting. Mike Jordan confirmed that it would be possible to add such a condition.

In response to a question from Councillor Barwood, Mike Jordan stated that there was no particular policy, or tariff system, for assessing the impact of developments on health provision. The Primary Care Trust was consulted on planning applications. In this case, there had not been a response to indicate an impact on local health provision. The development was of a small size and was likely to have a minimal health impact. Health issues were considered more proactively in relation to larger developments.

Councillor Bradley Fisher recognised the need for affordable housing but was concerned about the level of car parking provision for this proposal. Councillor Harris was concerned at the small size of the units. Councillor Cooper noted that the development was of a modern design but he felt it was not out of place on this site, which was adjacent to a busy road and where there were buildings of various styles in the area. Councillor Cooper moved approval of the recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Hibbs.
Resolved -

(a) That officers be authorised to negotiate an agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or other appropriate legislation, to secure the following:

(I) The provision of 8 one-bedroom units for affordable housing.

(II) The provision of parking spaces for a local car club.

(III) The restriction of parking permits.

(IV) The provision of two on-street car parking spaces for local residents.

(b) That, subject to satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, the Director of Planning be authorised to issue planning permission for planning application number 00083/210/P13 to erect a part two, three and four storey building to provide 16 flats and associated parking and landscaping at 210 Bath Rd, Hounslow subject to the conditions set out the report and the following additional conditions:

(I) that condition 12 be modified to require the applicant, or subsequent owners of the site, to replace the existing lime tree on the site if it should die or be seriously damaged within 10 years of the date of completion of the development.

(II) That the applicant be required to submit details for proposals for water harvesting for consideration by planning officers prior to commencement of the development.

45. Esporta Chiswick Riverside Club, Riverside Drive, Chiswick

See the report of the Director of Planning (agenda item 6) and addendum.

With the permission of the Chairman, Margaret Rogers spoke on behalf of the Staveley Gardens Residents Association in objection to the application. She stated that users of the sports club parked their cars in the local roads which tended to encourage petty crime, vandalism and the generation of rubbish. She stated that there were deliveries to the sports club at unsocial hours. She questioned the extent to which the proposed conditions would prevent noise nuisance to the residents of Staveley Gardens.

With the permission of the Chairman, Carolyn Courage a resident of Staveley Gardens also spoke as an objector to the application. She stated that the sports club dominated the landscape and blocked views of residents of Staveley Gardens towards the river. The domes, which would form part of the structure, were too close to the residents at Staveley Gardens. They were too large and too high. She stated that the club contributed nothing to the local community. Environmental improvements were needed on the Staveley Gardens estate. She felt that the close proximity of the buildings to Staveley Gardens was a fire risk. She referred to the low-level crime problems encouraged by car parking in neighbouring roads by sports club users. She referred to a problem of pollution from cars of users of the club. She stated that the residents of Staveley Gardens suffered noise nuisance from music amplified through loudspeakers. She was concerned at the level of traffic, which might be generated by the building work. She was also concerned that there were predawn deliveries to the sports club. She felt that the application should be deferred to allow alterations to produce a less intrusive solution. In response to a question from Councillor Cooper she stated that she had spoken to the owners of the sports club.
Mike Jordan, Director of Planning, set out the key issues relating to the application. He also declared that he was a member of an Esporta sports club in East London. He stated that the application was substantially for a very similar structure to that which had been destroyed in a recent fire. This was a quite exceptional circumstance, which militated against the normal presumption, which would prevent such a development on Metropolitan Open Land. The building would have a smaller footprint and it was proposed to add a removable bubble structure, which would cover the outdoor courts during the winter season. He referred to further comments on the application from Barnes Community Association Environment Group which were circulated at the meeting. He felt that the conditions proposed both in the main report and the addendum would address the concerns raised by Staveley Gardens residents, which were management issues rather than matters linked to the principle of development.

A number of Members acknowledged the concern of the residents of Staveley Gardens regarding late night/early morning deliveries and proposed that a condition be added preventing deliveries between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. It was also confirmed that the condition regarding late-night extensions was intended to be interpreted at allowing a maximum of five such extensions but was not intended to limit the discretion of the Licensing Panel to consider the merits of any licensing application.

Councillor Hibbs questioned why condition 29 related only to noise generation from external plant. Mike Jordan stated that it would be reasonable to extend the condition to noise emanating from within the building. It would not be possible to reasonably expect mitigation measures related to sports activities outside the building. In response to a further question from Councillor Hibbs, he stated that it was possible that there would be light pollution visible from the south bank of the River Thames caused by cars entering and leaving the site. It was not feasible to restrict two-way access to the site in the evenings as the route provided access to a number of different types of users and properties.

Councillor Barwood sympathised with the concerns of the residents of Staveley Gardens. She agreed that there was a crime issue and rubbish problem. She felt that the club should have a more secure perimeter. She also felt that there was a strong case for a section 106 contribution to improve the amenities on the Staveley Gardens estate. A number of Members shared the view that it would be appropriate to make a contribution to improve amenities on the Staveley Gardens estate. It was also felt that the club should make arrangements to allow concessionary use of its facilities by local residents. Mike Jordan stated that the suggestion for environmental improvements to allow refurbishment of the bandstand in Duke's Meadows had been put forward by the Chiswick Area Committee. The Sustainable Development Committee could prescribe some different use for the proposed contribution of £15,000 for detailed consideration by the Area committee.

Councillor Reid felt that, in order to mitigate the nuisance problems described by residents of Staveley Gardens, a condition be imposed to require the applicants to prepare and submit a management plan which would address those nuisance problems.

A representative of the applicant was invited to respond to the committee's proposals. He stated that there was a legal agreement in existence relating to the previous development, which prescribed arrangements for community use. He was willing to re-examine this and incorporate a similar requirement as part of the new legal agreement. Similarly he felt that the applicant would find a condition, which required the submission of a management plan, acceptable.
Councillor Dakers questioned what material would be used for the plastic bubble and whether it would have a reasonable lifespan. He also questioned the details of the energy efficiency proposals for the development, the number of bicycle parking spaces proposed, the type of combined heat and power system and the details of the travel plan. Mike Jordan stated that the details of these matters were not available. They would be subject to discussion with the applicant at the stage of submission of details required by the conditions of the application. In the case of bicycle parking spaces no number was set. The committee requested that the proposed green travel plan be submitted to the Committee for approval.

Resolved -

(a) That officers be authorised to negotiate an agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or other appropriate legislation to secure the following:

(I) A contribution of £15,000 towards improvements to provide more sustainable access to the site.

(II) A contribution of £15,000 to improve amenities on the Staveley Gardens estate and/or to enhance the overall environment of the Metropolitan Open Land.

(III) To oblige the applicant to implement and operate in accordance with their Green Travel Plan.

(IV) To completely remove the temporary building and restore the site to its former condition as lawn no later than one month after the occupation of the new club building.

(V) To oblige the applicant to make provision for local use of the club facilities.

(VI) To oblige the applicant to prepare, and submit to the Planning Office for approval, a management plan, which would address nuisance issues affecting residents of Staveley Gardens.

(b) That, subject to satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement and approval by the committee of the green travel plan, the Director of Planning be authorised to issue planning permission for planning application number 00946/B/P24 to redevelop and rebuild the health and racquets club, Riverside Drive, Chiswick subject to the conditions set out in the report, recommended by officers in the addendum and the following additional conditions:

(I) That deliveries to the site be restricted to the hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.

(II) That late-night extension of the opening hours be limited to a maximum of five nights per year and be subject to appropriate consideration under normal licensing procedures.

(III) That condition 29 regarding noise levels be extended to include noise emanating from the buildings.

46. 305-307, Chiswick High Road, Chiswick

The Committee accepted the request of the Director of Planning to withdraw the application in order to allow time for further consideration by officers of their views and advice on the application.
47. Garages site, Chinchilla Drive, Hounslow

See report of the Director of Planning (agenda item 8).

Mike Jordan, Director of Planning, summarised the main issues relating to the application. He suggested that members might want to reconsider the proposed condition 12, which controlled the hours of operation of the health centre. He felt that it might be unduly restrictive for such a use, which was unlikely to impact on the amenity of adjoining residential properties. Members were concerned to ensure that there was no possibility of the health centre building being used for other purposes. Mike Jordan stated that the condition 11 was quite explicit on this matter. It was also proposed to build this into the legal agreement. In planning terms there was no more stringent requirement which it was possible to reasonably impose.

Councillor Dakers noted that a sustainability checklist had been completed but questioned whether a condition should also be imposed requiring submission of details of sustainability measures. Mike Jordan stated that it would be possible to include such a condition.

Resolved -

(a) That officers be authorised negotiate a legal agreement under section 106 Of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, or other appropriate legislation securing the following:

(I) A financial contribution of £15,000 towards local transport services and network.

(II) To prepare and implement a green travel plan, agreed by the authority, for all users of the health centre.

(III) To prepare and implement a car park management plan for the health centre agreed by the local authority.

(IV) A financial contribution of £9,000 towards education provision.

(b) That, subject to the satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, the Director of Planning be authorised to issue planning permission for planning application number 01341/D/P2 to demolish the existing garages at Chinchilla Drive, Hounslow and erect a health centre with pharmacy and new housing block consisting of 16 flats with associated parking and landscaping subject to the conditions set out in the report with the following amendments and additions:

(I) That condition 12 relating to the permitted opening hours of the health centre be deleted.

(II) Submission of appropriate details relating to measures to be taken in accordance with the sustainability checklist.

48. Results of Planning Appeals

See report of the Director of Legal Services (agenda item 10).

Michael Jordan, Director of Planning, reported that in the case of 214 Chiswick High Road costs had been awarded against the Council in relation to the matter concerning the issuing of an enforcement notice against the compressor unit and galvanised steel supply duct. The claim of costs submitted by the appellant's solicitor was currently subject to negotiation. The committee requested to be informed of the final agreed costs.

The meeting finished at 9:48 pm.
Addendum Report of the Director of Planning

Sustainable Development Committee 15th January 2007

Agenda Item 6: Page 14
P2006/3135 & 3146; 00176/F/P4 & CA2
Chiswick War Memorial Homes

Section 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

Paragraph 5.2 pg 20

Additional Consultation Responses

5.2a An additional submission has been received from an objector stating that the petition received was signed by over 120 households, not 120 as stated in the report. This submission is also concerned the petition appears as one of the fourteen responses listed and so the assessment is biased. The submission also repeats concerns about the development that have already been summarised and considered in the assessment of the proposed development.

5.2b Comment: The report states that one of the submissions received had a petition attached. A review of this petition, which was received in separate parts on 31 October 2006, 2 November 2006, and 27 November 2006, shows 124 individual signatures (1 from an illegible address) from 103 separate addresses. The report should therefore be corrected to note that 124 persons signed the petition received. It is noted that this petition incorrectly states that the proposed development would be a change of use of the site, to consider housing people other than ex-service personnel and their dependents.

5.2c A separate petition from a different objector, which list concerns as the height of the 3-storey flats, the number of trees to be cut down, the large car park on the front and halfway down the boundary and the overall overdevelopment of this site has been received. This petition has no signatures, but lists the names and addresses of 49 persons.

5.2d Comment: The concerns raised in this petition have been considered in the assessment of the proposed development.

Amendment to condition 2

Along with the standard wording for the submission of samples of the materials to be used in external surfaces for the new work this condition should also include a requirement that details of fenestration and the design and construction of roof junctions, ridges, roof lights, fascias and soffits. To be submitted to the Council for approval prior to the commencement of work.
Section 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

Additional Consultation

Paragraph 5.5 pg 41

Comments from Chiswick Area Planning Committee of 10th January 2007:

- Members were impressed with the efforts of the developer to address every objection. It was felt that this was the sort of development – spacious, high quality, with adequate parking – to be welcomed.
- Local residents were also very anxious to see this development go ahead and fully supported it. For this reason a number of members urged its support by SDC.
- Members confirmed that footpath access would remain.
- Members hoped that the S106 contribution identified for pedestrian safety could be used for CCTV for the underpasses under the A4.
- Whilst no members objected to the application, two members did raise some concern about the modernity of the design and particularly the loss of an example of 1930s architecture, an era of architectural heritage that was especially under threat.

Amended conditions

14. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. A method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority to show how existing boundary walls will be protected, and works shall be carried out in accordance with this method statement. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Additional conditions proposed at the request of the Environment Agency

22. The construction of the surface and foul water drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment

23. No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated ground

Reason: To prevent pollution of groundwater

Additional condition
24. Non-vehicular access through the site from Netheravon Road South to Chiswick Mall shall be permanently provided for members of the public. Access through the site for members of the public shall not be restricted by gates or other barriers except at times agreed in writing by the Council. Details of the hours of access and measures to prohibit through access for vehicles, for example, bollards and cycle barriers, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of work and retained thereafter.

Reason: To enhance public access to the Thames foreshore.

Agenda Item 9; Page 49
P/2006/3642; 01253 P/P2
Victoria Works, Victoria Road Feltham

Section 5.0 CONSULTATIONS (page 52)

Additional Consultation

The proposal was considered by the West Area (Planning) Committee on 11th January. The Committee had the following comments:

(i) The proposed density is too high and the site is overdeveloped.
(ii) Acknowledge the UDP parking standards but feel that this is outdated – not enough car parking is provided.
(iii) Would prefer three bedroom houses to flats.
(iv) There would be a difficult traffic situation and there would be likely to be conflict with local school traffic.

Paragraph 5.1 pg 52
An additional comment has been received from a local household that objects to the level of car parking proposed given current local conditions. It also draws attention to the conflict with the Hounslow Plan 2006-10 (Policy Theme 2 Quality of Life) in that only 25% of the flats would have three bedrooms.

Revised drawing
Drawing No.PL01 C has been revised to PL01 D. Changes include the repositioning of boundary lines for gardens on the eastern and northern elevations as well as a dropped kerb between parking space 6 and 7.

Substitute for para 5.2
The Environment Agency has commented in their letter dated 28th December 2006, received 3rd January 2007. They raise an objection based on the fact that a 6m buffer zone is not provided between the Longford River and bank top, which, in their words, would prejudice their environmental obligations. It is stated in their letter that this 6m buffer zone was incorporated in the previous proposal. That is not the case. The distance between the proposed development and the Longford River has not changed from the previous proposal. A condition requiring a 6m buffer zone has been included as part of the recommendation though. This will reduce the size of the formal parts of the gardens on the northern elevation but would not require the building to be moved. The existing industrial building is closer to the river than the proposed development so the situation would improve. The Planning Inspector did not identify the proximity of the river as a problem.
The Royal Parks objected on the same grounds as before. The objections covered over-shading of the Longford River by day and an increase in nocturnal lighting. The Inspector dismissed these comments in his report.

The Primary Care Trust has not provided a response as of 9th January 2007.

**Add to the list of conditions**

26. A six-metre buffer zone shall be provided alongside the Longford River along the full length of the site. The buffer zone shall be measured from bank top (bank top is defined as the point at which the bank meets normal land levels). The buffer zone shall be free of new structures including overhanging structures such as balconies, hardstanding or hard surfacing. The buffer zone shall be left as a natural area for wildlife.

**Reason**

To maintain the character of the watercourse and provide undisturbed refuges for wildlife using the river corridor.

27. There shall be no storage of construction material within six metres of the Longford River along the entire length of the site during construction. This area must be suitably marked and protected and there shall be no access within the area during development unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no fires, dumping or tracking of machinery within this area during development.

**Reason**

To reduce the impact of the proposed development on the riverbank and the movement of wildlife along the river corridor and to prevent solid materials from entering the Longford River and causing pollution.

28. All planting within ten metres of the Longford River shall be of locally native plant species only, of UK genetic origin.

**Reason**

Use of locally native plants in landscaping is essential to benefit local wildlife and to help maintain the region’s natural balance of flora and fauna.

**Informative**

Due to the proximity of the school play-area to the western boundary it is advised that a scheme of noise insulation is incorporated for the residential units next to it. Acoustic glazing to habitable rooms is recommended.

**Substitute for condition 6 and condition 18, as condition 6.**

6. Before the development hereby permitted commences:

a. The site shall be investigated by a competent person to identify the extent and nature of contamination. A detailed site investigation report shall be prepared and submitted to the LPA. The report should include a tiered risk assessment of the contamination based on the proposed end use of the site. Additional investigation may be required where it is deemed necessary.

b. If required, a scheme for decontamination of the site shall be submitted to the LPA, for written approval. The scheme must account for any comments made by the LPA.

Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied:
c. The LPA shall be notified immediately if additional contamination is discovered during the course of the development. A competent person shall assess the additional contamination, and shall submit appropriate amendments to the scheme for decontamination in writing to the LPA for approval.

d. The agreed scheme for decontamination, including amendments, must be fully implemented and a written validation (closure) report submitted to the LPA for approval."

REASON:
Contamination is known or suspected on the site due to a former land use. The LPA therefore wishes to ensure that the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for public and environmental safety.

**Agenda Item 10; Page 59**

**References:**
P/2006/3063 00248/305-307/P7

**Address:**
305-307, Chiswick High Road

The Environment Agency has responded to confirm that the flood risk assessment is acceptable and requests that the following condition be attached to any planning permission:

No development shall commence before an Evacuation Plan for safe exit and access from the ground level to an upper level and a detailed flood warning system on the site has been supplied to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To reduce the risk of flooding to the occupants of the ground level.
1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 The application is a resubmission of a refused scheme that proposes the redevelopment and refurbishment of the existing Chiswick War Memorial Homes complex that houses vulnerable and disabled ex-service personnel and their families and provides for a mix of age and sexes. At present the site has eighteen (18) houses and flats provided in four blocks. The site is in Chiswick House Conservation Area.

1.2 The application proposes the demolition and replacement with larger buildings of two existing residential blocks that adjoin Burlington Lane, as well as the erection of a new residential block in the southeast corner of the site. The other two existing blocks that are located in the centre of the site are to be refurbished and extended. The proposal will increase the number of dwellings to thirty-six (36) and also includes the creation of additional parking and access and the erection of a residents’ common room. A number of mature trees are to be felled. Conservation Area consent is sought for the demolition of two residential buildings and a garage that front Burlington Lane.
1.3 The current application differs from the previously refused scheme, with the main differences being a reduction in the number of total dwellings from 37 to 36 and parking spaces from 24 to 15, and the redesign of the replacement buildings with them now being two-storeys with a third level in pitched roofs and with a style more similar to the existing buildings on the site that are being retained rather than a contemporary design. A lower proportion of one bedroom flats is also proposed.

1.4 It is recommended that planning permission and conservation area consent be granted, subject to a legal deed to restrict occupancy to only eligible ex-service personnel and their families and to pay for costs associated with the development, as the proposed design is complementary to the existing buildings on the site and the character of the surrounding conservation area and would not harm the amenity of neighbours, whilst the development provides additional supported housing for which there is a great need.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site of the War Memorial Homes was donated by the Duke of Devonshire, and is managed by the Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation, which is a registered charity and Registered Social Landlord (No. A3418). It covers 0.58 hectares of land on the south side of Burlington Lane. At present the site has eighteen (18) dwellings for vulnerable and disabled ex-servicemen and women and their families that are at present occupied mostly by elderly single persons. There is a covenant on the land restricting its use to homes for wholly or partially disabled war veterans and their dependents from Chiswick or in their default other wholly or partially disabled persons who have served in the military at any time and the dependents of members who have lost their lives. The accommodation is provided in four blocks arranged around a lawn quadrangle in the centre of the site. There is a war memorial at the front of the quadrangle, adjacent to Burlington Road. Two of the residential blocks front Burlington Lane and are sited parallel to the road. Both of these blocks are later additions to the site. The western most of these blocks, which is two storeys, contains four flats and was built in the 1980s. The other block, to the eastern side of the site comprises two attached houses built in the 1950s.

2.2 The other two residential blocks are located towards the rear of the site and adjacent to the rear of the central quadrangle. These blocks were built in 1922-23. The detached blocks contain two-storey flats and houses that form two terraces laid symmetrically at 45-degree angles to the road. The central quadrangle is an open grassed area, and the land to the rear of the buildings is laid out as communal open space, with some residents having created small landscaped garden areas. The area along the eastern boundary is wooded and overgrown. The existing buildings provide 8 x one bedroom flats, 4 x two bedroom flats and 6 x three bedroom houses. There are six (6) car spaces. There is a detached single garage close to the eastern boundary.

2.3 Opposite the site are two-storey semi-detached and detached houses of Burlington Lane. Along the western boundary, and part of the southern boundary of the site are rear gardens houses on Wilmington Avenue. The remainder of the rear boundary abuts allotment gardens. The Chiswick Tennis Club adjoins the western boundary of the site. Apart from houses in Wilmington Avenue that were built circa 1890-1910 the other surrounding houses in Burlington Lane and Staveley Road were built in the interwar period.
2.4 The ground level on the site is lower than the adjacent pavement level by between 600mm (2') to 1000mm (3'4'’). There is a vehicular access to the site leading to a parking area to the west of the site. To the east there are two vehicular accesses and also a wooded area. A bus stop is adjacent to this access point, which serves the E3 bus.

2.5 The site is within Chiswick House Conservation Area. Trees on the site are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (LBH TPO No. 42).

3.0 HISTORY

3.1 Application P1 granted permission for the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses and a garage (1953). Application P2 granted permission for the conversion of one of terrace buildings to 8 flats and the refurbishment of the other as well as the erection of a two-storey block of 4 flats (1984)

3.2 The relevant planning history for the site is as follows.

3.3 00176/F/P3 Demolition of existing two small blocks and garages and erection of three blocks comprising 29-one, two bedroom self contained flats, special need houses and extensions and refurbishments of existing 8-residential units, erection of new garden room, formation of new road associated with landscaping and widening of existing vehicular crossovers

Refused 13 October 2005

Reasons:

1. The proposed three storey buildings, by reason of their bulk, siting and location, are considered to be an over dominant feature on this low lying location, out of character with the surrounding streetscape, contrary to policy ENV-B 1.1 and IMP 2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan

2. The design, massing and siting of the proposed three storey buildings are not considered to preserve or enhance Chiswick House Conservation Area, contrary to policy ENV-B 2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

3. The layout of the proposed parking and associated hard surfacing areas results in an intrusive form of development, resulting in a loss of amenity for residents within and outside the site, through increased noise and disturbance, contrary to policy ENV-B 1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4. The mix of housing units proposed does not incorporate a reasonable mix of dwelling types, including housing adapted for wheelchair users, contrary to policies H 4.3, H 5.1 and H 7.1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3.4 00176/F/CA1 Demolition of two small blocks and garages

Refused 13 October 2005

Reasons:

1. The proposed demolition of front buildings and erection of 3 x 3 storey blocks of flats would introduce an alien design, scale and massing of development in this open and low lying part of Chiswick House Conservation, and detract from the character and appearance of this Conservation Area, contrary to Policy ENV-B 2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2. The proposed demolition of the block of flats and pair of semi-detached houses at the front of the site would detract from the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area in the absence of an approved scheme for the sites' redevelopment, and it is thus contrary to Policy ENV-B 2.2.

3. The proposed redevelopment of the site does not relate to the Chiswick House Conservation Area due to the excessive height and bulk of the proposed new buildings, and the scale of the new development would adversely harm the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area contrary to Policy ENV-B 2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4. The proposal for the demolition of the buildings at the front of the site and the proposed erection of two 3-storey blocks of flats would lead to the loss of an interesting and attractive set of buildings around the war memorial, which together make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and in particular the war memorial itself. It would be contrary to Policy ENV-B 2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

5. The demolition of the two front buildings, and erection of 3 blocks of flats would intensify the development on the site and alter the residential dwelling mix resulting in a loss of a rare instance of supported housing that demonstrates an early form of residential and social philanthropy. In this instance the open nature and character of the specialist residential development would be lost. It would be contrary to Policy ENV-B.2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4.0 DETAILS

4.1 The application proposes the redevelopment and refurbishment of the buildings and the site as well as the erection of an additional block of accommodation to provide more flats and houses. The number of dwellings on the site will be increased from the existing eighteen (18) to thirty-six (36) self-contained dwellings. The site will remain in residential use providing accommodation for elderly, vulnerable and disabled ex-service personnel and their families. The redeveloped site will provide 18 x one bedroom flats, 10 x 2 bedroom flats and 4 x three bedroom houses. Eight (8) of the dwellings will be wheelchair accessible.

4.2 The applicant is a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) and all the proposed dwellings are to be owned by the Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation and leased to tenants eligible for supported housing from the foundation.
The current application proposes the following work:

(i) Demolition of the two existing buildings that front Burlington Road and their replacement with two new residential buildings, ‘Block A’ and ‘Block B’.

(ii) Refurbishment of the two existing blocks to the rear of the site including internal alterations and rear additions.

(iii) Erection of a new residential building in the southeast corner of the site, along the eastern side boundary, ‘Block C’.

(iv) Erection of a common room, to be located to the rear of the War Memorial and facing onto the central lawn quadrangle.

(v) Modification of vehicle entrances and provision of additional car parking.

(vi) Landscaping of the site including new plantings, fencing and paving.

In detail the development consists of the:

(i) Demolition of two existing buildings adjacent to Burlington Lane and erection of two new residential buildings, ‘Block A’ and ‘Block B’

Both the 1950s houses and the 1980s block of flats located at the front of the site are to be demolished. Block A is located in place of the 1980s building and block B the 1950s houses. The two new buildings have a mirrored floor plan but are otherwise identical in design. The buildings will be set back 1m from the front boundary and have a roughly square shaped footprint. Both buildings are setback 1m from the front boundary and they will be positioned symmetrically on the site between the front boundary and the outer ends of the existing terrace buildings.

Both buildings will have 4 x 1 bedroom flats on the ground floor, 4 x 1 bedroom flats on the first floor and 1 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats on the second floor. The proposed dwellings in each building are to be self-contained with lift access provided to each floor.

They will have three levels with the upper floor provided within a pitched roof and dormer windows with gables facing the street. The external finishes of the buildings shall match the existing terrace buildings and includes face brickwork, roof tiles, render, cedar boarding and timber windows. Owing to the lower ground level of the site in relation to Burlington Lane, the ridge of the main roof of the new buildings will appear lower than the roof of the two-storey houses on the opposite side of the road. The ground floor flats will all have access to small private gardens while most of the upper floor flats have small balconies.

(ii) Refurbishment of the two existing blocks to the rear of the site including internal alterations and rear additions

The two existing terrace buildings located towards the rear of the site shall be refurbished and extended to the rear at ground level. The eastern terrace block will be converted to 4 x 2 bedroom flats on the ground floor, two of which are design to wheelchair housing standards, one of which has a lift while the other has a bedroom and self contained accommodation on the ground level and space for a lift if required. The western terrace provides four x 3 bedroom houses.

Apart from the internal alterations, the application proposes the erection of a single storey extension across the rear of each terrace, to infill the space between the wings at the rear of the building. These rear additions are to have mono-pitched roofs with roof lights and glass doors to the rear.
(iii) Erection of a new residential building in the southeast corner of the site, along the eastern side boundary, ‘Block C’

4.10 A new building is to be erected in the southeast corner of the site. This building has two storeys with a pitched roof that has small dormer windows. It will have a similar architectural style to the new Blocks A and B and the existing terrace buildings but will be lower in height than Blocks A and B and is comprised of two pavilions linked by a more contemporary atrium that contains stairs and a lift.

4.11 Each pavilion will have 2 x 2 bedroom flats, one of which is wheelchair compliant, on both the ground and first floors. Two of the flats will have small balconies.

(iv) Erection of a common room, to be located to the rear of the war memorial and facing onto the central lawn quadrangle

4.12 A new single storey building, to be used as a residents’ common room and office is to be located to the rear of the War Memorial and facing onto the central lawn quadrangle. This building has modern design with a ‘green’ roof, as it will be planted with sedum. Its floor level will be 850mm lower than the pavement. The south facing elevation of the building will have full height glazing.

(v) Modification of vehicle entrances and provision of additional car parking

4.13 The existing vehicle crossover from Burlington Lane on the western side of the site will be widened and will give access to an expanded car park and driveway adjacent to the western side boundary that will have six (6) car spaces. The two vehicle crossovers from Burlington Lane at the eastern side of the site will be replaced by a new crossover and leads to a new driveway and car park for nine (9) cars. The total number of car spaces is fifteen (15) of which seven (7) will be designed for disabled users.

(vi) Landscaping of the site including new plantings, fencing and paving

4.14 Proposed landscaping includes the provision of new plantings, footpaths, paved areas and fencing. The scheme will result in the removal of twenty-six (26) trees and groups of trees as well as one (1) street tree. Replacement plantings including over forty (40) new trees as well as shrubs and hedges are proposed.

Justification

4.15 Supporting information submitted with the application has highlighted there is high demand for additional supported housing for ex-service personnel and their widows from World War II and National Service veterans. The housing provided caters for these groups, which are now in an older age group as well as younger ex-service personnel and their families with disabilities. The Foundation receives an average of three applications per week but has capped their waiting list at 24 as there are at present only 12 – 15 vacancies per year. The applicant’s advise that priority will be given to eligible ex-service men and women from the London Borough of Hounslow initially from people living in Chiswick and then further afield if appropriate. Additionally, it is noted that the existing accommodation does not meet current housing standards for people with disabilities and needs upgrading.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 A total of 103 letters were sent were sent to residents of Burlington Lane, Wilmington Avenue, the War Memorial Homes residents and the Riverside Tennis Club. Press and site notices have also been posted.
5.2 There have been fourteen (14) responses received objecting to the development including a petition signed by 120 people from the local area. A summary of the relevant concerns from the responses and a comment is given in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overdevelopment in conservation area, increase in habitable rooms has led to cramped design</td>
<td>The density of the proposed development is within the appropriate density range specified by both the UDP and London Plan. The massing of buildings and the area of surrounding open space are considered to be satisfactory, whilst all dwellings have a greater floor area than the minimum required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of buildings is wholly inappropriate to the surrounding architecture and character of the conservation area</td>
<td>The design of the new buildings is considered to be complementary to the existing buildings on the site and compatible with the appearance and character of the conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object to 3-storey building</td>
<td>Owing to the ground level of the site being lower than the adjacent road, the proposed 3-storey buildings would appear as 2 storeys with rooms in the roof and their maximum height above street level is lower than the houses on the opposite side of Burlington Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks A and B are built up against front boundary and will result in loss of trees and shrubs and so will appear stark and institutional</td>
<td>The characteristics of the site and the proposed development make a reduced set back satisfactory. In this regard, there is no established building line in this section of the road, the lower ground level of the site compared to the pavement and the large street trees and raised shrubbery beds next to the front boundary will reduce the prominence of the buildings, whilst the style and massing of the buildings are appropriate. It is also noted that applicant has agreed to increase set back of these proposed buildings from the front boundary by an additional 500mm (to make the setback 1.0m) to allow a landscaped strip to be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks A and B are built up against front boundary and will make residents fell vulnerable due to unruly and noisy schoolchildren on weekdays and loud and often drunk people on weekends</td>
<td>There will be secure boundary fencing across the frontage of the site with landscaping between the new buildings and the front boundary. The Metropolitan Police have assessed the design of security for the site and have no objections to the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of use from homes with gardens for ex-service personnel and their dependents.</td>
<td>There will be no change of use. The new dwellings are only to be occupied by eligible ex-service personnel and their dependents in accordance with the covenant on the land. This restriction will also be included in the legal agreement for the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of mature trees</td>
<td>There will be mature trees removed at the location of the new Blocks A, B and C, and new parking areas, however many trees will be retained. Other trees that are dead or diseased or inappropriately planted are also to be removed. To offset the loss of trees the landscape plan includes the provision of over 40 new trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that landscaping will not be implemented</td>
<td>The submission of full details of the implementation of landscaping and associated works and ongoing maintenance for approval is required by a condition of consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic implications – proposal will increase danger for pedestrians including local school children who use footpath</td>
<td>The development is not likely to result in excessive traffic generation. The Council’s Highways and Traffic (Developments) sections have no objections to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parking spaces is inadequate</td>
<td>The provision of parking proposed is commensurate with the use and nature of occupants. The Council’s Highways and Traffic (Developments) sections have no objections to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park – Object to petrol fumes, noise and moving traffic</td>
<td>The car park in question has nine (9) spaces, which is not considered to be likely to result in excessive noise or air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive paving</td>
<td>The applicant has agreed to amend the proposal to delete and reduce the large areas of paving that were originally proposed at the rear of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – some existing residents park in Staveley Road, more development will increase parking pressure</td>
<td>The provision of parking proposed is commensurate with the use and nature of occupants. The Council’s Highways and Traffic (Developments) sections have no objections to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking from additional storey</td>
<td>The proposal would not result in undue overlooking of neighbouring properties. See paragraphs 7.22 to 7.24.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 **English Heritage** – Considered by specialist staff who do not wish to offer any comments. It is recommended that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the from your specialist conservation advice.

5.4 **Environment Agency** – No objection in principle, subject to recommended conditions to minimise flood risk.

5.5 **Metropolitan Police** – No objections.

5.6 **20th Century Society** – No response.
5.7 **Friends of Dukes Meadows** – No response.

5.8 **Chiswick Horticultural Society** – No response.

5.9 **Chiswick Area Planning Committee**

5.10 The application was reported to the Chiswick Area Planning Committee on 1 November 2006 for comment. The minutes from the committee are as follows:

5.11 “Members made the following comments to be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee.

- **Members considered that their concerns in respect of the previous application about detailing and appearance had been addressed and the proposed design would sit well with the existing buildings.**

- **Members noted that objectors had shifted ground as previous concerns focussed on appearance and had not mentioned loss of trees.**

- **Members noted that there would be no net loss of trees.**

- **Members were keen to retain the original purpose of the accommodation for the benefit of ex-service personnel.**

- **Members agreed with the comment that the development was close to the street but felt that with the lower ground level there would be no concerns about overlooking.**

- **Members supported the application, but noted that a full assessment by officers had not yet been undertaken. Members wished to see at a future meeting the full officers’ comments as reported to the Sustainable Development Committee.”

6.0 **POLICY**

6.1 The London Plan and Unitary Development Plan together are constituents of the development plan. The London Plan was adopted in February 2004 and has been the development plan for London since September 2004. The Unitary Development Plan was adopted in December 2003. The London Plan is the strategic plan setting out an integrated social, economic and environmental framework for the future development of London. The Unitary Development Plan has greater relevance for local borough wide issues. Where policies between the London Plan and Unitary Development Plan differ, the London Plan takes precedence.

6.2 **London Plan**

- **Policy 2A.1** Sustainability criteria
- **Policy 3A.4** Housing choice
- **Policy 3A.10** Special needs and specialist housing
- **Policy 4B.1** Design principles for a compact city
- **Policy 4B.6** Sustainable design and construction
- **Policy 4B.7** Respect local context and communities
- **Policy 4B.11** Heritage conservation
6.3 **Unitary Development Plan 2003**
- ENV-N.2.7 Trees and Community Woodland
- ENV-N.2.8 Tree Preservation Orders
- ENV-B.1.1 New Development
- ENV-B.1.8 Access and Facilities for People with Disabilities
- ENV-B.1.9 Safety and Security
- H.2.1 Affordable Housing
- H.4.1 Housing Standards and Guidelines
- H.4.2 Residential Density
- H.4.5 Associated Facilities for Residential Developments
- H.5.1 Housing for People With Disabilities
- H.7.1 Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments
- IMP.6.1 Planning Obligations

6.4 **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)**

**UDP SPG 1997**
- Section 7.0 – Chiswick House Conservation Area
- Section 9.0 – Form and Design
- Section 13.0 – Housing for People With Disabilities

**Chiswick House Conservation Area Appraisal**

**7.0 PLANNING ISSUES**

7.1 The main issues in the determination of this application are
- The principle of residential development on the site
- The bulk, scale, massing and style of the proposed buildings and whether or not the development would preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the Conservation Area
- The impact on adjoining residents and the area as a whole
- The quality of the proposed accommodation
- The impact on traffic and parking in the locality and access to the site
- Sustainability
- Has the amended scheme satisfactorily addressed the previous reasons for refusal?

**The principle of residential development on the site**

7.2 The site was developed for residential housing from 1919 onwards, with land that was donated by The Duke of Devonshire to provide homes for disabled war veterans. The first building being erected in 1922. The homes are owned and managed by the Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation, which is a registered charity and social landlord. The present use of the site has continued this original purpose and provides independent housing for eligible persons and their families. The proposal will create an additional eighteen (18) dwellings increasing the total number of dwellings to thirty-six (36). All dwellings
would be occupied in accordance with the foundation’s eligibility criteria and existing residents are to re-housed within the development.

7.3 Policy H.7.1 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) states that the Council will where appropriate, seek to facilitate and increase the provision of a variety of supported accommodation for people with special needs, from residential care homes to small scale ‘ordinary living’ housing. This policy also has criteria to be taken into account when considering proposals for supported housing. The criteria to be considered is as follows:

(i) the current or designated use of the site;
(ii) the proposal should meet a local need for that type of supported accommodation and be located within the residential area it is intended to serve, unless the scale of the accommodation is inappropriate for a residential setting;
(iii) there should not be an over-concentration of provision locally;
(iv) the effect of the proposed use on the environment, the amenity of adjoining occupiers and on access and highway considerations;
(v) the location is near shops, appropriate supporting services and public transport;
(vi) residential care homes should have regard to the Council’s standards for registered homes and nursing homes should meet the Health Authority’s registration requirements;
(vii) the proposal should have regard to the Council’s access guidelines for people with disabilities “Think Access”.

7.4 This criteria was taken into account in assessing the proposal and are dealt with in this planning report where relevant.

7.5 The proposal to provide additional housing for vulnerable and disabled war veterans and ex-service personnel and their families is consistent with this policy and would maintain the established use of the site.

7.6 Policy H.1.1 of the UDP applies a sustainable approach for considering the location of new housing development with preference given to locations that are located near to and are accessible by public transport and sites that utilise the capacity of existing infrastructure. The site is a suitable location for residential development given its existing residential use and the established residential development of surrounding land and the proximity to local bus services, Chiswick railway station and local shops.

7.7 Additionally, government guidance is that to ensure adequate housing supply and choice, higher residential density should sought where this will be compatible with existing development with preference given to the utilisation of existing developed sites. The existing density on the site is 82.5 habitable rooms per hectare (HRHA). Policy H.4.2 of the UDP states that density should not normally be less than 150 HRHA or exceed 250 HRHA, however the proposed density of new development should respect the established character and density of surrounding areas. Table 4B.1 of the London Plan sets density ranges for housing taking into account location, the setting in terms of existing building form and mass, and accessibility to public transport and is a guide for the appropriate intensity of use for a site. For this site, which is served by public transport, but is in a suburban area that is not on a transport corridor or close to a town centre, the lowest density range is appropriate. The lowest density range from the London Plan is 150-200 HRHA.

7.8 The proposed development will increase the density of the site to 168 HRHA which is within the density range specified by both the UDP and London Plan. The applicant
has calculated the density as 145 HRHA however this figure has not included kitchens over 11m² and other rooms that are over 20m² and capable of subdivision that should be counted twice.

7.9 Given the characteristics of the site, including its density and location, and noting the proposal will retain the existing residential use and provide additional supported housing for which there is a great need, it is considered that the principle of further residential development on the site is satisfactory. However, the acceptability of the proposed development itself will depend on the impact of the scheme on the appearance and character of the conservation area, the amenity of neighbours, and traffic and parking in the locality being satisfactory as well as the quality of housing provided.

The bulk, scale, massing and style of the proposed buildings and whether or not the development would preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the Conservation Area

7.10 The site and surrounding properties are within Chiswick House Conservation Area. Policy ENV-B.1.1 promotes high quality design that enhances the overall environmental quality and townscape. Policy ENV-B.2.2 states that development should preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area and that there is a presumption in favour of the retention of existing buildings that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area. Where a building makes little contribution to the area, consent for demolition will not be given unless there are approved plans for redevelopment or re-use of the land.

7.11 The existing complex of buildings on the site and surrounding landscaping and open spaces make a positive contribution to the conservation area. The two larger terrace buildings to the rear of the site are two-storey with pitched roofs. These are the oldest buildings on the site and are attractive buildings by themselves but are also good examples of the private philanthropic efforts made to assist war veterans after the World War I. They are laid out symmetrically around the landscaped quadrangle and War Memorial in the centre of the site. The other two blocks that front Burlington Road are later additions (post 1950s) and have no particular architectural or historic merit though they add to the overall positive contribution that the site makes to the appearance and character of the conservation area. Therefore in this instance the proposed demolition of two existing blocks would only be acceptable where satisfactory replacement buildings are provided.

7.12 The three new residential blocks have a coherent design that respects the architectural style and form of the 1920s terraces that are to be retained. The new buildings have materials and detailing that matches the existing terraces using face brickwork, render, timber cladding as well as glazing to reflect the existing buildings. The new buildings do not however completely mimic the existing buildings and where appropriate they also include more contemporary elements such as balconies with glass balustrades, solar panels and lantern roof lights.

7.13 Although the replacement buildings fronting Burlington Lane are larger than the existing buildings, their height and massing are satisfactory as they will have wide open spaces to each of their sides and despite having three-levels the maximum height of their main roof relative to Burlington Lane will be lower than the height of the existing two-storey houses on the opposite side of Burlington Lane owing to the lower ground level of the site reducing the apparent height of the proposed buildings in the street scene. Additionally, as there is no other development fronting this stretch of Burlington Lane there is no established building line and so decreasing the setback of the buildings from the front of the site as is proposed would not disrupt the pattern of
development in the street scene. The appearance of the buildings is also considered satisfactory as the materials and details are in keeping with the style of the retained terrace buildings. New landscaping, including the provision of replacement trees and shrubs around the new buildings will ensure that greenery is maintained.

7.14 The proposed residents’ common room, which is to be erected immediately to the rear of the existing War Memorial fronting Burlington Road, has a contemporary design but is to be discreetly located and designed to ensure it is not prominent in the street scene or detrimental to the setting of the existing War Memorial. It will be constructed of brickwork with full height glazing to the south elevation, which faces the central quadrangle. It will have a ‘green’ roof as it is to be planted with sedum, adding to the landscape character of the site.

7.15 The two terraces that are to be retained will be refurbished with the ground floor of both buildings being extended to the rear. The refurbishment would not significantly alter the appearance of the buildings as seen from Burlington Lane, with their façades retained as existing while the additions to the rear are relatively modest and would be sympathetic to the style of the buildings.

7.16 The new buildings, Blocks A, B and C along with the expansion of hard paved parking areas and driveways will require the removal of some of the existing trees on the site (23 individual trees and 3 groups). The wooded area that contains a disused garage and overgrown shrubs in the north east corner would be made a car park with perimeter plantings. A number of good quality mature trees that are within or close to the proposed building footprints will be removed, as will certain dead and diseased trees and also trees of poor form or inappropriate species. The removal of some trees will reduce the amount of greenery on the site. However there are many attractive and screening trees retained and the design includes much open space for landscaping and private gardens around the proposed buildings. The site plan has been amended to delete two large areas of paving that had been proposed at the rear of the site with these spaces to be retained as soft landscaped areas instead. This will maximise soft landscape areas and increase rainwater infiltration. The harm to the appearance and character of the conservation area from the loss of trees will be offset by the provision of new landscaping that includes over 40 trees as well as shrubs, in particular around the perimeter of the site.

7.17 The street tree to be removed is a medium height London Plane tree. Although this is a medium size tree, it is not of historic or great ecological significance and does not have an outstanding form, therefore its removal and replacement with a new tree of the same species is considered acceptable. Other larger street trees and shrubs along the pavement in front of the site will be retained. Conditions of consent relating to details of new landscaping including the planting of new trees and the protection of trees to be retained have been recommended.

7.18 Overall the proposed redevelopment and refurbishment will provide well designed buildings, associated open spaces and landscaping that would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area. Although the proposal provides larger buildings and covers more of the site than the existing development, the bulk, scale, massing and style of the buildings would be satisfactory. The most important elements of the existing site, being the two terraces, lawn quadrangle and the War Memorial and their setting are all appropriately maintained. Therefore the development is considered to preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area. Given satisfactory replacement buildings are proposed, the granting
of conservation area consent for the demolition of the 1950s houses and 1980s flats is recommended.

The impact on adjoining residents and the area as a whole

7.19 The scheme will replace two existing buildings with larger buildings but in a similar location, refurbish and modestly extend two other existing buildings and provide a new building, the latter being located to the southeast side of the site, furthest from neighbouring dwellings.

7.20 The proposal will increase the intensity of use of the site by providing additional dwellings, however the proposed density, which gives an indication of the intensity of the development, is not excessive and is within the range deemed appropriate for the area.

7.21 Owing to the appropriate siting, height and mass of the proposed buildings and their good separation from the houses on adjoining and nearby properties, the proposal would not result in an undue loss of daylight and sunlight or outlook for adjoining residents.

7.22 With regard to privacy, Appendix 1 of the UDP states that a distance of at least 21m is recommended between the windows of habitable rooms that directly face those of another habitable room. The windows of the front elevation of the proposed Blocks A and B will face onto Burlington Lane and towards the windows of houses on the opposite side of the road. However these new windows will be at least 25m from the nearest neighbours' windows and in any event will look towards windows exposed to the public domain. Therefore there would be no significant loss of privacy to the residential properties on the northern side of Burlington Lane.

7.23 As the site has tennis courts to the east and allotment gardens to the south and southeast, the only other potentially overlooked properties would be the rear of houses in Wilmington Avenue. The first floor windows to the rear of the existing terraces are unchanged whilst the windows and balconies of the new Block A will be more than 35m from the rear windows of the nearest houses in Wilmington Avenue, with overlooking also minimised by existing and proposed vegetation on the site and the neighbouring gardens. Therefore loss of privacy to neighbouring residents in Wilmington Avenue is also not considered to be significant.

7.24 As such it is considered that the amenity of adjoining and surrounding residents will not be unduly harmed by the development.

The quality of the proposed accommodation

7.25 Policy H.4.1 of the UDP states that new residential development will be allowed within existing residential areas and on suitable brownfield sites which are capable of being served by a choice of means of travel and community services and sets outs standards and guidelines that for new dwellings to ensure a satisfactory standard of housing. The standards and guidelines will be applied flexibly to ensure the development relates well to the surrounding areas, respecting the predominant character and density and not damaging the amenities of adjacent properties. These standards and guidelines are detailed in the appendices of the UDP as well as the UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance 1997 (SPG) and among the criteria covered are form and design, privacy and spacing between buildings, private amenity space and housing for people with disabilities.
7.26 As mentioned above the site is within an established residential area and is accessible by public transport. There are local shops and taxis located next to Chiswick railway station that is approximately 280m walk from the site.

7.27 All of the proposed new dwellings and converted dwellings in the refurbished buildings will have a floor area and internal room sizes that exceed the minimum areas required by the SPG. The dwellings will also all have adequate access to natural light and ventilation. Noting that many of the occupants are likely to be elderly and or disabled there is lift access to all dwellings in the proposed Blocks A, B and C. There are also eight (8) wheelchair compliant dwellings including 2 x 2 bedroom houses, 2 x 1 bedroom flats and 2 x 2 bedroom flats. The number of wheelchair dwellings represents 22% of the total dwellings, which is more than the UDP and London Plan requirement for 10% of new housing to be designed for residents in wheelchairs. This higher figure and the inclusion of lifts to twenty (20) of the other dwellings is appropriate given the nature of the development. The layouts of the two wheelchair houses provided in the refurbished terrace are not perfect though will still comply with the relevant wheelchair accessibility standards and the design has been influenced by the limitations of the existing building that restricts the extent of alterations that are appropriate. Satisfactory areas for the storage of waste and recyclables have been provided.

7.28 The area and character of landscaping and amenity space for the development is satisfactory as most of the ground floor dwellings throughout the complex will have their own gardens, other flats have small balconies and there are also communal landscaped open space areas and a new residents’ common room. This new common room will provide a pleasant social meeting place for residents as it looks onto the central lawn and has extensive south facing glazing. The spaces around the buildings are to be landscaped with new trees, shrubs and pathways.

7.29 Therefore it is concluded that the proposal will provide good quality accommodation for residents, with a mix of housing types suitable for the existing and future occupants. The scheme will also provide significant improvements to the standard of housing compared to the existing buildings that are in some cases unsuitable for infirm and disabled residents.

The impact on traffic and parking in the locality and access to the site

7.30 Policy T.1.4 states that parking for developments must be provided in accordance with the Council’s standards and provision should be made for people with disabilities and loading and deliveries. It is noted that with the exception of disabled parking, these standards are a maximum and other forms of transport to and from the site are encouraged.

7.31 The application proposes modifications to the existing vehicle access to the site and an increase in off street parking. The existing site has six (6) parking spaces, which will be increased to fifteen (15) parking spaces, of which seven (7) will be designed for wheelchair users. The proposal will expand the existing parking area at the western side of the site and will also provide a second new parking area along the eastern side of the site. The parking area on the west of the site will be accessed from Burlington Lane by an existing vehicle entrance, which will be widened. The provision of the new entry to the eastern car park will require the relocation of the existing E3 bus stop on Burlington Road and the removal of one (1) street tree in front of the site. Pedestrian access will be maintained at the present location adjacent to the War Memorial.
7.32 Under the UDP parking standards the development requires twenty-one (21) spaces inclusive of visitor spaces. These parking standards are maximum levels that should be reduced where suitable alternative forms of transport are available and the nature of the development warrants it. In this instance the required provision of parking should take account of the expected needs of residents, which will be mostly elderly as well as some disabled people and families and it is likely that car ownership levels will be significantly lower than for the population as a whole. It is also noted that the site is served by the E3 bus route that serves Chiswick railway station and Chiswick High Road.

7.33 Therefore it is considered that the proposal has provided adequate parking for the development and the impact on traffic and parking in the locality will be satisfactory.

7.34 The relocation of the bus stop and removal of a street tree is necessary to provide access to the new car park. Provision of a new bus stop and the planting of a replacement tree at the applicant’s expense would ensure that the development does not unduly impinge on the existing bus service or street scene. These matters have been included as obligations in the proposed section 106 agreement.

**Sustainability**

7.35 The broad aim of sustainable development is to ensure that the quality of social, economic and ecological environments are improved and maintained for future generations. The UDP and London Plan encourage sustainable development through many policies including the promoting the use of energy efficient building design and materials, re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings, and location of development in or close to town centres and areas with good public transport.

7.36 The proposed development is consistent with these aims, as it will result in the more efficient use of already developed land that is accessible by public transport. The proposal also includes the refurbishment and enhancement of accommodation in two existing buildings, prolonging their life and utilising existing stock. The new dwellings provided are to be built to lifetime homes and eco home standards. The development is expected to achieve an eco home rating of ‘Very Good’ (on a rating scale of pass, good, very good and excellent). It is noted that there are some constraints resulting from the reuse of existing buildings from the 1920s.

7.37 The building design includes practical energy efficient measures to maximise thermal insulation and reduce energy consumption and will have controlled lighting, low flow water fittings, and solar thermal collectors that are to contribute to hot water system and reduce energy needs and CO₂ consumption.

7.38 The extent of the additional built on area is not excessive and the applicant has agreed to reduce the originally proposed areas of paving at the rear of the site in order to maximise soft landscaped areas and water infiltration. Trees that are lost from the site are to be replaced.
Has the amended scheme satisfactorily addressed the previous reasons for refusal?

7.39 The amended scheme has made significant changes to the previous proposal. Of most importance is that the massing and external appearance of the new buildings are now in keeping with the architectural style and form of the two existing terrace buildings that are very attractive and contribute positively to the character of the conservation area. Therefore the proposal will preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area and is not detrimental to the amenity of nearby neighbours. It is noted that the previous scheme had a contemporary design with flat roofs that were not sympathetic to the existing built form on the site or the character of the surrounding area.

7.40 The extent of hard paving has been reduced and the number of proposed dwellings and parking spaces on the site decreased by one (1) and nine (9) respectively. Additionally a proposed service road within the site has been deleted.

7.41 The mix of housing types has been amended to provide more choice with less one bedroom flats, the development now having 4 x 2 bedroom houses and 4 x 3 bedroom houses as well as 18 x 1 bedroom flats and 10 x 2 bedroom flats with eight (8) dwellings wheelchair accessible. This compares to the previous scheme that has 4 x 2 bed houses, 4 x 3 bed house, 4 x 2 bed flats and 25 x 1 bedroom flats with only six (6) dwellings wheelchair accessible.

7.42 In light of these modifications, the proposed scheme is considered to have satisfactorily addressed the reasons for refusal and the proposal is now recommended for approval.

8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

8.1 This development will enhance the existing accommodation on the site and provides additional supported housing of good quality providing homes for elderly, vulnerable and disabled ex-servicemen and women and their dependents. The new dwellings are designed to meet lifetime home standards and eight of the dwellings are designed for wheelchair users.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed development will provide good quality supported housing in an appropriate location and is compatible with the existing use of the site and surrounding development. The development would also preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation and not unduly harm the amenity of surrounding neighbours or adversely affect traffic and parking in the locality. Therefore it is recommended that planning permission and conservation area consent be granted.

10.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

10.1 Policy IMP.6.1 seeks to ensure that a developer enters into a planning obligation to secure planning benefits related to the proposed development where appropriate. Such obligations may be made as legal agreements under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and can also include restrictions or requirements for financial contributions.
10.2 In this instance the proposed development provides supported housing for a particular need. Although the use of the land is presently restricted by a covenant of the original grant, this is a matter of private tenure, and so to ensure the development is maintained for its intended purpose the occupancy of the dwellings should be restricted by a legal agreement. Additionally the proposal will require the relocation of the existing bus stop and removal of a street tree in Burlington Lane in front of the site. All costs associated with the relocation of the bus stop and the provision of a suitable replacement tree should be borne by the applicant.

10.3 Therefore if the development is approved it is recommended that this be subject to a section 106 agreement that includes financial contributions and other obligations that are measures directly related to the development as follows:

**Restriction on occupancy**
All dwellings in the development are only to be occupied by persons eligible for housing in accordance with the Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation's criteria for housing of vulnerable and disabled ex-service personnel and their dependents, and the dwellings are to be managed by the Foundation in their role as a Registered Social Landlord.

**Relocation of existing bus stop**
All costs associated with the design, provision and making good and any other necessary work to the road and footpath for the relocation of the existing bus stop on Burlington Lane in front of the site shall be borne by the owners of the site. The new bus stop shall include a bus shelter designed in accordance with the Council’s requirements.

**Provision of replacement street tree**
The owners of the site shall plant and maintain a semi-advanced street tree of the same species as the existing street tree to be removed. This obligation will include a requirement to plant another tree should the new tree die within a certain time period.

11.0 **RECOMMENDATION A (Planning permission)**

11.1 That the Director of Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and securing the above planning obligations by the prior completion of a Section 106 deed, the exact terms of which shall be negotiated in accordance with the above by the Director of Planning on the advice of the Director of Legal Services.

11.2 **Reasons:** The proposed development will provide good quality supported housing in an appropriate location and is compatible with the existing use of the site and surrounding development. The development would also preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation and not unduly harm the amenity of surrounding neighbours or adversely affect traffic and parking in the locality. Therefore it considered to be in accordance with the objectives of the relevant policies of the London Plan and London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan, in particular UDP policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas), ENV-N.2.7 (Trees and Community Woodland), H.1.1 (New Housing), H.4.1 (Housing Standards and Guidelines), H.7.1 (Supporting Housing) and T.1.4 (Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Development) and the UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance.
### Conditions:

1. **A1A** (Time Limit)
2. **B4** (Materials – samples)
3. **B5** (Implementation in accordance with approved plans)
4. **B8** (Prior Approval (of details) before work starts)
5. **C5** (Restriction of Permitted Development Rights – no extensions without permission)
6. **C7** (Restriction of Permitted Development Rights – no fences, gates, walls etc without permission)
7. **C8** (Restriction of Permitted Development Rights – no windows without permission).
8. **C23** (No external plant)
9. **C29** (Hours of Construction: Monday to Friday 8:00am to 6:00pm Saturday 9:00am to 1:00pm, Sunday & Bank Holidays no work)
10. **C34** (Illumination, mud and dust on construction sites)
11. **D4** (Refuse storage - details)
12. **D5** (Refuse storage implementation)
13. **E1** (Landscape design proposals)
14. **E2** (Landscape works implementation)
15. **E5** (Boundary treatment- details)
16. **E6** (Landscape management plan)
17. **E12** (Location of trees on and adjacent to development sites)
18. **E15** (Maintenance of planted trees)
19. **E16** (Existing trees which are to be retained)
20. **G2** (Parking – outline)
21. **NS** (Protection for certain trees)

No development shall take place until an Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement must describe how demolition, excavation and construction activity is to be managed in order to protect the existing street trees adjacent to the site (excepting the one street tree to be removed (No. 17). This statement shall include details and specifications, for protective fencing, foundations and structural plans, ground level changes, Tree Protection Zones, a timetable of works, material storage areas, supervision and schedule of work methods with regard to BS 5837:2005.

20. **NS** No development shall take place until a scheme detailing proposed measures to protect the existing War Memorial from damage during excavation, demolition or construction work for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

21. **NS** (On-site Renewable Energy)
Details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, before the development is commenced, for a scheme of on-site renewable energy generating at least 10% of the sites energy needs (power and heat). The details shall be carried out as approved.

*Reason: To improve the sustainability of the development and to contribute to meeting the targets in the Mayor’s Energy Strategy in accordance with Policy 4A.7 of the London Plan and ENV-P.2.5 (Energy & Resource Efficiency) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan 2003.*
22. **NS** (Environment Agency)
No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water storage capacity during 1 in 100 year storm conditions has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

*Reason: To alleviate the risk of flooding*

*Note: The surface water run-off rate shall be restricted to 9-litres/second/hectare of impermeable attenuated to a 1 in 100 year critical storm event.*

23. **NS** (Environment Agency)
A breach/ overtopping analysis shall be supplied to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency before the commencement of the development. This analysis shall be used to obtain flood water levels in case of breach/ overtopping of the flood defences.

*Reason: To alleviate the risk of flooding.*

24. **NS** (Environment Agency)
A scheme showing that the finished floor levels are set above the flood water levels shall be supplied to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency.

*Reason: To alleviate the risk of flooding.*

25. **NS** (Environment Agency)
Surface water drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

*Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.*

26. **NS** (Environment Agency)
Surface water control measures shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

*Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and improve water quality.*

27. **NS** (Environment Agency)
The construction of the site foundations shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences.

*Reason: To prevent pollution of groundwater.*

28. **NS** (Environment Agency)
No soakaway shall be constructed in contaminated ground.

*Reason: To prevent pollution of groundwater.*
12.0 RECOMMENDATION B (Conservation Area consent)

12.1 That subject to the completion of the above legal deed and granting of planning permission, that conservation area consent be granted for the demolition of buildings as shown on drawing number SOS697/OD05 Revision A received 21 December 2006.

12.2 Reasons: There are satisfactory plans for the redevelopment of the site as the new and refurbished buildings and associated landscaping are considered to preserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area in accordance with policy ENV-B.2.2 Conservation Areas, of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan 2003.

12.3 Conditions:

1. NS (Replacement scheme)
   A copy of building contracts for the erection of the approved replacement buildings shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. No demolition shall be undertaken on the site until written confirmation from the Local Planning Authority has been provided verifying the submission of details in accordance with this condition has been received.

   Reason: To ensure that there is satisfactory replacement buildings for the buildings to be demolished, in accordance with policy ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan 2003.
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
15th January 2007
Case Officer: Sonya Heenan – Tel: 0208 583 4937
e-mail: sonya.heenan@hounslow.gov.uk

References: P/2006/2214 00558/A/P25
Address: Land at Centaurs Business Park, Harlequin Avenue, Brentford
Ward: (Osterley and Spring Grove)
Proposal: Outline application for the development of up to 69,581 square metres of floorspace on the site for a broadcasting facility (use class B1(b)), offices (use class B1(a)) and warehouse/storage uses (use class B8), landscaping, parking, access and highway improvements, together with ancillary works, plant and equipment

Information and drawing numbers:
- Environmental Statement (including sustainability statement)
- Environmental Statement Technical Appendices
- Environmental Statement Non Technical Summary
- Planning Supporting Statement, including Report of Community Involvement
- Application drawings
  - Drawing 1 (Rev E) - Site Location Plan
  - Drawing 2 (Rev E) - Red Line Plan
  - Drawing 3 (Rev E) - Existing Site Location Plan and BSkyB Land Ownership
  - Drawing 4 (Rev F) - Existing Site Sections
  - Drawing 5 (Rev D) - Existing Site Access and Circulation
  - Drawing 6 (Rev E) - Location of Proposed Landscaped Areas (illustrative)
  - Drawing 8 (Rev C) - Proposed Site Access and Circulation
  - Drawing 11 (Rev E) - Proposed Phasing Plan (illustrative)
- Design Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan Statement
- Energy Statement
- Description of BSkyB’s Community Activities

Amendments submitted 24 October 2006
- Amended Design Statement
- Amended Viewpoints 3, 5 and 6 from Appendix 14 of the Environmental Statement Technical Appendices

Amendments submitted 12th December 2006
- Letter dated 12th December 2006
1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 The planning application is outline, with only the means of access for approval at this stage, and all other matters (siting, materials, external appearance and landscaping) are to be reserved for subsequent approval. There is no detail in the application as it is outline, but illustrative material and a proposed maximum building envelope and maximum floorspace has been provided and would be subject to conditions.

1.2 BSkyB is a UK broadcaster, and has been operating from Osterley since 1987. BSkyB have identified the need for additional floorspace in order to accommodate projected growth and to relocate and consolidate their existing operations onto the Osterley Campus, which forms the application site. The development would be phased over 10 years, to replace the existing offices, studios and workshops within the application site. BSkyB currently rent/occupy a number of existing buildings in addition to the application site, including buildings 1-6 at New Horizons Court, 3 buildings at the West Cross Centre and Athena Court. The application site currently has 1057 ‘workplaces’, and the entire BSkyB land occupation currently has 3187 ‘workplaces’, employing a total of 6000 staff. The applicant’s propose that this would increase to 3,954 workplaces employing 6069 staff on the application site over the lifetime of the development. The BSkyB operation is a 24 hour, seven day a week business.

1.3 The application is outline and is seeking a flexible permission for the redevelopment of the site. In the original submission the applicant’s outlined that within the development site 17,434 m² would be demolished, 16, 792m² (the existing Sky 1, 2 and 3 buildings) would be retained and 52, 789m² of new floorspace would be provided on this site. This would have equated to a net increase of 35, 355m² of floorspace within the application boundary. The revised proposal seeks permission to redevelop potentially all of the site to a maximum floor space of 69, 581m² consisting of 29, 534m² (B1 (a), 38, 047m² B1(b) and 2,000m² of B8. Again, this would amount to an increase of 35, 355m² of floor space.

1.4 Athena Court with a floorspace of 5,948 m² of B1(a), would be retained for use by Sky, outside the application site. The consolidation will free up the off-site facilities, releasing the 27,316m² of office space on the Great West Road.
1.5 The PTAL of the site is poor (2), given the distance of the site from train and tube stations, and the frequency of bus services within the area, and BSkyB currently operate a shuttle bus system. The proposed total number of car parks on the application site is 1125, which equates to an overall standard of 1:62m². However, currently within the application site there is existing car parking to the north of the warehouses and additional spaces adjacent to Sky 1 to Sky 8, providing a total of 945 spaces. It is proposed that the use of these parking spaces would be regulated by a Section 106 Agreement.

1.6 When assessing the impact of this increased floorspace on the BSkyB site, account was taken of other relevant factors such as the likely reoccupancy of Sky’s existing offices on the Great West Road and the current application for the redevelopment of the nearby Gillette site. A Cumulative Traffic Assessment, taking account of the adjacent Gillette site, and the potential redevelopment of Harrods was submitted to assess whether the road network could accommodate the increased traffic movements.

1.7 The principle of the development is considered satisfactory, in the context of the Unitary Development Plan and other relevant policy and material consideration. The development can be serviced in terms of transportation, and the physical impacts of the scheme, including the size and scale of the proposal, layout and the resultant impact on surrounding area including the Metropolitan Open Land and other environmental issues, can be mitigated subject to appropriate conditions and section 106 measures. Planning permission is recommended subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2.0 The BSkyB site has an area of 8.5 hectares and is located to the north of the Great West Road. The site is accessed via Syon Lane and then Grant Way (which runs through to the Harrods Depot), and there is also access from Harlequin Avenue. The site has a number of existing buildings, which are used for studios, office space and storage space, and currently has the benefit of 945 car parking spaces.

2.1 The site is primarily hardstanding with some grassed areas around the buildings, shrub planting and scattered trees. The Brent Valley Sewer (3.2m diameter) crosses the rear of the site, and there is an easement of 3.0m either side of the sewer.

2.2 The plan below details the existing site layout for the existing BSkyB campus which currently occupies the buildings in New Horizons Court, West Cross Centre, Athena Court and the application site which consists of Sky Buildings 1-8 and the warehouses.
2.3 Surrounding the application site are a range of different uses and buildings, which are detailed in a plan in section 2.6 below. To the east is the West Cross Business Park and New Horizons Court (currently occupied by Sky). To the south is Athena Court (currently occupied by Sky), and adjoining is a Tesco Superstore. Also to the south is the Gillette site, which comprises of office, manufacturing and storage buildings, which include the Grade II listed Gillette Building with its distinctive main façade and clock tower. The Gillette Building is also a landmark under UDP Policy ENV-B.2.8 (Views and Landmarks), being referenced as landmark C in both Table ENV-B.1 (Viewpoints and Landmarks) and on UDP Map ENV-B.2 (Viewpoints and Landmarks). To the north of the site is the Harrods depository and distribution centre and to the north-west is the Wyke Green Golf Course, which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land. To the north-east of the site is a Refuse Transfer Station. Along the south side of Syon Lane are residential dwellinghouses.

2.4 Within the wider surrounding area are Wyke Green Golf Course (west of the site) and Boston Manor Park (north-east of the site), both of which are designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). In addition, Boston Manor Park is located within the Grand Union Canal and Boston Manor Conservation Area and has Grade I listed Boston Manor House within it.

2.5 Site Context:
2.6 The nearest train station is Syon Lane, providing links to London Waterloo and Hounslow, which is approximately 600 metres from the site. The closest London Underground Station is Osterley Station, which is 2.25 kilometres from the site. There are two bus-routes H91 (Hammersmith/Hounslow West), and the H28 (Bulls Bridge (Tesco) to Osterley). There are pedestrian footpaths on the surrounding roads, and there are cycle lanes along Great West Road and Syon Lane. BSkyB also operate a shuttle service providing links to Gunnersbury Station between 07.00 to 11.00 and 16.00 to 20.00 three to five times an hour, and the shuttle bus to Osterley operates every fifteen minutes from 06.00 to 21.55. The site has a PTAL of 2 (poor).

3.0 HISTORY

3.1 There are numerous planning records for the subject site. The previous planning history for the site began in 1949 for use of the site as a machine factory, and the subsequent planning applications related to the use of the buildings as workshops and for the sale of motor vehicles.

3.2 The most recent applications for BSkyB are:

00558/A/P23 - Demolition of existing and redevelopment of site for erection of five storey building for television broadcasting facilities incorporating four studios, ancillary technical areas, offices and energy centre with associated parking and landscaping
WITHDRAWN – 2000
00558/A/P24 - Demolition of existing and redevelopment of site for erection of seven storey building for television broadcasting facilities incorporating four studios ancillary technical areas, supporting offices and energy centre with associated parking and landscaping APPROVED subject to legal agreement (which was never completed) – 2001

3.3 Another application has been submitted for the subject site as detailed below:

00558/A/P26 - Retention of plant, portacabins, shelter machinery, structures and car parking on site
PENDING

4.0 DETAILS

Introduction

4.1 The proposal is an outline application for 69,581 square metres of floorspace on the site for a broadcasting facility (use class B1(b)), offices (use class B1(a)) and warehouse/storage uses (use class B8), landscaping, parking, access and highway improvements, together with ancillary works, plant and equipment

4.2 Paragraph 4.1 of the applicant's Planning Statement states the following:

"BSkyB wish to retain some flexibility with regards to the configuration and location of buildings on site, so that the redevelopment of the application site can be planned in a way which responds to rapid and often unexpected changes in business demands. This means that while the height, massing and siting of buildings across the site can determined through detailed planning applications at a later date, the principle and scale of the redevelopment of the site can be assessed and agreed at this stage."

The application

4.3 The proposal is to replace the existing offices, studios and warehouses with new buildings. The original submission proposed new buildings consisting of (Harlequin1) Broadcast Centre and Sky Sports, (Phase 1), Office Building 1, multi-storey car park, (Phase 2), Business Support Building, Office Building 2, and Office Building 3 (Phase 3) (refer to plan below in paragraph 4.7). The new buildings would consist of offices, studios, storage space and staff support facilities and would have a total floorspace within the application boundary of 69,581m².

4.4 In the original submission, the applicant's indicated that the existing Sky 1, 2 and 3 buildings would be retained, now these buildings may not be retained, due to the flexibility of an outline application. In addition to the proposed floorspace below, Sky will continue to occupy Athena Court, which has a floor area of 5,948m², but this is outside the application site.

4.5 The revised development would consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE CLASS</th>
<th>AREA (M²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1(a)</td>
<td>29,534 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1(b)</td>
<td>38,047 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>2,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69,581 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 The applicant’s have indicated that the above development may be phased as detailed below and shown in detail on the plans in paragraph 4.7 below. However the final detailed phasing could change and would be the subject of later submissions as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>BUILDING(S)</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harlequin1 – Broadcast Centre and Sky Sports</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-storey carpark Office Building 1</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Proposed Phase 3:

4.8 The redevelopment of the site would also include (as illustrated above), a new landscaped pedestrian spine, linking into Grant Way to improve accessibility within the site. In addition, there would be a landscape strip around parts of the external boundary of the site as detailed below.
4.9 The maximum height above ground level of any building on site would be 38 metres, or 61 AOD. The development proposes a maximum building footprint of 69,581m², and proposes a maximum building envelope for each of the several plots of land. Within each plot, the design details would be submitted at a later stage. The maximum height indicates the main roof level, and satellite dishes etc may be located on top of this (assumed not to extend above roof heights by more than 4.0 metres). The building envelope and therefore maximum building height will conditioned.

4.10 The proposed building envelopes are detailed below. However it is important to realize that the maximum envelopes could not be achieved on each of the plots as this would exceed the maximum floorspace of 69,581m².
Traffic

4.12 As part of the submission a Traffic Assessment was submitted and subsequently a Cumulative Traffic Assessment which takes into account the potential redevelopment of both the Gillette and Harrods site.

4.13 Access to the site will be from Syon Lane onto Grant Way and Harlequin Avenue as existing. The car parking will be provided around the site, within a proposed multi-storey car park, proposed under-croft parking and proposed surface parking adjacent to new office buildings. There would be parking provision of 1125 spaces, which equates to 1:62m².

4.14 The applicant’s Transport Assessment concludes:

The site has reasonably good links to bus services, National Rail and London Underground via the BSkyB shuttle bus.

• Highway improvement measures have been proposed to mitigate the effects of the redevelopment.
• The proposed mitigation measures will bring considerable improvement to the pedestrian environment, and strengthen the pedestrian links to surrounding local amenities and public transport nodes.
• The proposed development promotes the use of sustainable modes of transport by targeting a reduction in car parking provision in the long term.

Landscaping

4.15 Section 4.3 of the applicant’s Planning Statement states the following:

“The details of the landscape are reserved for consideration at a later stage. However, BSkyB is committed to delivering a high quality scheme which provides a good working environment for employees and improves the appearance of the site from its surroundings.

The redeveloped eastern part of the site is to be based around a new landscaped pedestrian spine, linking into Grant Way and improving accessibility within the site. The main spine will be predominantly hard landscape in character and will be punctuated by a series of soft landscaped courtyard spaces creating visual interest and places for staff to congregate outside. The orientation of this linear route allows for sun penetration into the secured open spaces between the buildings and a canopy along the spine will enable year round use.

In addition the landscape scheme for the redeveloped site will incorporate:
• Tree planting along streets;
• Soft landscape along the site edges to create buffers for security;
• Planting in between the buildings to increase shelter from the prevailing winds;
• Opportunities to improve the ecological value of the site through landscaping; and
• High quality landscape design and entrance feature to create an appropriate corporate image for BSkyB”

Environmental Impact

4.16 Additional information has been submitted in regards to the Environmental Impact on the points below, all of which are addressed in the main body of the report.

• Air Quality
• Archaeology and cultural heritage
• Ecology
- Drainage and flooding
- Environmental wind
- Visual amenity
- Noise and vibration
- Ground conditions
- Society and economics
- Waste

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 The Council consulted the following properties by letter dated 19th July 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-9 Amalgamated Drive</td>
<td>Amalgamated Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette (UK) Limited,</td>
<td>Great West Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natwest,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comet Place,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924 (Gillette), 931, 941,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great West House Pet Plan Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford Bearings Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dale and Stepsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chimera Design Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gillette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avro House Roman Crest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace Ltd</td>
<td>New Horizons Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Northumberland Avenue</td>
<td>Northumberland Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 Northumberland Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-59 Oakland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opel Telecom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Amcor Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cross Centre 8 The Courtyard</td>
<td>Ryan Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake Maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBL Wheelchair Ltd</td>
<td>Shield Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Print Factory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11-13, 12, 14, 15, 17-21, 23, 25, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC News</td>
<td>Syon Gate Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebase</td>
<td>Syon Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco Superstore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comet Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-146 (evens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-213 (odds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 West Cross Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 Windsor Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Wyke Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrods Ltd</td>
<td>Grant Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke Green Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Transfer Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Site notices were erected, and the proposal was advertised in the Middlesex Chronicle, and available at the Brentford Library. In addition to internal consultations, other external consultations included the London Borough of Ealing,

5.3 Objections

5.4 One objection has been received from a surrounding resident highlighting concerns with an increase in traffic using Syon Lane and the junction with Great West Road.

5.5 Harrods

After originally objecting, confirmation was received on 29/11/06 stating the following conclusions:

1 It is essential that the BSkyB development is required to incorporate the highway improvements identified by ARUP, in order to provide the highway capacity which they have identified as being necessary.

2 It is essential that the various travel plan measures proposed by BSkyB including, in particular, the proposal to allocate car parking in a manner which affects distribution of their generated traffic, are taken through as enforceable obligations attached to any planning permission.

3 It is essential that the car parking associated with the BSkyB development is restricted at least to the level most recently proposed by BSkyB in their letter to Harrods of 23rd November i.e 1125 spaces.

5.6 The following external comments have been received:

5.7 Brentford Community Council

- Request that infra-structure, access for pedestrians and vehicles and the landscaping are conditioned so that each section of the site is laid out in advance of successive buildings.
- Concerned about the poor quality approach to building 1, and that this area should be landscaped.
- It is acknowledged that security is an issue, but that the general public should have access to the common parts.
- Section 106 contributions should be relevant to improving the bus services and making the A4 crossing safer and more attractive for pedestrians.
- Concerned regarding the extent of the proposed parking and traffic flows
- Section 106 monies should be used to re-open the railway line to the north of the site and for the construction of a new station
- Require significant improvements to the public bus services.
- Extension of education programme to provide tertiary education and training in a variety of skills.

5.8 The Environment Agency

Advised that they do not have concerns with the proposed development, provided that planning conditions are imposed. Points addressed include:

- Water resources
- Groundwater quality
• Recreation
• Surface Water Issues
• Waste Issues
• Enhancement of biodiversity on development sites
  - Native planning
  - Swift nesting boxes
  - Bird/bat boxes in buildings
  - Sustainable drainage systems
  - Green and brown roofs
  - Wildlife refuge areas

5.9 Metropolitan Police

Made the observation that all carparks within the development should achieve The Safer Parking Award. This is to ensure that the additional parking does not impact on the local crime figures.

5.10 English Nature

Have advised that the Environmental Statement has addressed the key nature conservation and ecology issues. They welcome the broad recommendations for ecological enhancement on site and would expect this to be incorporated in the detailed design of the development, if permitted.

5.11 The Countryside Agency

Have advised ‘it is our view that this application does not affect any priority interests of the Countryside Agency within Greater London and we accordingly make no formal representation. Although the Agency does not wish to offer any formal representations to this proposal we would commend and support both the Council and developer in their consideration and development of a Travel Plan for the proposal and would encourage its adoption and take up by site users.’

5.12 Greater London Authority

The Greater London Authority (GLA) acknowledged (by letter dated 8 August 2006) that consultation documents were received. This application and the Gillette application detailed elsewhere on this agenda are to be reported to the next Mayor's meeting (10 January 2007) for the Mayor's formal consideration. This matter will be reported on in an addendum if the GLA reports and the Mayor’s formal views have been made available to the Council prior to the Committee.

5.13 COMMENTS FROM ISLEWORTH AND BRENTFORD AREA COMMITTEE

5.14 The application were reported to the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee on the 12th October 2006 for comment and the following was reported:

• Members acknowledged the inclusion of the report on the Gillette site as an Appendix, and that a cumulative traffic impact assessment had been submitted for assessment by officers.
• Member’s requested clarification on the current vehicular access to the site and the location of the car parking. Officers confirmed that the proposed drawings were indicative illustrations of how the site could be laid out and that matters such as the siting, massing and appearance of the buildings would be subject to subsequent approval if outline planning permission now being sought for access were granted.
• Officers were unable to speculate on how the site elevations would appear from Boston Manor Park as the proposal is outline, but that an assessment would be undertaken prior to SDC to ascertain where within the site it would be most harmful to locate larger buildings and how best to ameliorate this potential harm.
• It was acknowledged that the phased development of the site could imitate the ongoing Chiswick Business Park development. A facet of this phased development would be the reduction of parking levels on site, including a reduction of vehicle parking along Grant Way.
• Suggested that detailed plans would be submitted to Area Committee at a future date (i.e. should the outline planning permission currently being considered be granted) and that this would provide members with the opportunity to look at conditioning various aspects of the scheme including on-site parking.
• Member’s requested whether the impact on the local community and economy had been considered in detail and whether BSkyB could be encouraged to use other local businesses in the Great West Road area for procurement, etc.
• Member’s referred to the low PTAL rating of 2 and asked whether increasing the frequency of the train timetable would help improve this rating, and acknowledged that frequency of local transport provision was a contributory factor to the PTAL rating and the likelihood that the traffic management report would constitute the largest part of the S106 proposal.
• Members requested that accurate photomontages be prepared for submission together with the application at SDC.
• Officers confirmed that conditions and/or legal obligations would be put in place to ensure that the completed scheme would relate directly to BSkyB operations.
• Members requested that an employment demographic be included in the SDC report, as this was essential for travel plans and advising on employment opportunities.
• Members acknowledged that the 38-metre maximum build height could be for the purposes of accommodating studio space on site, but that more detail should be included with the forthcoming SDC report, should it be available by then.

Resolved:

That members comments as set out above be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY

National Policies

6.1 The relevant national planning policies are:

- Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
- Planning Policy Guidance 4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms
- Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres
- Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks
- Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport
- Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning
- Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy
- Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control
- Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise
- Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk
6.2 The Circulars of relevance to this planning application are:

11/95: Use of Planning Conditions in Planning Permission
05/05: Planning Obligations

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

6.3 Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Hounslow is The London Plan Spatial Strategy for Greater London (London Plan) adopted by the Mayor in February 2004 and the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in December 2003, with material considerations including planning policy statements and planning policy guidance already discussed.

The London Plan

6.4 The relevant policies of The London Plan Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (The London Plan) adopted February 2004 are:

- Policy 2A.1 Sustainability criteria
- Policy 2A.7 Strategic Employment Locations
- Policy 3A.15 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities
- Policy 3A.21 Education facilities
- Policy 3B.1 Developing London’s economy
- Policy 3B.2 Office demand and supply
- Policy 3B.3 Office provision
- Policy 3B.5 Strategic Employment Locations
- Policy 3C.1 Integrating transport and development
- Policy 3C.2 Matching development to transport capacity
- Policy 3C.22 Parking strategy
- Policy 3D.5 Sports facilities
- Policy 3D.7 Realising the value of open space
- Policy 3D.9 Metropolitan Open Land
- Policy 3D.11 Open space strategies
- Policy 3D.12 Biodiversity and nature conservation
- Policy 4A.6 Improving air quality
- Policy 4A.7 Energy efficiency and renewable energy
- Policy 4A.9 Providing for renewable energy
- Policy 4A.12 Water quality
- Policy 4A.13 Water and sewerage infrastructure
- Policy 4A.14 Reducing noise
- Policy 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
- Policy 4B.2 Promoting world-class architecture and design
- Policy 4B.3 Maximising the potential of sites
- Policy 4B.4 Enhancing the quality of the public realm
- Policy 4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment
- Policy 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 4B.7 Respect local context and communities
- Policy 4B.9 Large-scale buildings – design and impact
- Policy 4B.10 London’s built heritage
6.5 Some of the London Plan policies listed above at Paragraph 6.20 are summarised below.

6.6 All policies in the London Plan promote sustainable development (p. 38). Policy 2A.1 sets out the criteria that guides the approach to development; development should:

- optimise the use of previously developed land and vacant or underused buildings;
- use a design-led approach to optimise the potential of sites;
- occur in locations that are currently, or planned to be, accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and that are accessible to town centres, employment, housing, shops and services;
- takes account of the capacity of existing or planned infrastructure including public transport, utilities and community infrastructure;
- takes account of the physical constraints on the development of land, including, for example, flood risk, and ensures no significant harmful impacts occur, or that such impacts are acceptability mitigated;
- takes account of the impact upon natural resources, environmental and cultural assets and the health of local people;
- prevents major accidents;
- takes account of the suitability of the site for mixed-use development and potential contribution to strengthening local communities.

6.7 Policy 3C.22 seeks to ensure that on-site car parking at new developments is the minimum necessary and that there is no over-provision that could undermine the use of more sustainable non-car modes. It states that the only exception to this approach will be to ensure that developments are accessible for disabled people.

6.8 Ensuring that developments maximise the potential of the site; are accessible, usable and permeable for all users; are safe for occupants and passers-by; and respect local context, character and communities are amongst the principles of design for a compact city set out at Policy 4B.1.

6.9 Policy 4B.3 seeks the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, the design principles in Policy 4B.1 and with public transport capacity, and provides a density location and parking matrix.

6.10 Policy 4B.5 requires that all future development meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion and Policy 4B.6 that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction are met. It states, for example, that sustainable design and construction will include measures to conserve energy, materials, water and other resources; and reduce the impacts of noise, pollution, flooding and micro-climate.

6.11 Policy 4B.7 calls for Boroughs to work with local communities to ensure proposed developments preserve or enhance local social, physical, cultural, historical, environmental and economic characteristics.
6.12 Policy 4B.11 calls for Boroughs to identify areas, spaces and buildings of special quality or character and adopt policies for their protection and the identification of opportunities for their enhancement, taking into account the strategic London context; and encourage and facilitate inclusive solutions to providing access for all, to and within the historic environment.

6.13 Annex 2 of the London Plan identifies Strategic Employment Locations with Table A2.2 setting out Industrial Business Parks including "13 Great Western Road (part)".

**Unitary Development Plan (2003)**

6.15 The relevant policies of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted 2003 are:

**Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP 1.1</td>
<td>Integrating patterns of land use and the provision of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 1.2</td>
<td>The re-use and recycling of urban land and buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 2.1A</td>
<td>Regeneration and enhancement of town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 3.1</td>
<td>Brentford Regeneration Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 4.1</td>
<td>Primary locations for economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 4.2</td>
<td>The Great West Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 5.1</td>
<td>High quality building and urban design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 6.1</td>
<td>Planning Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.1.5</td>
<td>Protection of Metropolitan Open Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.1.7</td>
<td>Development near the Metropolitan Open Land boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.1.11</td>
<td>Protection and improvement of local open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.1.15</td>
<td>Heritage Land (Parks of historic interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.1.16</td>
<td>Historic parks and gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.2.6</td>
<td>Landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-N.2.7</td>
<td>Trees and Community Woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.1</td>
<td>New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.2</td>
<td>High buildings or structures affecting sensitive areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.3</td>
<td>High buildings in areas other than those listed in ENV-B.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.5</td>
<td>Environmental improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.6</td>
<td>Public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.8</td>
<td>Access and facilities for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1.9</td>
<td>Safety and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.2.5</td>
<td>Development affecting the setting of a listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.2.8</td>
<td>Views and landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-B.1</td>
<td>Viewpoints and landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.1</td>
<td>Environmental sustainability: environmental impact statements and sustainability checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.2</td>
<td>Water pollution and water quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.3</td>
<td>Surface water run off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.4</td>
<td>Waste water management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.5</td>
<td>Noise pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.6</td>
<td>Air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.7</td>
<td>Light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.1.8</td>
<td>Development proposals on or near contaminated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.2.4</td>
<td>Recycling facilities in new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-P.2.6</td>
<td>Renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.1</td>
<td>Location of new employment development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.2</td>
<td>Locations for business (B1) use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.16 Supplementary Planning Guidance


Think Access – Design for Accessibility (April 2000).

Supplementary Planning Guidance (Feb 1997) - Grand Union Canal and Boston Manor Conservation Area

6.17 Local Development Framework

The Brentford Area Action Plan (BAAP) and Employment Development Plan Document (DPD) form part of the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF), which will eventually replace the Unitary Development Plan. These are prioritised in the Council's Local Development Scheme, a project plan that sets out the documents to be included in the overall framework. For each document it provides information about timescales and when the public will be formally involved.

The last stage of consultation on the BAAP and Employment DPD in January 2006 outlined the Council's preferred options, including the identification of the application site within the Great West Road Industrial Business Park in accordance with the Strategic Employment Locations Framework of the London Plan.

It is not expected that the BAAP and Employment DPD will be adopted until 2008.
7.0 PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 This application raises a series of detailed issues for the Council and it is important that they are considered in a logical sequence. The summary section (paragraphs 1.1 to 1.8) provide the background to the proposed development, and raise some of the key issues with the proposed development, which are expanded in more detail below. For further assessment of the application the key issues and topics to be addressed can be identified as follows:

**ISSUE 1** Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable? Is it an appropriate location for a high trip generating use? Does the development support or undermine economic regeneration and employment objectives?

**ISSUE 2** Can the scheme be accommodated in terms of access and public transport? Is the parking provision appropriate?

**ISSUE 3** Is the site appropriate for high buildings? Is the scale and design of the development acceptable in relation to the surrounding built environment? Does the proposal achieve a high quality urban design?

**ISSUE 4** Is the proposed development acceptable in environmental terms?
   i) Air quality
   ii) Archaeological and cultural heritage
   iii) Ecology
   (iv) Drainage and flooding
   (v) Wind
   (vi) Noise
   (vii) Ground conditions
   (viii) Society and economics

**ISSUE 5** Are sustainable building principles applied?

**ISSUE 6** Is the balance of community benefits appropriate to mitigate the impact of the development?

**ISSUE 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable?</th>
<th>Is it an appropriate location for a high trip generating use?</th>
<th>Does the development support or undermine economic regeneration and employment objectives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.2 This section provides a summary of the planning policy assessment framework and then the applicant’s case before presenting Officers’ comments. The summary of Officers’ comments then concludes that the principle of the proposed development on the site is acceptable.

Planning policy assessment framework

7.3 The first consideration is the principle of redevelopment in this location in the context of the UDP, the London Plan and emerging national and local policies. PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development), UDP Objective IMP.1 and UDP Policy IMP.1.2 encourage the beneficial reuse of previously developed land and buildings, where this is appropriate and sustainable (e.g. subject to ensuring high levels of public transport accessibility and a high quality design and environment).
This approach is also laid out in London Plan Policy 4B.1, with the requirement to ensure that all development is readily accessible by sustainable modes also strongly expressed in UDP Policies IMP.1.1, T.1.1, E.1.1 and ENV-B.1.1.

7.4 UDP Objective IMP.3 promotes area regeneration, particularly in areas of the Borough that require physical improvement and the enhancement of the quality of life, housing and employment opportunities for local people.

7.5 UDP Policy IMP.3.1 is concerned with the Brentford Regeneration Area. It states that the Council will support and encourage regeneration of the physical environment and improvements to the local economy in order to achieve wider social and community benefits. Primary objectives include "(i) the maintenance and support of existing business whilst focusing on the creation of new jobs and encouraging new investment".

7.6 The regeneration of the Brentford area is seen as a priority as reflected in the BAAP, which will establish a framework for future development, having been given priority in the preparation of the Borough’s LDF (see Paragraph 6.17 above).

7.7 UDP Policy IMP.1.1 states that a sequential test will be applied to the location of all major trip-generating developments. The requirement for a sequential test to be applied is also laid out in UDP Policies IMP.4.1, E.1.1 and E.1.2, which seeks to direct new major, trip generating economic development to the Borough’s town centres, followed by edge of town centres and, "In the event that suitable sites are not available within town centres", states that new economic development that generates a high number of trips should be concentrated within specific development nodes, including the Great West Road.

7.8 These policies are in accordance with PPS6 (Planning for Town Centres), which defines offices, both commercial and those of public bodies; as amongst the main town centre uses to which the policy statement applies.

7.9 UDP Policy IMP.4.2 is referred to within UDP Policy E.1.5 and encourages business uses, including high quality offices, along the Great West Road in order to ensure that it continues to be a prime employment area.

The applicant’s case:

7.10 The applicant’s planning statement states the following:

“BSkyB is an established UK broadcaster, and as the architect of a technically advanced broadcasting platform is leading the industry into the digital age. BSkyB have submitted this application to develop its campus to meet the following needs:

- Consolidation onto a single headquarters site that provides improved building stock for existing users and space for both identified and anticipated future business growth;
- Development of additional studios, technology space, business support and office accommodation;
- Enhancing movement within the site whilst maintaining a high level of security and environmental quality; and
- Providing sufficient parking for staff and visitors to the site.

An important factor for BSkyB is remaining at the forefront of new and evolving technologies relating to broadcasting. In developing its property requirements, all accommodation must be sufficiently flexible to enable implementation of new
technology developments and respond to changing business requirements. As such BSkyB has submitted this outline planning application to secure both the principle and scale of development that will facilitate BSkyB’s ongoing presence in Hounslow into the future.”

Officer’s comments

7.11 The BSkyB redevelopment is for a hybrid type of B1(a) and B1(b) development which results in a significant increase in the level of office development on a site which is in an out of centre location and is not defined as an Employment Proposal Site or Key Employment Location on the UDP Proposals Map. The site is within the area defined as the Brentford Regeneration Area for which objective IMP.3 and Policy IMP.3.1 are relevant.

7.12 The site is currently an employment site suitable for B2/B8 development but is used for high trip generating uses. The existing pattern of development on the site however has evolved in response to the needs of BSkyB for the specific use and the current floorspace is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1(a)</th>
<th>B1(b)</th>
<th>B8</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,206(m²)</td>
<td>18,320(m²)</td>
<td>700(m²)</td>
<td>34,226(m²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.13 44% of this 34,226m² is currently in B1(a) use.

7.14 The proposed redevelopment will increase the amount of floorspace on the site from 34,226m² to 69,581m², more than doubling the amount of the existing floorspace on site. The compilation of this floorspace is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1(a)</th>
<th>B1(b)</th>
<th>B8</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29,534m²</td>
<td>38,047m²</td>
<td>2,000m²</td>
<td>69,581m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.15 42% of this, 69,581m² will be for B1(a) uses. The proportion of office B1a to B1b floorspace in both the current and the proposed operations remains comparable.

7.16 It is necessary to demonstrate the circumstances that justify the location of a significant amount of new B1floorspace in an out of centre location, rather than a sequentially preferable site in a more accessible location.

7.17 Paragraph 3.16 of PPS6 states “Local Planning Authorities should take into account any genuine difficulties, which the applicant can demonstrate are likely to occur in operating the applicant’s business model from the sequentially preferable site, in terms of scale, format, car parking provision, and the scope for disaggregation”.

7.18 An obvious difficulty which BSkyB have in looking at whether there are any sequentially preferable sites is that they are already here on site, a major local employer, and high profile business who not only wish to stay here but wish to expand.

7.19 BSkyB considered a number of redevelopment options as identified in section 1.6.4 of the Environment Statement, which includes the following:

“The ‘do minimum’ option – this would entail BSkyB continuing to operate from the Osterley Campus through continued maintenance and minimal upgrading of
the existing facilities. This has been rejected as unworkable due to the risk of going off air as a result of aging infrastructure, plus the need to expand and upgrade the Broadcasting and Studio facilities.

- **Relocation to an alternative site outside Osterley** – this option would have potential benefits in terms of providing an opportunity to select a site with improved access, and would avoid the logistical challenges of redeveloping an operational site. However BSkyB has concluded that the Osterley site can accommodate suitable facilities to meet the requirements of the business, and remaining on the site would have advantages in terms of retaining the existing workforce and making use of existing facilities.

- **Land swaps to increase the space available within the site** - various land swaps have been investigated by BSkyB but these could not be negotiated with the current adjacent owners within the timeframe required. It was considered that these discussions could have potentially delayed a decision to move forward with the current scheme which is crucial to the business both in terms of programme and facilities.”

7.20 A phased redevelopment of the subject site from 2006 to 2015 was identified as the best option for BSkyB, and hence the outline planning application has been submitted. This proposal would increase the technological component of the Sky operation and rationalise the business, resulting in efficiencies to the operation by locating all of the activities on the one site (with the exception of Athena Court which will remain outside the site boundary but adjacent to the remainder of the campus). The case being made by the applicant is that the nature of Sky’s operations are such that the B1(a) activities and the B1(b) activities are inextricably linked and thus cannot be divorced and consequently they need to find a site which can accommodate this amount of floorspace 69,581m² to meet their operational business needs.

7.21 It is clear that this amount of accommodation would clearly not be suitable in a town centre in terms of scale. The scale of the existing or proposed buildings on the application site as a whole could not be accommodated within the Borough’s town centres, due to their capacity.

7.22 UDP Policy IMP.4.1 states that where suitable sites are not available in town centres, new economic development should be located in Key employment locations (Great West Road, Chiswick Park, Bedfont Lakes). Whilst the site is just outside the Great West Road ‘Key Employment Location’ Proposal site, it forms part of the larger Great West Road employment area. Given Sky’s existing operations and the scale of their business model, it would not be appropriate to redirect the proposed uses, and therefore the current location is considered acceptable.

**CONCLUSION**

7.23 This application is in some respect a unique application, dictated by the particular characteristics of BSkyB, who, we understand, will be the owner and occupier of the final scheme. If the proposed development was seen in isolation it would be unacceptable, however in light of the special nature of BSkyB’s business, the advantage of consolidating the operation on a single site and the training, employment and other benefits that the recommendation is to make an exception.
7.24 However it is a fact that the scheme will result in high trip generating activity in an out of centre location and not within the Great West Road Employment Area, and will need to be made more sustainable in transportation terms.

7.25 It is acknowledged that BSkyB have different operating requirements from many other traditional businesses due to the precise nature of their operational activity. Therefore having regard to the site location, and the operational requirements of the site in the context of national and local employment policies it is recommended that the current proposal be approved subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement. The impacts of the proposed development are addressed in more detail below.

ISSUE 2

Can the scheme be accommodated in terms of access and public transport? Is the parking provision appropriate?

Planning policy assessment framework

7.26 Transport guidance places much emphasis on the need for integration between transport modes with improvements to pedestrian and cycle facilities, to bus links to stations and to taxi rank facilities. Parking should be provided at a level that encourages alternative means of travel other than the private car. All developments should provide access for people with disabilities. When considering works to the highway, the safety of all users must be a priority (PPS1 and PPG13).

7.27 Policy T.1.2 (The Movement Implications of Development), states that, before granting planning permission, the Council must be satisfied that proposals for new development will be readily accessible by sustainable modes. All proposals should ensure that the development promotes access by walking, cycling and public transport with the aim of maximising the proportion of trips to developments by these modes.

7.28 UDP Policy T.2.1 (Pedestrian Access) seeks to encourage walking and improvements to pedestrian footways leading to premises and amenities and will require good pedestrian access to and within all developments. UDP Policy T.2.2 (Pedestrian Safety and Security) seeks that new proposals be designed with the safety and security of pedestrian area and footways, subways and car parks as a priority.

7.29 UDP Policy 2.4 (Public Transport Infrastructure) will seek improvements to public transport infrastructure, whilst paying attention to public transport accessibility, environmental quality and the needs of pedestrians and people with impaired mobility. In addition, the Council will also seek provision of access and parking for bicycles.

7.30 UDP Policy T.4.3 (Traffic Implications of New Development), states that development will not be permitted if the traffic movement directly associated with it would increase danger, cause unacceptable noise, congestion or environmental intrusion. All developments are assessed for their road safety implications, their contribution to traffic congestion and in the light of the present and potential capacity of public transport.

7.31 The Council’s parking standards (UDP Policy T.1.4 and Appendix 3) are considered to be the maximum desirable provision unless there are exceptional
circumstances, with UDP policies seeking to reduce the need to travel, reduce reliance on the private car and promote the use of sustainable modes (e.g. UDP Policy ENV-P.2.5 discourages unnecessary use of the private car and promotes energy and resource efficient means of transport such as cycling, walking and public transport).

7.32 Policy T.1.4 of the UDP states that all developments must provide parking and servicing facilities in accordance with the Council’s standards. The maximum parking standard specified in Appendix 3 of the UDP for B1 development is 1:100 m² within a regeneration area (including Brentford). Disabled persons provision is required at a standard of one wider space per 1,000m² and thereafter 1 per 2,500m² where development requires”.

7.33 Cycle parking will also need to be provided on site. Appendix 3 states that for offices cycle provision of 1 space per 700m² is required.

7.34 London Plan Policy 3C.22 (Parking Strategy) similarly seeks to ensure that on-site car parking at new developments is the minimum necessary and that there is no over-provision that could undermine the use of more sustainable non-car modes.

The applicant’s case:

7.35 A Transport Assessment was submitted with the overall conclusions being identified as follows:

- The site has reasonably good links to bus services, National Rail and London Underground via the BSkyB shuttle bus.
- Highway improvement measures have been proposed to mitigate the effects of the redevelopment.
- The proposed mitigation measures will bring considerable improvement to the pedestrian environment, and strengthen the pedestrian links to surrounding local amenities and public transport nodes.
- The proposed development promotes the use of sustainable modes of transport by targeting a reduction in car parking provision in the long term.
- The proposed development complies with Government, regional and local transport policy.

7.36 In addition to the Transport Assessment related to the site, two further traffic impact assessments have been submitted, one for the cumulative impact of the proposed redevelopment of both the BSkyB and Gillette sites and the second for the potential cumulative impact of the redevelopment of the BSkyB, Gillette and Harrods sites.

7.37 The first Cumulative Traffic Impact Assessment for BSkyB and Gillette, submitted on 29 September 2006 states, “In summary...shows that the proposed highway improvements are able to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic from both...sites”. The second report, submitted on 12 October 2006, which considers the cumulative impacts of the BSkyB, and Gillette schemes, with two indicative scenarios for possible future redevelopment of the Harrods’ site, suggested mitigation measures which would be needed to accommodate the anticipated cumulative traffic flows as detailed below:

1. Widened approach on Syon Lane
2. Widened approach on Grant Way
3. A link road across both Harrods’ land and along the northern boundary of BSkyB’s northwest car park, allowing a redistribution of traffic to Harlequin Avenue.

Parking and Travel Plan

7.38 Revised information has been submitted confirming that the proposal will consist of a maximum of 1125 car parking spaces.

7.39 The applicant’s have stated that ‘Development and implementation of the Travel Plan that has been proposed by BSkyB as part of the planning application will be integral to securing a sustainable reduction in car parking on site.’

7.40 The applicant’s original Transport Assessment states “a core component of the proposal is to develop a Travel Plan Framework for the site that can be taken forward to a full Travel Plan as the scheme develops. The Travel Plan will set out a framework of aims and objectives, useful background information and a range of potential measures that could be considered. The Travel Plan Framework will seek to engage staff and manage a range of initiatives, both relating to improved infrastructure and services and to behavioural change, to develop a considered approach to daily travel patterns.”

7.41 Amendments to the application have advised that BSkyB is in the process of preparing the Travel Plan for the site, in order to achieve the overall objective to make optimum use of BSkyB’s resources by actively managing car parking and facilitating easier sustainable travel for staff, suppliers and visitors, through the improvement of travel choices available to them.

Access

7.42 The main site access is via Syon Lane and then Grant Way which runs through to the Harrods Depository. There is also access from Harlequin Avenue.

7.43 In addition, as mentioned in 7.37 above, in the event of a redevelopment of the Harrods’s site, a proposed Loop Road, connecting Grant Way and Harlequin Avenue has been identified (shown on the plan below). This would ensure that the road network could accommodate the traffic flow. This road will not be formed as part of this application, but the route across the BSkyB site would be safeguarded to enable its construction in the event of redevelopment proposals for the Harrods site.
7.44 Officers have reviewed the applicant’s Transport Assessment and both Cumulative Traffic Impact Assessments to ensure that the analyses are robust and that the mitigation measures proposed are adequate. In addition, at the request of LBH Officers, site survey works have been undertaken to ensure that the proposed highway works can in fact be accommodated.

7.45 The BSkyB operation is a 24-hour operation, and therefore in the officer assessment, there has to be an allowance/consideration for some journeys made by people working unsocial hours. The total current staff levels are 6000, with the peak hours of operation being 07:00 to 13:00 and 15:00 to 21:00. The applicant’s have advised that between 07:00 to 13:00 there are approximately 60% of staff on site, and between 15:00 and 21:00 there are approximately 35% of the total staff on site. In addition, officers have considered the local BSkyB/Gillette/Harrods minibus service that the applicant has already in operation.

7.46 Whatever the special circumstances for the location and the operational requirements of BSkyB may be, the proposal must demonstrate how the increased level of activity can be accommodated on the site in terms of the traffic and transportation impacts taking account of:
   i) the increased level of development on the site;
   ii) the reoccupation by others of the existing offices that BSkyB will be vacating;
   iii) the extended hours of operations on the site;
   iv) the redevelopment of the Gillette site, and potentially the Harrods’s site;
   v) the need for a sustainable travel plan to improve the sustainable patterns of transport movement and to decrease the number of car parking spaces.

7.47 The nearest train station is Syon Lane, providing 4 trains an hour to London Waterloo and to Hounslow, and is approximately 600 metres from the site. The closest London Underground Station is Osterley, which is 2.25 kilometres from the site. BSkyB operates a shuttle bus service to Osterley Station, operating every
fifteen minutes from 06.00 to 21.55, and also provides a shuttle service to Gunnersbury Station between 07.00 to 11.00 and 16.00 to 20.00 three to five times an hour. There are two bus-routes serving the site, the H91 (Hammersmith/Hounslow West), which runs along the A4 Great West Road and the H28 (Bulls Bridge (Tesco) to Osterley (Tesco) which runs along Syon Lane. There are pedestrian footways on the surrounding roads, and there are cycle lanes along the A4 Great West Road.

7.48 The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) for the site based on the above public transport services has been calculated as 2, reflecting a “low” level of accessibility.

7.49 The applicant is proposing a number of changes to junctions and other improvements in the area to accommodate changes in traffic patterns and to cope with increased levels of pedestrian movement. These are proposed to include:
   i) signalisation of the Grant Way/Syon Lane junction with pedestrian facilities;
   ii) signalisation of the A4 Great West Road / Harlequin Avenue junction with pedestrian facilities across the A4;
   iii) improvements to the existing pedestrian subway under the A4 at Gillette Corner; and,
   iii) signalisation of the existing zebra crossing in Syon Lane by Syon Lane station.

7.50 Policy T.1.4 of the UDP states that all developments must provide parking and servicing facilities in accordance with the Council’s standards. The maximum standard specified in Appendix 3 of the UDP for B1 development is 1:100 m² within a regeneration area (including Brentford). For a completely new development based on the proposed total floorspace on the application site of 69,581m², a maximum of 696 car parking spaces would normally be allowed in accordance with the UDP standards. Cycle parking will also need to be provided on site, although this would be subject to conditions.

7.51 The proposed total number of car parking spaces on the application site is 1125 spaces which equates to a standard of 1:62m² of floorspace.

7.52 Setting aside the Athena Court building in Grant Way which is currently leased by BSkyB but does not form any part of the current development proposals, BSkyB employees currently have access to some 1660 spaces on the Grant Way site and on the various other sites currently utilised by BSkyB in the area. As staff move to the Grant Way campus and vacate the other sites in the area, there will be a reduction in parking spaces available to BSkyB staff to the 1125 proposed as part of the Grant Way development and this represents a significant and welcome reduction in the availability of on-site parking for employees. However, to prevent staff parking from migrating onto the local road network, it may be necessary to consider the need for a Controlled Parking Zone on the roads around the site and funding for such a scheme will form part of the proposed Section 106 agreement, although implementation of any scheme will depend on the outcome of local consultation.

7.53 The application includes a Travel Plan Statement that outlines the measures the applicant will introduce to encourage employees to switch from use of the private car to more sustainable modes of travel. This covers a wide range of initiatives and will be managed by a newly appointed Travel Plan Co-ordinator.

7.54 A number of potential Planning Obligations relating to the proposed development have been identified with regard to Traffic, Parking and Transport issues and these
are listed in detail in ISSUE 6, starting in paragraphs 7.199 below.

7.55 For the development to be sustainable given the reduction in on-site parking for employees that is outlined above, there needs to be a major change in employees’ choice of transport mode which can only be achieved through the effective implementation of the travel plan and by significant improvements to local public transport.

7.56 Officers propose that proposed section 106 contributions from both this development and the adjacent Gillette development should be utilised to substantially increase the frequency and hence the capacity of the H91 bus service to ensure that it provides both an efficient and effective service

CONCLUSION

7.57 The suitability of the site for this development has been linked directly to the accessibility of the site and the Cumulative Traffic Assessment, which shows that this level of development can operate satisfactorily provided that a number of measures can be put in place, primarily to increase public transport accessibility and to reduce the number of car parking spaces and regulate their use. These factors would be subject to a legal agreement.

ISSUE 3

Is the site appropriate for high buildings? Is the scale and design of the development acceptable in relation to the surrounding built environment? Does the proposal achieve a high quality urban design?

Planning policy assessment framework

7.58 UDP Policy ENV-B.1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that new development should be compatible with, and seek to enhance the character of the area in terms of size, scale, materials and design.

7.59 The application site adjoins the Wyke Green Golf Course that is designated as Metropolitan Open Land. Policy ENV-N.1.5 seeks to safeguard the permanence and integrity of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and requires that special regard be given to conserving and enhancing its particular character.

7.60 Policy ENV-N.1.7 refers to development near the MOL boundary and requires that any development in areas near the MOL and conspicuous from within it must be designed so that it does not detract from the open aspect or visual amenities of the M.O.L.

7.61 UDP Policy ENV-B.1.2 (High buildings or structures affecting sensitive areas) states,

‘Planning permission will normally be refused for the erection of buildings or other structures which significantly exceed the height of their surroundings or where it would result in significant harm to (i) the Metropolitan Green Belt; (ii) Metropolitan Open Land; (iii) residential areas; (iv) Conservation Areas; (v) Thames Riverside, Thames Policy Area and all the Borough’s waterways; (vi) local parks, sites of nature conservation importance and other open spaces; (vii) the setting of listed buildings.’
In the remainder of the Borough, planning permission will only be granted for high buildings where the development is carefully related to the surrounding area; the site is significantly large enough to ensure an adequate setting, including landscaping without impairing the amenity of surrounding sites; and the buildings are of high quality design and take account of the micro-climate and functional constraints and respect local views (UDP Policy ENV-B.1.3 (High buildings or structures in areas other than those listed in ENV-B.1.2)).

UDP Policy ENV-B 2.2 states that the Council will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas by ensuring that any development within or affecting a Conservation Area preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and any development should respect the character of the existing architecture in scale, design and materials.

UDP Policy ENV-B.2.5 (Development affecting the setting of a listed building) reads, "The Council will have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building in considering whether to grant listed building consent or planning permission by appropriate controls over proposals including design, scale, height, massing and alignment and use of appropriate materials".

UDP Policy B.2.8 (Views and Landmarks) seeks to protect the local views and landmarks from immediate obstruction from high buildings and any development should only be permitted if it does not adversely affect the views and landmarks. The Gillette building forms one of the Landmarks to be protected.

The relevant London Plan policies (in particular 4.B.3, 4.B.7, 4.B.10, and 3D.9) confirm the need to respect local context and communities, protect and enhance built heritage and maintain the protection of MOL from inappropriate development.

Policy 4B.8 (Tall buildings – location) of The London Plan states,

The applicant’s case:

The outline planning application identifies a number of development sub-areas within the site, within each of which maximum building heights are specified.

The applicant states that the key objectives that have informed the design process include the desire to:

- Replace poor quality buildings, which do not meet business requirements with a well-planned campus of good quality attractive buildings;
- Provide a better quality and more effective working environment for BSkyB employees;
- Enhance movement and legibility within the site whilst maintaining a high level of security;
- Improve environmental quality, including a landscaped spine through the centre of the redeveloped part of the campus; and
- Enable consolidation and more effective use of space.

The Design Statement states that the rationale behind the proposed building envelope approach is to:
• Secure both the principle and scale of the development that will consolidate BSkyB’s ongoing presence in Hounslow into the future.
• Build in the maximum flexibility with regards to the final configuration and location of buildings on site.
• Enable BSkyB to respond to rapid and unexpected changes in business demands within the ten-year plan.

7.71 The visual assessment undertaken by the applicant’s examines the main views of the proposed development from the neighbouring environment and considers short range, middle distance and loner views. The Environmental Statement Non-technical Summary states:

“The site lies in a region of contrasting land uses and the character of the surrounding townscape is varied. The surroundings include industrial sites, residential properties and a network of playing fields and historic parkland. The distinctive towers of the Gillette Building and the GlaxoSmithKline UK offices are close by, and there are three Historic Parks and Gardens, two of which are designated Conservation Areas.

7.72 The assessment accepts that, due to its height and massing, the development will have an impact on a wide area. The Environmental Statements: Non-Technical Summary, p7. Visual Impact and Townscape concludes:

“Mitigation measures will include planting to provide screening of the site where required, for example alongside the Metropolitan Open Land. Good design and the use of appropriate materials will be crucial in avoiding adverse effects on areas such as the open land, and the Grand Union Canal and Boston Manor Conservation Area, where intermittent views would be apparent through the trees. Although this cannot be assessed at this stage, it is BSkyB’s intention that the buildings will be designed and built to a high quality. Assuming this is achieved, there will be no adverse impacts and views of the site from suitable points such as the M4 and A4 may be improved.”

Officer’s Comments

7.73 Whilst the subject site does not contain any listed buildings, it is adjacent to the Gillette building, which is a Grade II Listed Building. Also within the area to the north, in the Wyke Green Playing Fields, is the Listed Centaurs Club, accessed off Gower Road. The River Brent and the Grand Union Canal are also located approximately 150 m from the property boundary. To the north-east of the site is an important area of Metropolitan Open Land, leading from the Grade I listed Boston Manor House. In addition, the site is visible from the Great West Road, and the M4.

7.74 As the proposal is an outline application, it is difficult to assess fully all of the potential physical impacts on the surrounding environment as only maximum building heights are specified. The actual height and footprint of the eventual buildings, and their appearance, would only be established later under reserved matters applications submitted for individual buildings. It is important to bear in mind that the application specifies the maximum floorspace across the site. Officer analysis has shown that the building envelopes in the submitted plans are substantially larger than the volumes that would be needed to accommodate the maximum floorspace proposed. It is likely therefore that the maximum building heights specified could be reached over only small areas of the site, if at all and a range of different built forms would be possible. It is therefore necessary to test the
acceptability of the proposals against a range of possible scenarios.

7.75 The application seeks a maximum height of building at 61 metres above AOD at the southern end of the Harlequin Avenue frontage. Given existing site levels at this point, this would equate to a building height of 38 metres. To put this in context, the top of the existing Gillette Tower is at 68.62 metres AOD, meaning that at the maximum height a BSkyB building would be 7.62 m lower. The majority of the remainder of the site would be developed at or below 43 metres above AOD.

Is the site appropriate for high buildings?

7.76 The first consideration has to be whether any part of the site is suitable to accommodate such height and likewise which parts of the site would be the most sensitive.

7.77 Buildings can be described “high” in both contextual and absolute terms. UDP policy ENV-B.1.3 refers to a high building or structure as one that significantly exceeds the height of their surroundings. Metropolitan Green Belt; Metropolitan Open Land; residential areas; conservation areas; Thames riverside, Thames Policy Area and all the Borough’s waterways; local parks, sites of nature conservation importance, and other open spaces; and the settings of listed buildings are all considered sensitive areas as described in ENV-B.1.2.

7.78 The appropriateness of a site for high buildings is illustrated in the UDP by the examples: “sites on the Great West Road whose frontage adjoins the elevated section of the M4, where high buildings exist on site or the surroundings are characterised by high buildings, and in town centres.” It is not considered that the Sky site falls into these categories.

7.79 Elsewhere, ENV-B.1.3 describes the special criteria for permitting a building or structure, which significantly exceeds the height of their surroundings:

(i) the development carefully relates to the surrounding area and sites;
(ii) the site is significantly large enough to ensure an adequate setting, including landscaping without impairing the amenity the surrounding sites,….
(iii) the building should be of high quality design, take account of the microclimate, and functional constraints, and respect local views and vistas.

7.80 The London Plan generally encourages the development of tall buildings: Policy 4B.8 (Tall buildings - location) states,

“The Mayor will promote the development of tall buildings where they create attractive landmarks enhancing London’s character, help to provide a coherent location for economic clusters of related activities and/or act as a catalyst for regeneration and where they are also acceptable in terms of design and impact on their surroundings”

7.81 London Plan policies would support applications of the highest quality of design, if meeting contextual, sustainability and use issues. In particular, a development application would be supported where it created attractive city elements as viewed from all angles and where it appropriately contribute to an interesting skyline, consolidating clusters within that skyline or providing key foci within views.

7.82 In the view of officers:
(i) the buildings which might be proposed within the height parameters in this
application can be considered tall.
(ii) the site is not one anticipated in the UDP as likely to be appropriate for high buildings, but equally it is not located in a proscribed area;
(iii) the GLA is likely to support a scheme which fits its criteria for high quality of design, both within the development and in the wider context
(iv) the acceptability of any tall structure here is dependent on the degree of impact on the surrounding built environment and the scope to mitigate this impact.

Is the scale and design of the development acceptable in relation to the surrounding built environment?

7.83 The outline nature of the application and the flexibility required by BSkyB for operational reasons means that the detailed nature of the eventual structures and buildings are not yet known. It is therefore difficult to assess fully the likely outcome of mass and storey heights because very few definite design features are available to be assessed. An illustrative masterplan drawing and block model is provided showing how the total floor areas could be distributed into buildings. The building shapes could accommodate the described floor areas and more, but are not definitive. Maximum heights could be as follows:

(a) along the railway line – between 16m AOD (approximately ground level) and 43m AOD (approximately halfway height between the waste transfer station’s ridge and chimneys)
(b) along McFarlane Lane - up to 43m AOD (approximately 20m above current ground level – equivalent to 4/5 standard commercial storeys)
(c) along the north west side of Grant Way - up to 51m AOD or 28m above ground (equivalent to tallest Harrods storage warehouse)
(d) along the south west side of Grant Way, north of Athena Court: - up to 56m AOD or 33 -35m,above ground
(e) along Harlequin Avenue - up to 57m AOD at the north end and 61m AOD further south - 37.5 – 38.5m above ground – equivalent to 7- 9 standard commercial storeys (ie 10m taller than the Harrods block, or 7.6m lower than the top of the Gillette tower)

7.84 Details of the proposed appearance of these buildings is limited at this stage to the applicant’s aspirations for architectural quality and “a coherent architectural language” and “limited palette of materials”: glass; white, light, metal panels; steel supports; highlighting special elements such as canopy, roofs, sculptures. The main results from the choice of materials would be on colour, reflectivity and variety, which can strongly influence the visibility of the scheme.

7.85 Whilst most of the adjacent buildings are industrial, starting from the Syon Lane/Great West Road context they are mostly of solid construction and not in the least similar to the suggested architectural expression. Further away there is a wider variety, and most existing buildings are quite low level. As a result, there is a good case for developing a sympathetic and attractive new architectural language.

7.86 The relative positions and shapes of buildings as shown on the block indicative model could produce satisfactory relationships. The skyline and silhouette of elevations and gaps between buildings to allow slot views of the Gillette tower from the north and east also will be very important. This will have to be designed and
assessed at a later stage.

7.87 In medium-distance views from sensitive places the buildings occasionally will be visible. It is likely that the evergreen trees (which are necessary in order to mask Boston Manor's immediate grounds and setting from the motorway blight) will also screen most of the view of the proposed buildings. Augmenting and maintaining the planting is therefore extremely important. Further mitigation could be provided by shapes, materials and layering of buildings, and relief on the skyline.

7.88 The two storey houses along Boston Gardens have garden elevations facing the development. The boundary has its own fringe of occasional shrubby trees, partly filtering the impacts, which could be urbanising intrusions on the horizon. This tree screen could be enhanced.

7.89 Seen from Syon Lane, more likely from Syon Park, the shapes will be larger but seen as occasional views through foreground interruptions. The impact will come from shape/s and colour of buildings, and the collective effect, such as gaps, shadows formed by overlaps in building height and on plan. These will be possible to design successfully at the detailed design stage.

7.90 Seen from the towpath and lower meadow, a lower height envelope at the far end of the Harlequin Avenue building, as indicated on the block model, would reduce the impact. Tree planting near the affected views, and detailed architectural design will be of extreme importance. The tree band both inside the site and along the canal should be augmented. The building surface finishes, and skyline treatment sympathetic to a more natural foreground, will be very important at detailed design stage.

7.91 Closest to Oaklands Avenue, the fragmented massing, which currently exists, is important to reduce impact. The increased height envelope in the area of the existing Sky 1 building closest to the housing along Oaklands Avenue should be limited to 35mAOD, ie an additional commercial storey.

7.92 The Gillette tower is a tall and recognisable feature seen from Boston Manor station platforms, yet often masked on the walk between Osterley station and Gillette. Seen from the south-west arc of view the foreground Gillette building will mask much of the new development. An effect to be considered is whether losing the contrast of its background of space will diminish the Gillette landmark tower. However there are unlikely to be relevant unimpeded viewpoints, seen from far enough away, for this to be a problem.

7.93 The proposed maximum height envelope is 61mAOD. The top of the Gillette tower is only 7.62m taller at 68.62mAOD. This leaves about the minimum silhouette required to maintain recognition of the tower. However the view of it seen from north to east would be lost almost in entirety by the 43m foreground height envelope. It will be important to design in slots and changes of height across this envelope so that occasional strategic views of the tower can be obtained.

CONCLUSION

7.94 Phasing, detailed design of the buildings themselves, and tree growth would help to mitigate the impact of the development. The site's buildings are located away from the Great West Road and landmark buildings and will have a potential visual impact, over a wide area. Different massing -height, form, modelling and skyline / interest- would reduce the amount of new intrusion into the scene generally.
7.95 The proposed taller buildings on the skyline would absorb existing foreground features; where these are of a visually good enough design this could be beneficial. At close quarters this quality is undoubtedly possible. Tests of required design quality are included in the London Plan at 4B.9 and the UDP and would need to be applied during the detailed design process.

7.96 Fragmentation within the zone envelopes will be important. During the detailed design stage, the ability to see the Gillette tower through slot views to the south west, and north through north-east sector, should be tested and the building masses designed accordingly.

7.97 The tree screen zone would need to be deep enough to permit a varied canopy height including those of good-sized trees. Augmenting the trees along the rear boundary to the Boston Gardens would reduce the impact.

7.98 Maintaining the tree screen for Boston Manor House and its park by ensuring succession planting is considered essential. The skyline interest and shapes, with slots and variety of shapes within the upper height envelopes will be very important to soften the impact.

7.99 Some stepping down of the height would be expected at the southern end; and using the maximum height over a much smaller footprint would provide a vertical focus and contrast in accordance with the design principles found in the area. At the same time any clashing of importance with the Gillette tower silhouette such as a tower or point block would need to be designed out.

**Does the proposal achieve a high quality urban design?**

7.100 The applicant assesses that “There are no direct townscape impacts as the proposed development would be constructed on an existing site owned by BSkyB with the same land and building uses as is being proposed. Impacts relating to the visual impact of the proposals are more significant and this includes a consideration of the height, massing design and finishes of the new structures and open space.”

7.101 As well as responding to context urban design includes the buildings themselves and the way in which they are grouped. It will be high quality where attractive, appropriate and durable buildings are arranged to form satisfactory and satisfying spaces and places. The ingredients of “good design” also include aspects of logistics, construction and sustainability which are discussed elsewhere.

7.102 Description of the proposed design. The outline nature of the application has been discussed earlier. An illustrative masterplan drawing and block model shows how a notional, potential, building layout, which includes a partially covered private pedestrian spine route, could be included. This is shown in the definitive statement as the location of proposed landscaped areas. It is noted that the pedestrian spine is oriented to channel the prevailing SW or, in winter, NE winds along it, however it is assumed that it will be in the client’s interest that the microclimate will be mitigated. The effect on potential landscape and its ecological value should however be noted. In principle it would provide an opportunity for good landscape and urban design, most of which would be contained within the security-controlled private estate.

7.103 Tree planting along the streets, a “principal space” onto Grant Way, and soft landscape edge to create buffers for security and screening along the south-west and edge are also annotated. Elsewhere in the application planting is suggested.
specifically for increasing shelter from the prevailing winds between the buildings.

7.104 This is a bespoke campus for a particular company, which has stated during meetings not to be interested in producing iconic buildings. It requires secure access and non-public areas, although a public highway separates the two parcels of land and abuts one of them at the lower level. The security measures are not described, but would affect potential walking distances and connections into the site from nearby streets and public transport.

CONCLUSION

7.105 The net effect of the massing strategy appears to increase the building heights generally, and more or less gradually away from public views. The potentially highest buildings would be on Harlequin Avenue, not in the middle of the applicant’s own site, but in the middle of the overall area. The mounding principle is the right approach and would need to be regulated during phasing and build-out of buildings when approved.

7.106 The development clearly has the potential to create a new horizon, urbanise currently more open views and hide or mask out existing features. Screening and massing requirements have been described in the paragraphs above to mitigate the unknown but potential development within building height envelopes. Mitigation by way of tree planting can only go so far.

7.107 The tallest building at each skyline that can’t be mitigated by tree planting ought to be modelled to provide interest. Creating an interesting skyline is in accordance with London Plan principles for tall buildings. However this should be designed to avoid negative impact on the Gillette tower and Boston Manor.

7.108 A further 4m zone of plant rooms, satellite dishes etc on top of the height envelopes should be anticipated. This plant and potential for renewable energy, if appropriately expressed, also would give an opportunity to make an interesting skyline, and help merge the building with the foreground. Again this should be designed to avoid negative impact on the Gillette tower.

7.109 The building envelopes are likely to mask the Gillette tower in views from north to east, so massing should be regulated to create slot views. This again would help to fragment the impact.

ISSUE 4

Is the proposed development acceptable in environmental terms?

i) Air quality
ii) Archaeological and cultural heritage
iii) Ecology
(iv) Drainage and flooding
(v) Wind
(vi) Noise
(vii) Ground conditions
(viii) Society and economics

7.110 Moving away from the principles of the development any acceptable development will still need to address the key environmental issues outlined below:
Air quality

Planning policy assessment framework

7.111 Current UDP policy and indeed Government guidance sets guidance on reducing and assessing the air quality. PPS23 advises that any consideration of the quality of land, air or water and potential impacts arising from development, possibly leading to impacts on health, is capable of being a material planning consideration, in so far as it arises or may arise from or may affect any land use. In addition Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport Local states that air quality is a key consideration in the integration between planning and transport.

7.112 UDP Policy ENV-P.1.6 (Air Pollution) requires the Council to give detailed consideration to air pollution matters, and requires a detailed air quality assessment.

7.113 The relevant London Plan policy is 4A.6 (Improving Air Quality) seeks to implement the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy and to achieve reductions in pollutant emissions. This policy describes measures to deliver air quality improvements through the design and location of new developments.

The applicant's case

7.114 The applicant's Environmental Statement report, page 25 states, 'the principal source of air pollution... is the emissions from traffic, specifically NO\textsuperscript{2} generated from the additional vehicles and changing traffic volumes on the local road network. There is also potential for atmospheric emissions as a result of demolition and construction of activities.'

Officer's Comments

7.115 The Borough has undertaken a review and assessment of air quality as required by the Environment Act 1995. This has concluded that the target level of air quality will not be met and has lead to the declaration of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Air quality issues relate with the presence or absence or airborne pollutants.

7.116 On 6\textsuperscript{th} of March 2006 LBH declared an AQMA over the whole Borough AQMA. Current UDP Policy and indeed Government guidance sets guidance on reducing and assessing the air quality implications of traffic. However, whilst the designation of the AQMA is indicative of a certain level of air quality, this in itself does not prevent development.

7.117 The Council’s Pollution Officer has reviewed the submitted details and has advised that LAQM TG03 states "For the review and assessment of road traffic sources it is essential that model verification is carried out". Model verification refers to checks that are carried out on model performance at a local level. This involves the comparison of predicted versus measured nitrogen dioxide concentrations. This work was undertaken, and no further information was requested.

Conclusion

7.118 It is considered that the proposal would impact on levels of air pollution, but this would not be grounds for refusal and could be mitigated by a Section 106 contribution with the money to be spent on projects related to air-quality management as allowed by PPS23 (Planning and Pollution Control).
Archaeological and cultural heritage

7.119 Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning Archaeological is important as it states that remains are irreplaceable, as they are the only evidence of the past development of our civilization.

7.120 The site is not within any of the Council’s Archaeological Priority Areas (UDP Map ENV-B3). Notwithstanding, UDP Policy ENV-B.3.2 requires the Council to promote the conservation, protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage of the Borough and its interpretation and presentation to the public.

7.121 In addition, the relevant London Plan Policies 4B.10 (London’s built heritage), 4B.1.1 (Heritage conservation), Policy 4B.12 (Historic conservation-led regeneration) and Policy 4B.12 (Archaeology) which confirms the need to protect and enhance historic assets.

Applicant’s case

7.122 The applicant’s Planning Statement states, ‘previous activities will have had an impact on the survival of possible buried archaeological remains; thus reducing the archaeological potential of the site. The likelihood for the discovery of significant remains is considered to be low to moderate. Mitigation measures to avoid adverse effects on archaeology will include evaluations in advance of construction within each phase of the development to identify and characterise any archaeological remains.’

7.123 The applicant’s EIA report states the site does not contain any buildings or visible features of historic importance, although the Gillette factory, a 20th Century Grade II Listed building, lies immediately to the south. It goes on to state, the potential for archaeological remains on the site will be further investigated through a desk study, and further evaluations or mitigation measures will be proposed as necessary.

7.124 The applicant’s have contacted the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service, who advised that ‘the area was generally of archaeological interest and that the proposed development would require a trench evaluation to determine the presence or absence of archaeological deposits.’

7.125 The applicant's have advised that the trial trenching will be incorporated in the construction programme.

Officer’s comments

7.126 Substantial parts of the site have existing buildings. During the proposed redevelopment the foundation work and proposed basements would require excavation work, and with proposed undercroft basements that may extend 2-3 metres underground.

7.127 It is considered that any archaeological remains can be protected through the imposition of planning conditions on the outline planning application.

Conclusion

7.128 If is considered that the proposal can be conditioned to ensure that there would be no impacts or loss of archaeological and cultural heritage within the Borough.
Ecology

Planning policy assessment framework

7.129 PPG9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) sets out planning policies on protection of biodiversity and geological conservation through the planning system. It includes the broad aim that planning, construction, development and regeneration should have minimal impacts on biodiversity and enhance it wherever possible.

7.130 Particularly relevant UDP policies include ENV-N.2.2 (Sites of regional/local nature conservation) and ENV-N.2.3 (Promotion of nature conservation management) and ENV.2.3A (Species protection), ENV-N.2.4 (Habitat protection), all of which seek to manage development so that the local ecology is maintained and enhanced.

7.131 London Plan Policy 3D.12 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) states that the Mayor will work with partners to ensure a proactive approach to the protection, promotion and management of biodiversity in support of the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy. The planning of new development and regeneration should have regard to nature conservation and biodiversity, and opportunities should be taken to achieve positive gains for conservation through the form and design of development. Other relevant documents include the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy – Connecting with London’s Nature, and The Biodiversity Strategy for England – Working with the grain of nature, both of which aim to ensure biodiversity is maintained through identification is issues and impacts of development and propose suitable mitigation measures.

The applicant's case

7.132 The applicant's undertook an ecological impact assessment, which included a baseline study to determine the existing ecological conditions on the site and within the immediate surrounding area. From this mitigation measures have been proposed to address the impacts and effects.

7.133 The ecological assessment submitted has provided details to identify the existing ecological conditions at the site and within the immediate surrounding area. The BSkyB site consists of a variety of habitat types being:

- Buildings
- Hardstanding/paved areas including pavements, roads and car parking areas
- Trees – juvenile and semi-mature
- Scattered scrub
- Planted ornamental vegetation
- Small areas of rank grassland and vegetation.

7.134 The applicant's have stated the following:

"The site comprises a mixture of hardstanding and mowed grass with some semi-mature trees, and does not contain any significant habitat areas. The nearest area of interest is a small pond and wetland area behind the Tesco store, adjacent to the site. Wyke Green Golf Course, to the west beyond the playing fields, and Osterley Park further west, are designated as Nature Conservation Areas by LBH and identified as Grade 1 Borough Importance in the Hounslow Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). The Grand Union Canal to the north is classified as a Site of
Metropolitan Importance for nature conservation in the BAP. There is a low probability of protected species existing on the site, but species such as bats may be present in the local area. Additionally the construction of the development is likely to have a temporary effect on local wildlife such as birds and invertebrates using the site. Nesting birds are protected by law, and construction will be managed so as to avoid disturbing nesting birds during the breeding season. There is a potential for the development to improve the value of the site for local wildlife, and the ecological assessment will suggest enhancement and mitigation measures as appropriate.”

7.135 The agents have provided the following details as proposed mitigation measures:

“These measures will include the incorporation of detailed design features, replacement of habitat, provision of protection measures, provision of other ecological features appropriate to the species and minimisation of risks to ecological resources through the timing and phasing of construction activities;

• Habitat creation through appropriate design and management;
• To take measures to provide new habitats in accordance with the objectives of the relevant BAPs;
• To incorporate general protection measures during construction phases for habitats or species inhabiting land adjacent to or within the construction site where necessary;
• To take all practical opportunities to include ecological design measures into the proposed scheme and landscape design, in order to maximise the ecological benefits of the scheme;
• To undertake a watching brief in respect of protected species during site clearance and construction activities where necessary. This would primarily relate to nesting birds; and
• To implement measures during construction to minimise impacts including avoiding works at sensitive times, implementing pollution control and prevention, and preventing dust and debris pollution.”

Officer’s comments

7.136 The Scoping Opinion issued by London Borough of Hounslow stated that regard should be given to the responses received from English Heritage, the Countryside Agency and the Environment Agency, and their responses were detailed in paragraphs 5.10 and 5.11, but they have advised that they are not requesting any additional information.

7.137 The site is already covered in building and hard surfacing with some landscaping within the site and around the site, which forms part of the ecological resources, within the wider surrounding area. Within the proposed redevelopment the existing vegetation and habitat areas will be removed, and disturbance to the surrounding areas will occur eg noise disturbance from construction to the Metropolitan Open Land, Grand Union Canal Area where bats were recorded in 1994).

7.138 In addition existing bird nests in any of the vegetation/existing buildings would be removed, resulting in conflict with any nesting birds. To overcome this, the applicant’s Environmental Statements, specifies that site clearance activities should be avoided during the bird-breeding season (March to July).

7.139 The applicant’s propose the use of green roof areas to increase biodiversity of the site, although this would be outlined in the reserved matters application. In addition the redevelopment proposes the provision of landscaping treatments around the site, which could lead to habitat creation.
Conclusion

7.140 It is considered that conditions can be set as part of the approval to ensure that new habitat creation as part of a long-term landscape framework for the site occurs. This should include an ecologist to undertake a watching brief to ensure that those areas being cleared do not contain any breeding birds/nests, and conditions can be imposed to incorporate suitable nesting habitats. There will be some disruption during the construction and implementation phases of the development, however the resultant development and improved habitats will mitigate this.

Drainage and flooding

Planning policy assessment framework

7.141 The aim of draft PPS25 is focuses on national planning policy and to provide clarity on what is required at regional and local levels to ensure that decisions are made at the most appropriate level and in a timely fashion to deliver sustainable planning for development and flood risk. Flood risk should be considered at all stages of the planning and development process in order to reduce future damage to property and loss of life.

7.142 UDP Policy (ENV-P.1.2 (Water Pollution and Water Quality) states that the Council will continue to liase with the Environment Agency to encourage cleanliness of all waterways.

7.143 UDP Policy ENV-P.1.3 (Surface Water Run Off) states that Council will promote the principles of sustainable urban water drainage, and that there is a presumption against new developments generating surface water run off likely to result in adverse impact such as an increased risk of flooding.

7.144 UDP Policy P.1.4 (Waste Water Management) states that the management of waste water must be in accordance with criteria set down by Thames Water Utilities.

The applicant's case

7.145 The details submitted as part of the Environment Statement address the environmental effects to the water environment from the proposed development being:

Surface water and foul drainage
Flooding Issues
Water quality, and;
Groundwater hydrology

7.146 Section 5.3.12 of the applicant's Planning Statement states:

“The site is not located within a floodplain, and as such is not susceptible to flooding from watercourses. However, any development has the potential to affect flooding elsewhere by increasing the volume of surface run off during heavy rainfall. The site is mainly hard surface at present, and the redevelopment will marginally increase the extent of landscaping, allowing more water to soak away and marginally reducing run-off. The existing surface water drainage network will be retained but, in order to bring the system up to the current standards, it will be
necessary to control run-off using attenuation and infiltration techniques. A Flood Risk Assessment has considered various sustainable drainage techniques that could be incorporated into the design. It is considered that the most viable option for the site is attenuation in storage tanks or tank sewers. However, the use of green roofs, increased landscaping areas, or the use of porous paving in the car parks would reduce the volume of storage required.

Local groundwater flows may be impeded by basements, and the size of basements would need to be addressed at detail design stage to prevent flows from being obstructed and increasing the risk of flooding from groundwater.

Construction works would result in areas of soil being exposed, and sediment and other pollutants could be washed into the nearby watercourses during rainfall, affecting the water quality. This would be prevented by the use of shallow cut-off trenches where necessary. During operation, oil interceptors would be used to prevent oil from car parks from being washed into watercourses.

The overall effects of the development would be an improvement in the surface water drainage system and negligible effects on groundwater and surface water quality.”

Officer’s Assessment

7.147 The site is outside the extreme flood events as identified on the Environment Agency’s Flood Map. As detailed in paragraph 5.8 the Environment Agency had no objection, but wants conditions imposed on any approval given.

7.148 Due to the increase in the building footprint within the site, the design phase will need to incorporate appropriate design to ensure that the volume of surface water run off can be achieved. However overall a number of sustainable drainage techniques can be achieved through design and suitable conditions.

Conclusion

7.149 If is considered that the proposal can be conditioned to ensure that there would be no impacts on the drainage and flooding of the subject site and the surrounding area.

Wind

Planning policy assessment framework

7.150 UDP Policy ENV B.1.3 states that: ‘Planning permission will only be granted for the erection of a building or structure which significantly exceeds the height of its surroundings when each of the following criteria is met:… the building should be of high quality design [and] take account of the microclimate…’

7.151 The London Plan Policy 4B.6 states that: The Mayor will, and boroughs should, ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and reflect this principle in UDP policies. These will include measures to: …reduce the impacts of microclimatic effects…’, and Policy 4B.9 states that: All large-scale buildings including tall buildings should be of the highest quality design and in particular: be sensitive to their impact on micro-climate in terms of wind....”
The applicant's case

7.152 Levels of windiness are described by a number of criteria for use with wind tunnel testing. The design incorporates a ‘spine’ of open space will run north-south through the eastern side of the site, parallel to Grant Way, and a second strip of open space will connect the spine with Grant Way, approximately half way though the site. The applicant’s consider that these are potentially the most sensitive areas of the site in terms of wind impact.

7.153 The applicant’s have also stated that the site is exposed to winds from the prevailing west and south-west directions across Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Windiness may be significant at times near the northwest and south-east corners of the buildings on the exposed edges of the site. However, the existing planting will be very beneficial around buildings of the current height in areas where it is present. From other wind directions the site has at least some protection by buildings of similar height to those on site.

7.154 The applicant’s have advised that the specific mitigation measures that should be adopted where adverse wind effects are identified as follows:

- In the area to the west of Grant Way, mature trees on the western edge of the site could help control the windiness in the area.
- Between the buildings, local windy conditions would be mitigated by planting and trees.
- Along the south of the site, space is likely to be needed at the corners of the buildings to provide sheltering features, such as a hedge, to protect pedestrian users of Grant Way, especially on the west side.
- Mitigation measures for wind to achieve the relevant Lawson criteria will be developed at the detailed design stage. At this stage, areas most likely to be sensitive are identified. The worst areas will be those where new buildings are constructed of a height, which makes then exposed to the prevailing WSW winds.

Officer's Assessment and Conclusion

7.155 The current application is an outline application, and when the proposed built form of the application is submitted under reserved matters, then additional details can be submitted for consideration taking into account materials and design of the buildings.

Noise and Vibration

Planning policy assessment framework

7.156 PPG24 outlines the considerations to be taken into account in determining planning applications both for noise sensitive developments and for those activities, which will generate noise and recommends appropriate levels for exposure to different sources of noise; and advises on the use of conditions to minimise the impact of noise.

7.157 The Council has a general policy on noise pollution, which states that the Council will not allow any development proposals that could result in unacceptable levels of noise nuisance to nearby existing or future occupiers. The stated reason for UDP
Policy ENV-P.1.5 (Noise pollution) is to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers, the aim being to reduce as far as practicable noise from all sources.

7.158 In addition, UDP Policy ENV-B.1.1 states, amongst other things, that new development and the uses being proposed should “ensure any noise is minimised at source and provides measures to protect local and neighbourhood amenity; ensure protection from any adverse impact of external noise.”

7.159 London Plan Policy 4a.14 states that boroughs should reduce noise by minimising the potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, or in the vicinity of, development proposals; by reducing the impact of traffic noise through highway management and transport policies; and by containing noise from 24-hour activities.

The applicant's case

7.160 Section 8 of the applicant’s Environmental statement states the following: The nearest noise sensitive residences are on Syon Lane 300m to the south and Oaklands Avenue approximately 300m south-west of the proposed development. The Grand Union Canal is to the east and north-east of the site and is at a distance of at least 330m from any proposed changes to the site.

7.161 Based on the proposal plans, the following potential noise changes have been identified:

- Demolition of existing buildings and construction of the proposed development;
- Road traffic noise from internal roads within the proposed development and any changes in traffic flow or composition on existing surrounding roads;
- Plant machinery noise associated with buildings; and
- Noise from car park areas
- Energy plant

Officer’s Comments

7.162 The Environmental Health team have considered the impact of the construction phase of the development, and advised, that if the proposal is approved, then a condition should be imposed in regard to hours of operation. It is however noted that this condition does not prohibit working at other times provided the work is inaudible at or beyond the site boundary(s). In addition, the applicant should be advised to make use of the methods set out in BS 5228: 1997 to control construction/demolition site noise.

Conclusion

7.163 If is considered that the proposal can be conditioned to ensure that there would be no impacts on the surrounding area, subject to suitable conditions regarding hours of operation.

Ground conditions

7.164 PPS23 advises that any consideration of the quality of land, air or water and potential impacts arising from development, possibly leading to impacts on health, is capable of being a material planning consideration, in so far as it arises or may arise from or may affect any land use.
7.165 UDP Objective ENV-P.1 states that the plan aims to protect residents and workers in the Borough from further detrimental effects due to noise, poor air quality, contaminated land and general environmental pollution.

7.166 UDP Policies ENV-P.1.8 (Development Proposals on or near Contaminated Land) states “that the site is or will be made safe for its intended use, in relation to its surroundings and in accordance with ODPM and other appropriate guidelines (see SPG 1997 for the assessment and monitoring of landfill and contaminated land sites). Any development proposals near to a source of potential pollution, in particular on sites within 250 metres of landfill, will be required to demonstrate that they can be developed and used safely before permission is granted or development is commenced, as appropriate. Where a development is proposed to be on land known or strongly suspected to be contaminated, there will be a requirement to demonstrate that this can be carried out safely, without detriment to the development and the adjoining land, before planning permission is granted or development is commenced, as appropriate. Where the Planning Authority suspects the land is contaminated, or where the evidence suggests that there may be only slight contamination, this will normally be the subject of planning conditions requiring investigation and appropriate remedial measures.”

7.167 Policy ENV-P.1.9 Policy ENV-P.1.9 (Remediation of Contaminated and Potentially Unstable Land) states that: “Where contaminated land warrants action to render it safe and of sound environmental quality, the Council will seek to instigate and achieve any necessary action in accordance with legislation, ODPM and other appropriate guidelines (see SPG 1997 for the assessment and monitoring of landfill and contaminated land sites). Where remedial measures are shown to be necessary, the Council will seek to have work carried out on site rather than excavation or pumping of material for disposal elsewhere. 'Dig and Dump' will normally be allowed only if it is within the site area or current treatment methods are not the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO).”

The applicant's case

7.168 During the potential construction phase, the applicant’s have identified that the key adverse environmental effects associated with ground contamination due to ground disturbance principally concern:

• Pollution of groundwater;
• Pollution of surface waters;
• Human health and safety, on and off site;
• Deterioration of construction materials; and
• Limitations to plant growth.

Officer’s Assessment and Conclusion

7.169 Suitable conditions have been suggested to identify any contamination during the construction phases, and measures identified to mitigate it.

Society and Economics

Planning policy assessment framework

7.170 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1) sets out the Government's overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system. The guidance focuses on key issues including that “Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning
planning” and that the Government has set out four aims for sustainable development:

- social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;
- effective protection of the environment;
- the prudent use of natural resources; and,
- the maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

7.171 These aims should be pursued in an integrated way through a sustainable, innovative and productive economy that delivers high levels of employment, and a just society that promotes social inclusion, sustainable communities and personal well being, in ways that protect and enhance the physical environment and optimise resource and energy use.

7.173 PPG4 takes a positive approach to the location of new business developments and assisting small firms through the planning system.

7.174 UDP Objective IMP.3 promotes area regeneration, particularly in areas of the Borough that require physical improvement and the enhancement of the quality of life, housing and employment opportunities for local people.

The applicant’s case

7.175 The applicant’s Environmental statement provides the following information:

“…increase the total number of workspaces from 3,187 to 3,954, and consolidate Sky’s operations within a single site.

7.176 **BSkyB Corporate Responsibility**

BSkyB contributes to the local community through its programme of community volunteering and funding. The proportion of staff taking part in donation and volunteer schemes is growing, and is expected to continue to make a positive contribution to the local community. BSkyB also runs a programme aimed at improving the school attendance and academic performance of young people through sport.

7.177 **Education and Skills**

**Construction**

The phased construction of the proposed redevelopment will create the potential for local people to develop skills by taking up opportunities offered by the construction process. This potential can be increased through the use of appropriate recruitment strategies and training programmes, and by publicising these opportunities to the local community.

7.178 **Operation**

The long-term establishment of BSkyB within the borough of Hounslow will contribute both directly and indirectly to local education and skills development.

7.179 **Community Impacts**

As a multi-million pound company, BSkyB has the potential to make a significant contribution to the local community within Hounslow. …there are a number of schemes already being run as part of BSkyB’s Corporate Responsibility programme. It is anticipated that the development will increase the contributions
made to the local community by ensuring BSkyB’s long-term presence within the borough.”

Officer Comments

7.180 There are undoubtedly economic benefits from trying to retain Sky’s business operation within the area and also for trying to accommodate the growth required to expand their operations to meet their business needs. Some of these are:

- Retention and continued growth of a high profile employer
- The continued presence of Sky in the Borough could potentially encourage economic growth and employment through attracting other creative industries (for example, other media related companies) to the Borough, as has occurred at Chiswick Business Park.
- There are also secondary benefits associated with business concentration and proximity to the supply chain, which can enhance employment opportunities in the Borough.
- Additional community/educational benefits. Whilst there is only a small number of additional jobs, there is the potential for an increase in the number of jobs accessed by local people as part of the long-term employment plan for Sky.

Conclusion

7.181 The proposed consolidation of Sky’s business onto one site will provide space for both identified and anticipated future business growth thus supporting the local economy.

ISSUE 5

Are sustainable building principles applied?

Planning policy assessment framework

7.182 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1) sets out the Government’s overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

7.183 Sustainability underpins many of the UDP policies and The London Plan. These require developments not only to be sustainable in transport terms; but also to include appropriate recycling facilities and to minimise waste; to include energy efficiency measures and promote the use of renewable energy; and not to significantly increase the requirement for water supply or surface water drainage.

7.184 UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-P.1.3 (Surface Water Run Off), ENV-P.2.1 (Waste Management), ENV-P.2.4 (Recycling Facilities in New Developments), ENV-P.2.5 (Energy and Resource Efficiency) and ENV-P.2.6 (Renewable Energy) require that all developments should include recycling facilities and minimise waste, include energy efficiency measures, be sustainable in transport terms, promote the use of renewable energy and not significantly increase the requirement for water supply or surface water drainage.

7.185 The London Plan outlines the Mayor’s Energy Strategy which sets targets for London wide reduction in emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂). London Plan Policy 4A.9 states that ‘the Mayor will and boroughs should require developments to show
how the development would generate a proportion of the sites electricity or heat needs from renewable, wherever feasible.

The applicant’s case

7.186 As part of the submission, the applicant’s submitted an Energy Statement and during the application a Supplementary Energy Statement was submitted (following a meeting the GLA).

7.187 The Supplementary Energy Statement submitted states that BSkyB focuses upon reducing its energy consumption across technologies, buildings and infrastructure and securing carbon free energy for its buildings and then offsetting its residual carbon emissions. It goes on to state that BSkyB’s Energy Strategy can be summed up in the following hierarchy:

- Supply energy efficiently
- Use renewable energy
- Maintain carbon offset

7.188 Section 4 of the Supplementary Energy Statement states:

“The site will adopt an integrated energy system that interconnects new buildings on site to another integrated energy management system for sharing.

Within this integrated energy system, BSkyB will utilize a combination of renewables to generate energy on-site, including solar water heating, photovoltaics, wind generated power and a Bio-fueled Combined Cooling and Heating Plant.”

7.189 In addition BSkyB’s Energy Statement outline that they have a company target to deliver a 50% reduction in waste landfill.

7.190 In the applicant’s Environmental Statement the following summary and recommendations are detailed:

7.191 “The redevelopment of the BSkyB Osterley Campus is generally compatible with local, London-wide and national sustainability policy. The key strengths of the scheme are:

- Location of the development on previously developed land, with no direct impacts on open space or other land uses;
- Development of land outside the flood plain, and reduction of storm water run off rates;
- Intensification of economic activity, bringing economic and employment benefits;
- Location of a major employment generating development on a site that is accessible by public transport; and
- Flexibility within the Tactical Property Plan to ensure that the development can respond to BSkyB’s future business demands.

7.192 Certain aspects of the development are contrary to the goals of sustainable development, and these include:

- Demolition of the existing buildings and replacement with new-build development is more resource intensive and generates more waste than the option of ongoing maintenance and refurbishment of existing buildings. However BSkyB has found the later option to be unsustainable in terms of its ongoing business requirements; and
The nature of the development is such that maximising the longevity of the buildings is not a key design aim. This may lead to construction impacts associated with the future redevelopment of the site.

7.193 There are a number of recommendations that will be carried through to the detailed design stage to ensure that the redevelopment is undertaken in a sustainable way. Many of these are included throughout this Environmental Statement, in the mitigation sections of the specialist chapters. Key sustainability principles include:

- The selection of construction materials will aim to maximise the use of local, recycled and sustainably sourced materials.
- The buildings should be designed to provide flexible, adaptable spaces that will cater for BSkyB’s business needs in the long term and would be capable of conversion (e.g. from studio to office space).
- A Travel Plan will be developed.
- The economic and employment benefits of the redevelopment should be made available to the local population.
- The redevelopment provides an opportunity to improve the value of the site for biodiversity.
- Attenuation of surface water run off will be provided to prevent the site from contributing to off-site flooding during storm events. Where possible, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) techniques, such as permeable paving and green/brown roofs, should be used to achieve this.
- The site’s energy usage should be addressed in the detailed design, with the aim of minimising carbon emissions associated with the site and maximising the use of onsite renewables. This will be achieved through a hierarchical approach, by first reducing the energy demands of the buildings through passive design measures (e.g. insulation, increasing natural daylighting and reducing solar heat gain).”

Officer’s comments

7.194 Overall the applicant’s are committed to implement sustainable design in accordance with the best practise and the requirements of the Building Regulations.

7.195 Conditions would need to be imposed on the grant of any planning permission for refuse/recycling.

7.196 Due to the nature of the business, and the proposed studios being built the proposed development is a high-energy user. However up-to-date technology is being used to ensure that sustainable building principles are applied.

Conclusion

7.197 On a large site, the proposal can make a substantial contribution to sustainable development in the Borough and it is important that it recognises and adopts sustainable development principles.

7.198 Officers recommend further safeguarding conditions on the grant of any planning permission. In addition, Section 106 planning obligations as set out below are required.

ISSUE 6

Is the balance of community benefits appropriate to mitigate the impact of the development?
7.199 Policy IMP6.1 (Planning Obligations) of the Unitary Development Plan states that the Council will seek to ensure that a developer enters into a planning obligation to secure planning benefits related to the development. Planning decisions impact on the local area and it is important when assessing a planning application to examine the consequences of a proposal on the locality and what the impact of a development will be. Where these consequences and impacts can be mitigated by off site measures planning obligations may be appropriate.

7.200 London Plan Policy 6A.4 (Priorities in planning obligations) states (in part) that “Affordable housing and public transport improvements should generally be given the highest importance...” (emphasis added) (see also Paragraph 7.221 above).

7.201 The following details sets out the heads of terms in three categories in line with the Code of Practice. It also sets out the potential planning obligations that have been identified and either confirmed or are in the process of being negotiated between Officers, and the developer. It should be noted that all payments would be index linked and the phasing of the payments and the construction programme subject to detailed negotiation.

7.202 Measures needed for the development to go ahead

Phasing

A scheme to ensure that the proposed development is built and occupied by BSkyB and that freestanding speculative offices are not the final outcome. This will be controlled by both occupanciy restrictions and parking levels.

Traffic, Parking and Transport issues

Section 278 Works

1. Grant Way/Syon Lane junction – improvements required to accommodate growth in traffic movements.
2. Syon Lane south of A4 – conversion of zebra crossing by Syon Lane station to pelican to reduce extensive delays to traffic movement when large numbers of pedestrians dominate crossing.
4. Footway improvements on Syon Lane and Gillette Corner junction.
## Measures needed for the development to go ahead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport:</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Agreed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contribution to traffic management/CPZ if required  
Study cost (£30,000) (£10,000 for 3 studies) 
& Implementation cost, if required (£150,000) | £180,000.00  
With payback mechanism should the Gillette application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and any CPZ required as a result of that scheme overlap with any required as a result of this application. | In principle. |
| Public transport (H91 bus service) | £1.67 million (approximately) in joint payments in respect of:  
(i) this application;  
(ii) the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda should it be approved and implemented; and  
(iii) financial contributions in respect of already approved schemes towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time. | Subject to negotiation |
| Amount in respect of this application to be advised – with payback |
| Routes towards Brentford Town Centre (along Canal) | £20,000.00 | Yes |
| Footway Improvements | £40,000 | Yes |
| | There would be £100,000 in joint payments for footway improvements in the surrounding area should the Gillette application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented. |
| B Sky B to implement a comprehensive Green Travel Plan to achieve significant modal switch and to secure compliance with such Travel Plan by any occupational tenants, including targets and annual monitoring requirements, Car and cycle scheme. | Flows naturally from the development. |

**Measures directly related to the proposed development**

**Employment and training:**

<p>| The developer will appoint a representative to co-ordinate its training/employment activities in relation to the Agreement and liaise on its behalf with the Council’s appointed representative on all local economic matters relating to the development. | Yes |
| In principle. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Training:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount to be advised</strong></th>
<th><strong>In principle: amount to be agreed.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Construction training providers (approved by the Council) will be given access to contractors on site (and their sub-contractors) once contracts are let and during the construction phase of the project, with the object of promoting and finding work placements for local construction apprentices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Considerate Contractor Scheme:** | | Flows from development. |
|-----------------------------------| | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Job-Brokerage:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount to be advised</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>In principle.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The developer will use reasonable endeavours to encourage the training and recruitment of local people into jobs provided by the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sector specific support for local creative and media industries:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount to be advised</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>In principle.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support and encouragement for local production and other creative and media companies, through innovation and development of the creative and media industry supply chain network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Support for local training and education in the creative and media sector:</strong></th>
<th><strong>£100,000 over 5 years (£20,000 per annum, on commencement of works),</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a programme of creative and media sector awareness, education, vocational training and work experience for 14-19 year olds in Hounslow schools through Hounslow Education-Business Partnership (HEBP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Environmental improvements:** | | |
|-------------------------------| | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Great West Road</strong></th>
<th><strong>£100,000.00</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution towards a scheme of improvements to the Great West Road in the vicinity of the Developer, the scheme to be agreed between the Developer and the Council and Transport for London prior to commencement of works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Street Tree Planting</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contribution of £30,000.00 + maintenance costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planting of street trees for the Harlequin Avenue frontage in addition to those proposed in the landscaping plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Off site screening</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contribution of £30,000.00 + maintenance costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>In principle.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme of improvements within Boston Manor Park to provide additional screening from the rear of Boston Manor House and the Playing Fields, with the scheme to be agreed between the Developer and the Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Enhancement of listed building** | | **Yes** | **Amount to be agreed.** |
|-----------------------------------| | | |
**Enhanced external lighting**
Providing additional lighting along public access areas to and from the BSkyB Osterley Campus.

| Nil cost to Council. | Amount to be agreed. |

**Air Quality**
The air quality impact of the redevelopment to be mitigated with a s.106 contribution with the money to be spent on projects related to the Air Quality Action Plan. This money would be for the purchase, installation, operation and maintenance of air quality monitoring equipment or provision of other assistance or support to enable LBH to implement any necessary monitoring or other actions in pursuit of an Air Quality Action Plan. Also contribute towards a lamppost mounted air quality monitor (NOx and PM10).

| £85,000.00 | In principle. |

**CCTV**
Provision of CCTV cameras and infrastructure for the Syon Lane subway and publicly accessible/outdoor areas of the development together with monitoring and maintenance.

| Nil cost to Council. | Yes |

**Access Ramp At Syon Lane Station**
Provision on a ramp to Syon Lane Station.

| £50,000.00 | Yes |

**Energy strategy**
Flows naturally from the development: Obligation to do a joint energy study with Gillette if that proposal, detailed elsewhere on this agenda, is granted planning permission and implemented.

| Amount to be agreed. |

**Monitoring Costs**
Associated with compliance with the section 106 agreement.

| Amount to be agreed. |

### 8.0 Conclusion

#### 8.1
The heads of term for a Section 106 agreement have effectively been agreed and a number of planning obligations agreed or agreed in principle. The consequences and impacts of the development would be able to be mitigated and planning benefits able to be secured subject to a satisfactory Section 106 agreement with phasing of development and contributions.

#### 8.2
The application site is an out-of-centre location and is not defined as an Employment Proposal Site or Key Employment Location on the UDP Proposals Map. The development would result proposes B1a (offices), B1b (research and
development, studios, laboratories, high tech) and B8 (warehouses), and 1125 car parking spaces, with the construction of the project taking up to 2015. The regeneration of the Brentford area is seen as a priority as reflected in the Brentford Area Action Plan being prepared as part of the Borough’s Local Development Framework.

8.3 The development which is a bespoke scheme for BSkyB’s end use can be accommodated and serviced in terms of transportation, and the physical impacts of the scheme, including the size and scale of the proposal, design and layout, resultant impact on surrounding area including the Metropolitan Open Land and other environmental issues, can be mitigated subject to appropriate conditions and section 106 measures.

8.4 The Section 106 Agreement prescribes the nature of development and provides a package of contributions that fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development therefore meeting UDP Policy IMP.6.1 (Planning Obligations) and the requirements of Circular 5/2005.

9.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 With regards to access and facilities for people with disabilities, UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development) and ENV-B.1.8 (Access and facilities for people with disabilities) seek to ensure that development proposals and refurbishments are designed so as to be fully accessible to people with disabilities or impaired mobility and have regard in particular to the Council’s ‘Think Access’ SPG (April 2000).

9.2 Part M of the Building Regulations ensures that all new buildings allow access for people with disabilities.

9.3 Further assessment on accessibility would be undertaken at the detailed design phase, and if approval is given, conditioned accordingly.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

10.1 That on completion of the necessary legal agreement, that the Borough Planning Officer be authorised to grant outline planning permission subject to the following conditions.

10.2 Reason

It is considered that this outline application for the principle of redevelopment of up to 69,581 square metres of floorspace on the site for a broadcasting facility (use class B1(b)), offices (use class B1(a)) and warehouse/storage uses (use class B8), landscaping, parking, access and highway improvements, together with ancillary works, plant and equipment would not be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining area. On balance, the development is in accordance with Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New development), E.1.5 (Development involving the loss of or changes in employment uses), Policy T.1.2 (The Movement Implications of Development), and T.1.4 (Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments) of The London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan, (2003), and Supplementary Planning Guidance (1997).

10.3 Conditions and reasons:

1 Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of any of the building(s), and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called “the reserved
matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any phase of the development is commenced.

To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission and in order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development.

2. Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition 1 above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and development shall not commence otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

3. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of (six) years from the date of this permission.

To accord with the provisions of Section 92(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of (three) years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of (two) years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

To accord with the provisions of Section 92(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5. The total amount of gross external floorspace in each respective use class permitted by this planning permission shall not exceed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE CLASS</th>
<th>AREA (M²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1(a)</td>
<td>29,534 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1(b)</td>
<td>38,047 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>2,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69,581 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to satisfy the requirements of policy ENV B1.1 (New development) and T.1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities.

6. No additional floorspace shall be formed within the buildings hereby permitted by means of internal horizontal division without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development and in order not to prejudice the Council's standards for provision of car parking spaces and service facilities in accordance with Policies ENV-B.1.1 New Development, E.1.1 Location of New Employment Development, S.1.1 Main Shopping Areas and T.1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments of the Hounslow UDP).

7. No building or any part of the development hereby permitted shall exceed the maximum building heights as per plan reference AA-39186/01/S-00-038).
In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to satisfy the requirements of policy ENV B1.1 (New development)

8. No building or development hereby permitted shall be constructed over the 'potential vehicular route' as per plan reference AA-39186/01/S-00-088).

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 (New development) and policy T.4.4 (Road Safety).

9. With respect to any condition that requires the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority then the approval may only be taken as having been given if it is given expressly by reference to the relevant condition (and for the avoidance of doubt agreement expressed under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 shall not, alone, be taken as such an approval) and the works thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval unless subsequently otherwise approved in writing by that Local Planning Authority.

To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approval, and to avoid any detriment to amenity that may be caused by any phase remaining uncompleted.

10. A scheme of phasing and timetable of development and timing of construction shall be submitted to and agreed by the LPA before each phase of development commences and the development shall be implemented in accordance with that scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission.

11. Vehicular access to the site shall not be otherwise than in accordance with the layout shown on drawing number AA-39186/01/S-00-038 Rev (I).

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development, and policy T.4.4 Road Safety.

12. No development shall take place on each phase until full details of the landscaping to be undertaken on those parts of the site shaded green on approved drawing number AA-39186/01/S-00-038 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Landscaping shall be undertaken on those parts of the site shaded green on approved drawing number AA-39186/01/S-00-038

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

13. No development on each phase shall take place until samples of the materials and a sample board of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to satisfy the requirements of policy ENV B1.1 (New development), and (H6.4 Extensions and alterations).
14. No development on each phase shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the road surfaces hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to satisfy the requirements of policy ENV B1.1 (New development), and (H6.4 Extensions and alterations).

15. No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 on Mondays to Friday and 08.30 to 13.00 on Saturdays and none shall take place on Sundays and public holidays without the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

16. Before commencement of each phase of the development details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to cover the following matters:

   i) Temporary external illumination of the site.
   ii) Measures to ensure that all mud and other loose materials are not carried on the wheels and chassis of any vehicles leaving the site.
   iii) Measures to minimise dust nuisance caused by the operations and to ensure that no dust or other debris is carried on to the adjoining properties.
   iv) Illumination of the interior of buildings prior to their occupation; and
   v) other measures that would be implemented to regulate the environmental impact of the construction process.

In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential properties and in the interest of road safety.

17. Before any plant and/or machinery is used within each phase it shall be enclosed with sound-insulating material and mounted in a way which will minimise transmission of structure borne sound in accordance with a scheme for the relevant phase that shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

To safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties and users of the publicly open space in accordance with Policies ENV-B.1.1 New Development and ENV-P.1.5 Noise Pollution of the Hounslow UDP.

18. Before the development on each phase commences details of parking (including spaces for people with disabilities) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the spaces shown on the approved drawing shall be available for use before first occupation of any part of the development.

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development and to ensure that parking spaces are available in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development and policy T1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and servicing facilities for developments.

19. At each phase, the use hereby permitted shall not be begun until details of the arrangements for storing of refuse or waste recycling which is to include a waste management strategy have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The arrangements for storing of refuse or waste recycling shall not be
carried out otherwise than in accordance with any approval given and shall be completed before any part of the buildings hereby permitted are occupied.

To safeguard the amenities of the area and in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 (New development), and ENV-P.2.4. (Recycling facilities in new developments).

20. No development shall take place on each phase until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include (proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing material; permeable pavement design, minor artefacts and structures (eg. refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports, fire hydrants etc); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant), details of green roofs and details of biodiversity enhancements to promote nature conservation (eg native planting, swift nesting boxes, and bird/bat boxes in buildings).

Soft landscape works shall include (planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; implementation programme)

To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the site and improve the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

21. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the local planning authority.

To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the site and improve the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

22. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment. The boundary treatment shall be completed before any of the buildings hereby permitted are first occupied.

To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and privacy of adjoining properties locality in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 (New development).

23. A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all hard and soft landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area locality and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

24. No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the
local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area locality and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

25. No works or development shall take place until full details of all proposed tree planting, and the proposed times of planting, have been approved in writing by the local planning authority, and all tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area locality and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

26. If within a period of (two years) from the date of the planting of any tree, that tree, or any tree planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, (or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective,) another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area locality and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

27. The plans and particulars submitted in accordance with condition 26 above shall include:

(a) a plan showing the location of, and allocating a reference number to, each existing tree on the site which has a stem with a diameter, measured over the bark at a point 1.5 metres above ground level, exceeding 75mm, showing which trees are to be retained and the crown spread of each retained tree;

(b) details of the species, diameter (measured in accordance with paragraph (a) above), and the approximate height, and an assessment of the general state of health and stability, of each retained tree and of each tree which is on land adjacent to the site and to which paragraphs (c) and (d) below apply;

(c) details of any proposed topping or lopping of any retained tree, or of any tree on land adjacent to the site;

(d) details of any proposed alterations in existing ground levels, and of the position of any proposed excavation, (within the crown spread of any retained tree or of any tree on land adjacent to the site) (within a distance from any retained tree, or any tree on land adjacent to the site, equivalent to half the height of that tree);

(e) details of the specification and position of fencing (and of any other measures to be taken) for the protection of any retained tree from damage before or during the course of development.

In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the plan referred to in paragraph (a) above.
In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the arrangements for protecting trees, in the interests of visual amenity area and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development, and ENV-N.2.8 Tree Preservation Orders.

28. Before any site works take place protective barriers and ground protection must be erected around the retained trees to form an exclusion zone. It is essential the exclusion zone be maintained throughout the demolition and construction phases.

To safeguard the health of the existing trees

29. All work to trees shall be carried out to BS Specification 3998 (As Amended).

To safeguard the health of the trees and to accord with policy ENV-N.2.8 Tree Preservation Orders.

30. Before first occupation of the buildings the loading, unloading and turning space, and parking spaces (including spaces for people with disabilities) shall be provided within the curtilage of the site in accordance with the phasing of the scheme and such spaces shall be permanently available and not be used for any other purpose.

In order to prevent obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjacent highway and the premises, and in the interests of road safety available in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development and policy T1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and servicing facilities for developments and T4.4 Road Safety.

31. There shall be no more than 1125 marked car parking spaces on the site at any time.

To limit the maximum number of cars parked on the site in the interests of controlling traffic congestion therefore improving road safety and encouraging use of public transport in accordance with policy T1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and servicing facilities for developments.

32. Before the development on each phase hereby permitted is commenced a scheme indicating the provision to be made for disabled people to gain access to buildings shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented before the development hereby permitted is brought into use.

To provide satisfactory access for people with disabilities in accordance with policy ENV-B.1.1 New Development and E.1.3 Disabled Access.

33. Before the development on each phase details of cycle parking/stands have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and the spaces shown on any of the approved drawings shall be available for use before the first occupation of the buildings and permanently maintained and retained thereafter.

In order that the LPA may be satisfied as to the details of the development and to encourage the use of the site by cyclists.

34. No excavation or remedial works shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (including a watching brief and the timetable for the investigation) which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the approved programme of archaeological work,
unless otherwise agreed, in advance and in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with English Heritage). Should significant archaeological remains be encountered in the course of the initial field evaluation, an appropriate mitigation strategy, which may include archaeological excavation or areas of preservation in situ, is likely to be necessary.

Local Planning Authority would wish to protect the site from any damage, which might occur whilst carrying out the development.

35. Before the development is commenced details of the access road shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not commence (be occupied) until the access road has been completed in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the development and to accord with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development, and policy T.4.4 Road Safet.

36. The construction of the surface and foul drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority with consultation with the Environment Agency before the development commences and should provide the following details:

(i) The layout of the surface water drainage
(ii) The phasing of the surface water drainage
(iii) The methods of construction to be employed including measures to control potential pollution during construction
(iv) A sampling regime to test for pollution in surface water

To prevent pollution of the water environment.

37. No development shall, unless the Council first approves otherwise in writing, take place within each phase (phasing as shall have been approved under Condition 10) until details of earthworks for the relevant phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding land form, and the location and protection of tree pits against encroachment by hard landscaping and services (including mains supplies, foul and surface water drainage work, etc. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Supporting notes:
(a) In assessing any detail submitted the Council will have regard to any details already approved and how the proposal would relate to these.

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy ENV-B.1.1 New Development of the Hounslow UDP.

38. The construction of the site foundations shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority with consultation with the Environment Agency before the development commences.

To prevent pollution of groundwater.

39. Details at each phase shall be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA to
ensure that no soakaways shall be constructed such that they penetrate the water table, and they shall not in any event exceed 2.5 metres in depth below existing ground level.

To prevent pollution of groundwater.

40 A plan shall be submitted and approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority indicating the proposed compound location prior to commencement of works.

To safeguard the visual amenities of the area.

41 Details at each phase shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, before the development is commenced, for a scheme of on-site renewable energy generating at least 10% of the sites energy needs (power and heat). These details shall be carried out as approved.

To contribute to meeting London’s targets for the generation of renewable energy.

42. No fans, louvres, ducts or other external plant shall be installed without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority

To protect the visual amenities of the area.

43. Details of lux levels, direction and screening of any floodlighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the use hereby permitted commences and the building(s) are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the floodlighting in the interests of the visual amenity of the area in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

44. The development shall not be occupied until screen planting along boundaries have been planted in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the site and improve the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development.

45. No development above natural ground level shall take place until wind tunnel tests (including details of mitigation measures and the timetable for mitigation measures to be carried out) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and must be permanently retained in full working order thereafter.

To ensure that the impact of the development on the wind environment within and around the site is acceptable.

46. No development shall take place until a statement on the sourcing of materials to be used in the building, involving reuse, recycling and other sustainable sourcing of materials to be used in the construction and fitting out of the building wherever possible has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be carried out as approved.

To safeguard the visual amenities of the area.
47. No development shall take place until details of measures for the harvesting of rainwater, the minimisation of water run-off from the building and the conservation and reuse as appropriate of other water supplies in the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be carried out as approved.

_In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the details of the minimisation of water run-off in accordance with policy ENV.B.1.1 New development._

48. The use of each of the carparks shall not commence until details of the location, type and appearance of all the directional signage in the car parks for pedestrians (including disabled) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

“To ensure that pedestrians, can easily navigate their way around the car parks.”

Informatives

a) Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (e.g. watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld.

b) Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for dewatering from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse.

c) Thames Water would recommend that petrol/interceptors to be fitted in all carparking/washing facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use pf [petrol/oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourse.

d) S106 planning benefits: The application is subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

e) S106 restrictions on use: Further restrictions on use are set out in the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

f) S106 staging of development: The phasing of the development (order in which the parts shall be carried out) is also regulated in part by the Section 106 Legal Agreement.
Sustainable Development Committee
15 January 2006

Addendum Report of the Borough Planning Officer

This report contains additional information relating to agenda items not available at the time of publication of the main agenda.

Agenda Item 7 (Pages 36-98)
BSkyB, Centaurs Business Park, Harlequin Avenue, Brentford
00558/A/P25

1/ Statement from applicants:

"BSkyB have characterised their pre-application discussions and post submission negotiations through continuous amicable discussions with the council officers, who have provided useful and informative advice that has led to significant improvements in the content of the application.

In parallel, discussions have been held with various technical officers in the GLA in respect of renewable energy, travel plan, car parking, employment and design matters. We believe the entire process has been helpful to BSkyB and has resulted in an improved scheme for the benefit of both BSkyB and the local community.

Since September 2006, discussions commenced with the council officers on Section 106 matters. We have now agreed the transport and traffic issues with senior council officers and are working towards reaching agreement on the majority of the Heads of Terms, currently reviewing detailed drafts of the Agreement with solicitors. We are confident that we can soon proceed to a satisfactory conclusion. In summary, BSkyB are providing significant contributions, including the necessary highway and pedestrian improvements. The Agreement covers matters such as traffic management, transport, employment and support for local creative and media industries, as well as addressing environmental, access, safety and air quality monitoring issues.

We have, from the beginning of the process, been in discussion with Bonningtons and their transport consultants. Meetings have been held on a regular basis and our transport proposals have been developed in tandem with them.

As we embark on the next phase of growth we need to create new Studios and Broadcasting facilities. An application will be submitted for approval shortly, supporting our development over the next ten years. This planning application aims to regenerate BSkyB’s Osterley Campus and secure the Company’s continuing contribution to the wider community and we hope that these proposals demonstrate our aspiration to create a truly sustainable workplace for the future."

2/ Greater London Authority (GLA) report:

Further to paragraph 5.1.2 the Greater London Authority (GLA) has responded as follows:
Having considered the report, the Mayor has concluded that the application proposal will ensure both a consolidation and expansion of an important sub-regional employer that will benefit London’s world city role in terms of the creative industries. The proposal should provide a significant increase of high quality B1(b) floor space within the Great Western Road SEL and help secure a substantial broadcasting employer with currently 6,000 employees that has been operating within this sub-region for the last twenty years. It will secure some £450 millions of inward investment and thus allow the company to plan and provide for continual growth. The transport and energy benefits that have been negotiated should be secured by appropriate planning conditions and clauses within any proposed Section 106 agreement and be subject to formal consultation with the GLA (energy) and TfL (transport package- financial contribution and bus route enhancements and travel plan). The suggested employment and training factors/issues that the LDA has identified and recommended should also be incorporated within any approved Section 106 agreement.

The Mayor has also made clear that in view of the applicant’s stated global position in terms of sustainability he expects that the proposed energy strategy must deliver the promised 20% carbon savings.

The application represents EIA development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999. The Mayor has taken the environmental information made available to date into consideration in formulating his comments.

3/ Section 106 and conditions (refer Issue 6 of the agenda report)

NB Amendments from applicants shown in italics.

7.202 Measures needed for the development to go ahead

Phasing

A scheme to ensure that the proposed development is built and occupied by BSkyB and that freestanding speculative offices are not the final outcome. This will be controlled by both occupancy restrictions and parking levels.

NOT AGREED
This is not a personal permission.
Provisions included in s106 for notification of occupation of non-BSkyB companies (see below)

Traffic, Parking and Transport issues

Section 278 Works

1. Grant Way/Syon Lane junction – improvements required to accommodate growth in traffic movements. AGREED

2. Syon Lane south of A4 – conversion of zebra crossing by Syon Lane station to pelican to reduce extensive delays to traffic movement when large numbers of pedestrians dominate crossing. YES – in principle
but covered by £40,000 financial obligation

AGREED

4. Footway improvements on Syon Lane and Gillette Corner junction.
YES – in principle
but covered as part of lighting and footway contribution of £40,000.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures needed for the development to go ahead</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Original Table Agreed?</th>
<th>Addendum BSkyB Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to traffic management/CPZ if required</td>
<td>£180,000.00</td>
<td>With payback mechanism should the Gillette application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and any CPZ required as a result of that scheme overlap with any required as a result of this application.</td>
<td>In principle. NO Total contribution of £75,000 - but if not used for CPZ, monies can go towards H91 bus service improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study cost (£30,000) (£10,000 for 3 studies) &amp; Implementation cost, if required (£150,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transport (H91 bus service):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1.67 million (approximately) in joint payments in respect of:</td>
<td>Subject to negotiation</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Total contribution of £405,000 payable in 3 tranches (based on ‘stage 3 service provision’ as set out by Chris Calvi-Freeman with an equivalent contribution from Bonningtons).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) this application; (ii) the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda should it be approved and implemented; and (iii) financial contributions in respect of already approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scheme towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time.

**Amount in respect of this application to be advised** – with payback mechanism should the Gillette application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and some of the total £1.67 million (approximately) joint payments towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time be unused (unless otherwise committed to further improvement of the H91 service).

<p>| Routes towards Brentford Town Centre (along Canal) | £20,000.00 | Yes. | YES £20,000 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures directly related to the proposed development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and training:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer will appoint a representative to co-ordinate its training/employment activities in relation to the Agreement and liaise on its behalf with the Council’s appointed representative on all local economic matters relating to the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In principle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footway Improvements</th>
<th>£40,000</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>YES £40,000 (as part of the lighting and footway contribution)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There would be £100,000 in joint payments for footway improvements in the surrounding area should the Gillette application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| B Sky B to implement a comprehensive Green Travel Plan to achieve significant modal switch and to secure compliance with such Travel Plan by any occupational tenants, including targets and annual monitoring requirements, Car and cycle scheme. | Flows naturally from the development. | Have removed reference to car and cycle schemes. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Training:</th>
<th>Amount to be advised</th>
<th>In principle: amount to be agreed.</th>
<th>YES – in principle but through a financial contribution of £30,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Construction training providers (approved by the Council) will be given access to contractors on site (and their subcontractors) once contracts are let and during the construction phase of the project, with the object of promoting and finding work placements for local construction apprentices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerate Contractor Scheme:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Flows from development.</th>
<th>YES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job-Brokerage:</td>
<td>Amount to be advised</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>YES - in principle but through a financial contribution of £100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer will use reasonable endeavours to encourage the training and recruitment of local people into jobs provided by the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>In principle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sector specific support for local creative and media industries: | Amount to be advised | Yes | Yes - in principle but through a financial contribution of £30,000 |
| Support and encouragement for local production and other creative and media companies, through innovation and development of the creative and media industry supply chain network. | | In principle. | |
| **Support for local training and education in the creative and media sector:** | £100,000 over 5 years (£20,000 per annum, on commencement of works), | Yes. | **NO**
Covered by obligations above |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a programme of creative and media sector awareness, education, vocational training and work experience for 14 -19 year olds in Hounslow schools through Hounslow Education-Business Partnership (HEBP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Environmental improvements:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Great West Road**
Contribution towards a scheme of improvements to the Great West Road in the vicinity of the Developer, the scheme to be agreed between the Developer and the Council and Transport for London prior to commencement of works. | £100,000 over 5 years (£20,000 per annum, on commencement of works), | Yes. | **YES**
£100,000 |

| **Street Tree Planting**
Planting of street trees for the Harlequin Avenue frontage in addition to those proposed in the landscaping plan. | Contribution of £30,000.00 + maintenance costs | Yes. | **YES**
£45,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Off site screening</strong></th>
<th>Contribution of £30,000.00 + maintenance costs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>YES £45,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scheme of improvements within Boston Manor Park to provide additional screening from the rear of Boston Manor House and the Playing Fields, with the scheme to be agreed between the Developer and the Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Enhancement of listed building</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>YES £50,000 offered but amount to be agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Works to be undertaken to enhance the appearance of the Listed Building Centaurs Club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Enhanced external lighting</strong></th>
<th>Nil cost to Council.</th>
<th>Amount to be agreed.</th>
<th>YES – in principle as part of £40,000 lighting and footway contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>£85,000.00</td>
<td>In principle.</td>
<td>YES £85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The air quality impact of the redevelopment to be mitigated with a s.106 contribution with the money to be spent on projects related to the Air Quality Action Plan. This money would be for the purchase, installation, operation and maintenance of air quality monitoring equipment or provision of other assistance or support to enable LBH to implement any necessary monitoring or other actions in pursuit of an Air Quality Action Plan. Also contribute towards a lamppost mounted air quality monitor (NOx and PM10).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CCTV</strong></th>
<th>Nil cost to Council.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of CCTV cameras and infrastructure for the Syon Lane subway and publicly accessible/outdoor areas of the development together with monitoring and maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Access Ramp At Syon Lane Station</strong></th>
<th>£50,000.00</th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>YES £50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision on a ramp to Syon Lane Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Energy strategy | Flows naturally from the development: Obligation to do a joint energy study with Gillette if that proposal, detailed elsewhere on this agenda, is granted planning permission and implemented. | YES in principle
Not currently covered but wording could be inserted in agreement |

| Monitoring Costs | Amount to be agreed. | YES
Amount to be agreed |
References: P/2006/3652 and P/2006/3653 01286/H/P2 and 01286/H/CA2

Address: Chiswick Lodge, Chiswick Mall, Chiswick

Ward: Chiswick Homefields

Proposal: Planning application
Demolish existing buildings and erect a 4 storey terrace of 3 x 5-bed houses fronting Chiswick Mall with integral garages, a 4-storey terrace of 6 x 4-bed houses with integral garages adjacent to the garden of Norfolk House and a pair of 3-storey 3 bed semi-detached houses fronting Netheravon Road, with direct access from it. The main access to the central courtyard and integral garages will be from Netheravon Road.

Conservation Area Consent
To demolish the existing buildings

Drawing numbers: Drawing numbers. 4250/T(20)D01, 4250/T(20)EO1, 4250/T(20)EO2, 4250/T(20)EO3, 4250/T(20)EO4, 4250/T(20)EO5, 4250/T(20)EO6, 4250/T(20)EO7, 4250/T(20)E10, 4250/T(20)E12, 4250/T(20)E13, 4250/T(20)E14, 4250/T(20)E15, 4250/T(20)E16, 4250/T(20)E17, 4250/T(20)P-1, 4250/T(20)PO1, 4250/T(20)PO2, 4250/T(20)PO3, 4250/T(20)PO4, 4250/T(20)PO6 and 4250/T(20)P10  Design Statement, Conservation Statement, Sunlight and Daylight report and flood risk assessment received 17 November 2006 and drawing no 4250/T(20)P00A received 21.12.06

Application received: 17 November 2006

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 The site of Chiswick Lodge extends between Chiswick Mall and Netheravon Road. It is currently occupied by a 3-storey building most recently used as a day hospital but currently vacant. The proposal is to demolish the buildings and erect 11 houses. The site is within Old Chiswick Conservation Area.

1.2 A previous application on this site was refused under delegated powers in October 2006. This is an amended application, following the same layout, but reducing the scheme in scale to overcome concerns raised by members, officers and local residents. It is recommended that the scheme be approved, subject to the satisfactory completion of a s106 legal agreement

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Chiswick Lodge is located between the Great West Road (A4) and the River Thames with frontages to both Chiswick Mall to the south, directly looking over the Thames and Netheravon Road South to the north. Private residential dwellings bound the site to the east and west.
2.2 The site is L-shaped, as a separate plot on the Chiswick Mall frontage has been previously sold for the development of a private residence. It covers 0.23 hectares (0.26ha for density purposes).

2.3 Chiswick Lodge is a 3-storey building which extends over the depth of the site. The frontage onto Chiswick Mall is approximately 26.9m wide and to Netheravon Road South approximately 36.9m.

2.4 The existing building extends to a total floor area of approximately 2502 sq m on a gross internal area basis.

2.5 The southern façade to Chiswick Mall is a three-storey neo Georgian design of brick under a pitched roof with timber sash windows with a small garden area fronting onto Chiswick Mall. It is at a higher level than the road. Pevsner describes the building, overlooking the river, as the former Chiswick Maternity Hospital; 1912. It has been designed to “read” as a single, symmetrical large residence overlooking a semi-formal forecourt garden. The building has a traditionally classical hierarchy of windows in the centre bay, and with the sliding sash windows and appropriately coloured brickwork is plain and dominating but not un-neighbourly by virtue of the setback and softening of the planting in the foreground. The space is borrowed for overlooking by the side elevations of The Osiers, in particular, and St John’s, and has thus become an important feature in the street scene.

2.6 In the middle of the site the property provides ancillary offices at ground level and a conservatory with ward areas on the two floors above. At the northern end of the site there is a large three-storey block with brick elevations and a pitched roof. It is considered that this later element of the building does not benefit from the same standard of architectural design as the southern elevation. The majority of the rear of the building was constructed in the 1930’s.

2.7 Internally the building is functional, with small ward areas, individual rooms and associated offices. Floors and walls are mainly of solid construction and the resulting configuration is rather cellular. Internal ceiling heights are approximately 3m reflecting the purpose of the building as a hospital.

2.8 The site also includes an outbuilding for plant and parking/delivery areas. In the centre of the site abutting the western boundary there is a small area of garden.

2.9 There is an existing vehicle access off Netheravon Road South and pedestrian access from Chiswick Mall.

2.10 The site falls within Old Chiswick Conservation Area. The main setting of this part of the Conservation Area is listed buildings and long gardens. Along Chiswick Mall, eleven properties consecutively to the west, and five consecutively to the east are listed buildings. The only ones that are not listed in this complete run are Chiswick Lodge itself and its formerly associated plot “The Cottage”.

2.11 All except two are listed Grade II. Walpole House is Grade 1, and was the premier property of the area, most of the immediate neighbourhood having been part of its land. Stretches of the rear wall along Netheravon Road are part of this historical heritage. Strawberry House, next but one to the site, is listed at Grade II*. The gardens of both these properties are on English Heritage’s Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.
2.12 Historically the gardens of these properties backed onto Netheravon Road, which provided access and ancillary buildings for use of the river-fronting houses. Further west, some of these have been sub-divided from the major plots and have become separate curtilages. Even so, most of these have been designed to present the character of being mews or overgrown (but ancillary) coach-house buildings on the boundary, with garaging at ground floor. This has the value of ensuring a substantial area of open garden between the Mall-side buildings and those perching at the boundary with Netheravon Road.

2.13 The garden of Morton House runs along much of the western boundary of the site. Fronting Netheravon Road, this property has a single storey triple garage, with planning consent to erect a first storey.

2.14 St Johns is adjacent on the eastern boundary. Norfolk House is adjacent, and the garden along the eastern boundary of the application site belongs to Norfolk House.

2.15 The surrounding roads are included within a CPZ. Chiswick Mall floods on occasion, increasing pressure on on-street parking on Netheravon Road.

2.16 The M4 separates the area from the main body of Chiswick to the north. There is a pedestrian underpass giving pedestrian access to Netheravon Road to the north of the Great West Road.

3.0 HISTORY

3.1 The site was used as a hospital, and then most recently as a day hospital. In 2004, the Primary Care Trust made the decision to dispose of the site. The hospital was closed and the site auctioned.

3.2 In May 2005, a report recommending planning principles for the redevelopment of the site was submitted to Chiswick Area Planning Committee for comment. Members commented that

- Ideally the site should be returned to house and garden
- The Old Chiswick protection Society support the content of the report
- It is vital to retain the frontage
- The site is inappropriate for affordable housing
- Any proposal for housing should be low density
- There is no access from Chiswick Mall
- The preferred use remains health provision

3.3 The planning principles were made available to prospective purchasers of the site.

3.4 A planning application was received in July 2006 for 13 dwellings on the site. Objections were received from residents and members of Chiswick Area Planning Committee had concerns over the proposals. Amendments from the applicants did not overcome these concerns and the application was refused under delegated powers in October 2006 for the following reasons.
Refusal, for the following reasons

1. The proposed houses, by reason of their design, bulk and siting are considered to be an over dominant feature on this low lying garden area, likely to damage existing walls and trees that are an accepted feature of the area, contrary to policy ENV-B 1.1, ENV-B 2.2 and ENV-B 2.5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2. The design, massing and siting of the proposed houses are not considered to preserve or enhance Chiswick House Conservation Area, contrary to policy ENV-B 2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan.

3. The design and positioning of windows, balconies and terraces results in an intrusive form of development, resulting in a loss of amenity for residents within and outside the site, through increased noise and disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy, contrary to policy ENV-B 1.1 and H 4.1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4. The amount of housing on the site is considered to be excessive, leading to unneighbourly relationships with other houses within the site, and adjoining houses, contrary to policies H 4.1 and H 4.2 and ENV-B 1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Conservation Area Consent

1. The proposed demolition of the three storey disused hospital buildings would detract from the character and appearance of the Old Chiswick Conservation Area in the absence of an approved scheme for the sites' redevelopment, and it is thus contrary to Policy ENV-B 2.2.

4.0 DETAILS

4.1 The proposal is to develop a terrace of houses fronting Chiswick Mall, with a mews style development at the rear, with access off Netheravon Road.

4.2 The terrace fronting Chiswick Mall (houses 1-3) will be 4 storeys in height (14.2m), with the 3rd floor in the roof being set back 2m from the main elevation and 1m from the rear elevation, allowing a terrace to be created at roof level overlooking the river. Each of these houses will have a double garage at ground floor level, accessed from Netheravon Road. Bedroom 4 / study will also be on the ground floor. The 1st floor will comprise the kitchen and living room, and will have an elevated patio area to the rear. The second floor will have 3 bedrooms, with the 5th bedroom on the 3rd floor with a front terrace. Each house will have a basement with a gym, sauna and laundry room. The main elevations will be in brick, with copper panels on the roof. Two of the houses will have a rear patio area of 49m2. The house next to St Johns would have a reduced size patio of 20m2, set in 4.5m from St Johns and angled between 2 and 5m from the proposed terrace of houses at the rear.

4.3 A four storey terrace 11.6m high comprising 6 x 4-bed houses is proposed at the rear of this main terrace, at 90 degrees to it, similar to the existing building layout (houses 4-9). The houses would each have a 3 storey half width rear extension 3.5m deep. This would be 4.5m from the boundary with Norfolk House, and the main wall of the building would be set in by 8m. These houses would have an integral garage and kitchen on the ground floor, living room, one bedroom and bathroom on the first floor, 2 bedrooms with integral bathrooms on the second floor and a fourth bedroom with integral bathroom at the rear on the 3rd floor. Side windows of the rear extensions would be angled and offset to prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties. The windows to the rear, fronting Norfolk House, would be stencilled, and have a deep sill, to prevent overlooking of Norfolk House.
The ground floor would be brick, and the first and second floor rendered. The roof would be copper plated. It would be set in 0.5m front and rear, and each house would have a small balcony 1.0m deep overlooking the mews. Each house would have a rear garden area, and an area at the front for landscaping, and parking for one car. 5 of the houses would have rear garden areas of 36m2, and the end house closest to Netheravon Road would have a rear and side garden of 50m2.

4.4 A pair of three storey (9m high) 3-bed houses are proposed on the western side of the site, on the border with Morton House (houses 10 and 11). These two houses have an off street parking area with 4 spaces to the rear. Each of these houses would have a private rear garden of 50m2. They have a study and kitchen / dining room on the ground floor, a bedroom and living room on the first floor and 2 bedrooms on the second floor. They would all have a 1.0m deep balcony from the 2nd storey / roof. The elevations would be brick on the ground floor, rendered on the first floor, and the roof copper plated.

4.5 Planting is proposed around this parking area, on the boundaries with Morton House and The Cottage.

4.6 A site area of 0.26ha is used to calculate density. The UDP states that kitchens with an area greater than 11m2 count as habitable rooms, and any rooms greater than 20m2 capable of sub division count as 2 habitable rooms. On this basis, it is calculated that the development would create 76 habitable rooms, giving a density of 292 habitable rooms per hectare. In this development a number of rooms are large. If the calculation was made on actual number of habitable rooms (irrespective of size), there are 70 habitable rooms, giving a density of 269 habitable rooms per hectare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Habitable rooms for density purposes</th>
<th>Habitable rooms</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front terrace (1-3)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 x 7</td>
<td>3 x 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace of 6 (4-9)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5x 5</td>
<td>6 x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair of semis (10 and 11)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 x 6</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 House no 9, the end terrace house closest to Netheravon Road is designed to be wheelchair accessible, and has a ground floor bathroom.

4.8 The main access from Netheravon Road would be paved. Trees are proposed to be planted within the development, and in particular, a large tree is proposed on the boundary with Morton House.

4.8 To demolish the existing buildings on site, Conservation Area consent has been sought.
5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Over 30 neighbouring residents were notified in October 2006. Press and site notices were also posted. Two responses have been received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern over noise reaching the gardens of Chiswick Mall properties from the removal of the existing building</td>
<td>The replacement buildings and planting are set further forward than the existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amended scheme has addressed the concerns expressed over the previous scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 English Heritage state “On balance the existing fabric is expendable, and the proposed riverside replacement seems to replicate the height and mass of the existing. The quality of the materials for this development must be of the highest order, so as to enhance the historic character of the locality. The reduction in the volume of the proposals sounds welcome, as the setting of the listed gardens of Strawberry House is one of our primary concerns”

5.3 The Old Chiswick Protection Society have written say that the scheme is an improvement on the former design and they are in favour of its approval by the Planning Committee

5.4 The Director of Children’s Services and Lifelong Learning states that there should be a financial contribution of £42000 for 6 primary school places and £36000 for 4 secondary school places.

5.5 The application is being presented to Chiswick Area Planning Committee on 10 January 2007 and the views expressed by members will be reported to this meeting.

6.0 POLICY

6.1 The London Plan and Unitary Development Plan together are constituents of the development plan. The London Plan was adopted in February 2004 and has been the development plan for London since September 2004. The Unitary Development Plan was adopted in December 2003. The London Plan is the strategic plan setting out an integrated social, economic and environmental framework for the future development of London. The Unitary Development Plan has greater relevance for local borough wide issues. If to any extent a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document adopted, approved or published (para 37 (5) the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill: Part 3 Development Plans

6.2 Relevant London Plan policies are

- Policy 3A.1 Increasing London’s supply of housing
- Policy 3A.4 Housing Choice
- Policy 4B.3 Maximising the potential of sites
- Policy 4B.7 Respect local context and communities
- Policy 4B.10 London’s Built Heritage
- Policy 4C 10 Historic Environment
- Policy 4C.11 Conservation Areas
6.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan includes “Accessible London: achieving an Inclusive Environment” and “Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2006). Draft SPG “Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation” was issued for consultation purposes in October 2006.

6.3 The Unitary Development Plan is the statutory plan for London Borough of Hounslow. It was adopted in December 2003. Relevant policies are

- ENV-B 1.1 All New Development
- ENV-B 1.8 Access and Facilities for People with Disabilities
- ENV-B.1.9. Safety and security
- ENV-B 2.2 Conservation Areas
- ENV-B 3.2 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- ENV-P.1.1 Environmental Sustainability: Environmental Impact Statements and Sustainability Checklist
- ENV-W.1.1 Design in the Thames Policy Area
- ENV-W.1.3 Important Views and Structures in the Thames Policy Area
- ENV-W 1.4 Archaeology of the Thames Policy Area
- H.2.1 Affordable Housing
- H 4.1 Housing Standards and Guidelines
- H 4.2 Residential density
- H 4.4 Provision for Children’s Play in Housing Development
- H 5.1 Housing for People With Disabilities
- C.3.3 Changes of Use of Health Facilities
- T 1.4 Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments
- T.2.2 Pedestrian safety and security
- T.4.3 Traffic implications of new developments
- T.4.4 Road safety
- IMP 6.1 Planning Obligations
- IMP.5.1 High quality building and urban design
- IMP.1.2 The reuse and recycling of urban land and buildings

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance
Old Chiswick Conservation Area 1997
Conservation Area appraisals adopted by Sustainable Development Committee 21 March 2006
Residential Standards and Controls (LBH February 1997)

7.0 PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 The main issues in the determination of this application are
- the principle of residential on the site and the loss of a health facility
- Bulk, scale and massing and the appearance in the Conservation Area
- Quality of the proposed accommodation
- Impact on adjoining residents and the area as a whole
- Traffic, parking and access
7.2 The scheme has been substantially amended to overcome the issues previously raised by surrounding residents. The proposal has reduced from 13 houses to 11 houses. The pair of semi-detached houses overlooking The Cottage and on the boundary with Morton House have been removed. The terrace of 6 houses has been further removed from St Johns and Norfolk House, the rear patio to this terrace has been removed so that it is further from the boundary with St Johns and Norfolk House and 1st floor balconies to houses 1-3 have been removed.

**Principle of residential**

7.2 The site is located in a Chiswick Mall, a residential area. PPS 3 Housing, the London Plan and the Council’s Unitary Development Plan all encourage more efficient use of land in order to provide sustainable communities and meet housing needs in the local area.

7.3 The London Plan seeks to promote the objectives of the NHS Plan, Local Delivery Plans and the organization and delivery of health care within the boroughs. Unitary Development Plan Policy C 3.3 states that the loss of buildings for health use will not normally be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that all relevant local and area needs can be satisfactorily met. On sites and buildings which are surplus to the health authority requirements, future use should be consistent with the character of the locality. Chiswick Lodge has been disposed of, and the receipts from the sale of the land have been used for the provision of health facilities elsewhere in the borough. Housing is an appropriate alternative use in this location as it is compatible with the surrounding residential use.

7.4 Policy H 1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that new housing should be located in accordance with the Council’s framework for sustainable development and regeneration. When considering new housing proposals, the Council will seek to promote sustainable patterns of development and allow for new housing provided it is consistent with all other policies in the Unitary Development Plan, and can be achieved within a high quality environment for new and existing residents. The site is previously developed land within a residential area, and the principle of residential development is acceptable here.

7.5 Policy H 2.1 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks that on all sites capable of providing more than 20 homes, provision for on-site affordable housing should be made. 11 homes are proposed to be provided on the site, so no affordable housing is provided.

7.6 11 houses are proposed on site, with a density of 292 hrpha. Density is a tool to be used to assess the harm of a proposal. Table 4B.1 of the London Plan sets appropriate densities to be achieved. For sites such as the application site where it is within 10 minutes walk of a town centre location and has moderate car parking provision, proposals for terraced houses and flats should be within a density of 200-450 hrpha, ensuring it is compatible with local context. Council’s policy H 4.2 states that new developments should not exceed 250 hrpha except in locations where it is within a town centre location with good public transport accessibility. PPS 3 and the London Plan both encourage more efficient use of land in order to provide sustainable communities and to meet local housing needs. This site is located within 10 minutes walk of a town centre with public transport links, with a density of 292 hrpha. It is greater than the maximum density outlined in the Unitary Development Plan, but falls within the density matrix of the London Plan. The dwellings would provide large family accommodation, for which there is an acknowledged need as shown in the Annual Monitoring Report 2006 and the Housing investment Programme 2003.
Bulk, scale and massing and the appearance in the Conservation Area

7.7 Policy ENV-B 1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks that new proposals make a positive contribution to the overall environmental quality. New development should relate well to the site, and to the scale, nature, height, massing, character and use of the adjacent townscape. The existing building dominates the rear garden areas and Netheravon Road frontage at present. The proposal is for 2 terraces of houses and a pair of semi detached houses to be set around a central access to create a mews development on a similar layout and massing to the existing buildings. The applicants state that the proposed development will not be an increase in height over the existing development. The existing building has three floors, but the two terraces proposed would have four floors, at a lower overall height. This would be achieved by having lower floor to ceiling heights, to reflect the proposed residential use of the site, rather than the existing high ceilinged hospital use. The additional floors are be created by reducing internal floor to ceiling heights.

7.8 The site is located within Old Chiswick Conservation Area. The proposed design and appearance is considered to be appropriate to ensure that it relates to the heights of the existing and surrounding buildings and works within the existing streetscene. The proposed appearance is intended to provide interesting modern housing which follows the existing forms within the context of the area.

7.9 New planting is proposed within the site. Care needs to be taken that the planting is set in from the boundaries of the listed buildings of Morton House and Norfolk House, to protect the existing boundary walls. The cherry tree on the boundary with St Johns and Norfolk House has been protected by a TPO to protect residential amenity, and this should be retained. The relocation of the terrace 4-9 further north than in the last application should help to protect this tree.

7.10 Conservation Area consent is required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site. English Heritage have stated that “the existing fabric of the building is expendable, and the proposed riverside replacement seems to replicate the height and mass of the existing. The quality of the materials for this development must be of the highest order, so as to enhance the historic character of the locality. The reduction in the volume of the proposals sounds welcome, as the setting of the listed gardens of Strawberry House is one of our primary concerns”.

Quality of the proposed accommodation

7.10 Room sizes within the development are generous. 11 good sized family houses would be created. Supplementary Planning Guidance for amenity space sets minimum standards for suitable and usable provision. In accordance with this guidance, each house should have 75m2 private amenity space. None of the 11 houses has this amount of private amenity space, although all do have either private garden areas, or extended rear terraces (houses 1-3). Some balconies are provided to give additional open seating areas. However, with the amount of development proposed on the site, and the constraints of the existing site it is difficult to provide any further amenity space on site. Given these constraints, the additional provision of balconies to some of the houses, the close proximity of the amenity of the river Thames and the fact that the southern part of Homefield Recreation Ground is within a 5 minute walk of the site, it is considered appropriate that a financial contribution to improvements to nearby public amenity space are made to offset this shortfall.
House 9 is proposed to be made accessible for people in wheelchairs, in accordance with Unitary Development Plan and London Plan policy, and London Plan SPG. It will have a ground floor bathroom, and all the ground floor will be of adequate size and layout for turning space for wheelchair accommodation.

Impact on adjoining residents and the area as a whole

Policy ENV-B 1.1 seeks that adequate daylight and sunlight reaches adjoining properties and minimises any detrimental impact on adjoining properties. The height of the buildings proposed will be less than the existing building, which has stood for over 70 years. The terrace of houses 4-9 will be set 8.5m away from the front terrace of houses 1-3, creating a gap through which daylight and sunlight can penetrate, which will be an improvement over the existing single building.

The existing building has windows that overlook gardens to the east and west of the site, albeit that these windows are to hospital bedrooms. The applicants have considered this in the design and layout of the proposed development. There will be no windows on the western elevations of the semi-detached houses on the boundaries with Morton House. The windows fronting the gardens of Norfolk House and St Johns are proposed to be etched, to prevent direct overlooking of these garden areas. There will be no direct overlooking of existing habitable rooms of neighbouring properties.

First floor terraces are proposed at the rear of houses 1-3. The terrace to house no 1 will be set in 4.5m from the boundary with St Johns, to prevent any overlooking of this property, and also to reduce any potential overlooking to the garden of proposed house no 4.

The development will follow the positioning of the existing development, mainly on a north/south axis. It is not considered that the proposal would result in any additional loss of light or overshadowing than is experienced from the existing building.

Traffic, parking and access

The Council’s Unitary Development Plan states that this type of development generates a maximum requirement of 2 car parking spaces plus 10% visitor spaces per dwelling. All 11 houses would have 2 parking spaces. The development would thus be deficient in 2 visitor parking spaces according to the UDP. The parking standards are a maximum. The surrounding streets are covered by a Controlled Parking Zone. The area is linked by a pedestrian underpass to the northern side of Chiswick, and it is about a 10-minute walk to the buses of Chiswick High Road, and 15 minutes to the nearest underground station. It is considered reasonable to seek a financial contribution for improvements to the pedestrian environment to encourage use of public transport facilities on the northern side of the A4. The surrounding Controlled Parking Zone is under pressure from existing permit holders, especially in times of flooding on Chiswick Mall. However, each house has 2 parking spaces, in accordance with Unitary Development Plan standards, which are a maximum. The development has no on-site visitor parking spaces, although in the surrounding CPZ there are pay and display parking spaces.

Sustainability

The development will be built on previously developed land. The planting around the site, and provision of private garden areas will increase the amount of vegetation on the site, creating an additional habitat for insects and birds. Cycle storage is provided in all houses, and a financial contribution is offered to improve pedestrian access to public transport facilities on the northern side of the A4, accessed through the underpass. The design of the houses is such that large windows have been designed into the buildings to maximise solar gain.
8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

8.1 One of the houses (no 9) is proposed to be provided to wheelchair standards, An access way through the site, from Netheravon Road to Chiswick Mall is proposed.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The scheme accords with sustainability principles, providing residential development on urban land. The PCT have already determined that the site is surplus to their requirements and have disposed of it. There have subsequently been improvements to other health facilities in the Chiswick area, including an extension to Clifton Gardens. Redevelopment of the site would improve the visual appearance of the site, whilst encouraging more efficient use of the land. The proposal is considered to achieve a high quality development that complies with Council policies while maintaining the living conditions of the nearby residents.

9.2 The scheme overcomes the issues previously raised by surrounding residents. 1st floor balconies to the front terrace have been removed, the rear patio to this terrace has been removed so that it is further from the boundary with St Johns and Norfolk House, the terrace of 6 houses has been further removed from St Johns and Norfolk House, and the pair of semi-detached houses overlooking The Cottage and on the boundary with Morton House have been removed.

10.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

10.1 UDP Policy IMP.6.1 seeks planning obligations to secure planning benefits related to the proposed development.

10.2 The main areas for inclusion into a S106 agreement are:

- There is a deficiency of on-site amenity space proposed on site, so it is proposed to offset this with a financial contribution of £9000 towards improvements to local open space in the vicinity of the site, in accordance with policies ENV-B.1.1 and H.4.1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- A financial contribution of £50000 is proposed for environmental improvements in the Conservation Area, including lighting, planting and pedestrian improvements and measures to improve pedestrian safety within the vicinity of the site, including improved access through the underpass under the M4.

- Developments proposing ten dwellings or more are likely to increase the demand for educational facilities within the Borough, especially given that this proposed development provides 11 units of 3 beds and more. A financial contribution of £78 000 is agreed.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That subject to the satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, the Director of Planning be authorised to issue planning permission for the development, subject to the following conditions and reasons.

Reason for Approval

11.2 Subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions this application to erect 11 houses represents an acceptable form of development. It would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area and would not be harmful to neighbours' living conditions or highway safety. On balance, the development is in accordance with Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas), ENV-B.2.5 (Development affecting the setting of a Listed Building), ENV-B.1.8 (Access & Facilities for People with Disabilities), H.4.1 (Housing Standards & Guidelines), H 4.2 (Residential Density) and T1.4 (Car & Cycle parking) of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.
Conditions:

1. A1A  
   Time limits - 3 years

2. B4  
   Materials

3. B5  
   Strictly in accordance with plans

4. C23  
   No external plant

5. C29  
   Hours of construction (Mon-Fri 08.00-18.00, Saturday 9.00-13.00, not at all on Sundays, Bank & Public Holidays)

6. C34  
   Illumination, mud & dust on construction sites

7. D1  
   Obscure Glazing (east and west)

8. D2  
   No additional windows within the development

9. D4  
   Waste and recycled materials Storage

10. D5  
    Waste and recycled materials (implementation)

11. D9  
    Soundproofing-External Noise

12. E1  
    Landscaping design proposals

13. E2  
    Landscaping (implementation)

14. E5  
    Boundary Treatment

15. E12  
    Location of trees on or adjacent to development sites

16. E14  
    Provision for Tree Planting

17. E15  
    Provision for Tree Planting

18. E16  
    Existing Trees that are to be retained

19. F6  
    Sightlines

20. G1  
    Parking

21. G3  
    Parking

Conservation Area Consent

1. There is a recommendation for approval for planning permission relating to the redevelopment of the site, so the demolition of the existing building would meet the criteria set out in policy ENV-B.2.2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan 2003.

   1. A1 (a)  
      The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission
      REASON: To accord with the provisions of section 92(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act

   2. Non-SDT  
      The existing building on the site shall not be demolished until details of the building contract for the construction of the houses that has a valid planning permission has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
      REASON: To preserve and enhance the Conservation Area
1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 This application is a resubmission following the dismissal at appeal, after a Public Inquiry, of an almost identical proposal. The single reason given by the Inspector for dismissing the appeal came down to the way in which the applicant had intended to implement the proposed Unilateral Agreement to provide affordable housing. It would have precluded the provision of any rented accommodation, contrary to policy H.2.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

1.2 The applicant has now revised this position and re-submitted the application. A number of changes are included, such as, the increase in number of 2 and 3 bed flats, by seven each, the clearly defined defensible space around ground floor units and the provision of suitable disabled parking spaces.

1.3 A Unilateral Undertaking is expected but has yet to be received from the applicant as of 2 January 2007.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site contains an existing engineering workshop with ancillary parking. It is bound to the north by the Longford River, to the east by Feltham Leisure Parks (FLP), to the south by Victoria Road and to the west by The Victoria Junior School. Victoria Road itself is largely residential in character with a relatively new block of affordable flats on the other side of the road from the application site. South of Victoria Road the characteristic use is industrial, while to the east, and adjoining the application site, the character is dominated by the FLP with its extensive areas of car parking.

2.2 The application site is close to Feltham High Street, the new Feltham town centre development and Feltham Station. Because of this Victoria Road acts as a link between the town centre and the FLP.
3.0 HISTORY
Victoria Works, Victoria Road, Feltham.

3.1 01253/D/P1 Erection of extension to offices.
     Granted 06/10/1970.

3.2 01253/P/P1 Demolition of existing buildings and erection of part four/part five storey
     building comprising of 73 affordable housing units and 36 associated parking
     spaces, landscaping and access
     Refused 1 March 2006.

1. Reasons: The proposed development would involve the loss of an existing
   employment use that is located within a site that has been identified within
   the local development plan for mixed development with employment uses
   in this particular part of the site. The Council is not satisfied that this loss is
   justified. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies E.1.5
   (Loss of employment uses) and H.3.5 (Release of employment uses to
   residential) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan
   (Adopted 2003).

2. The proposed development exceeds the Council’s density standards and,
   thereby, fails to include adequate outside amenity space, adequate
   facilities for people with disabilities, and adequate parking and servicing
   facilities. Its design would also result in a poor level of safety and security
   for occupants. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies
   H.4.2 (Residential density), H.4.1 (Housing standards and guidelines),
   H.5.1 (Housing for people with disabilities), T.4.1 (Car and cycle parking),
   ENV-B.1.9 (Safety and security) of the London Borough of Hounslow
   Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2003) and Supplementary Planning

3. The proposed development, due to the substandard room sizes, entirely
   north facing flats, lack of wheelchair accessible housing and lack of
   information with respect to Lifetime Homes Standards and would not
   provide a suitable quality of housing and would be contrary to policies
   H.4.1 (Housing standards and guidelines) and H.5.1 (Housing for people
   with disabilities) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development
   Plan (Adopted 2003) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 1997.

4. The proposed development would give rise to the potential for the
   inappropriate overlooking of the adjoining Victoria School contrary to policy
   ENV-B.1.1 (New development) of the London Borough of Hounslow
   Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2003).

5. It is considered that the proposed building bulk would have an overbearing
   and oppressive effect on land and premises to the north including the
   Longford River. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy ENV-
   B.1.1 (New development) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary
   Development Plan (Adopted 2003).

This decision was appealed against but was dismissed by the Planning
Inspectorate at a Public Inquiry on 19 October 2006.

Reasons for dismissal: The Unilateral Undertaking was deemed to be
deficient, as the affordable housing units would have precluded the provision
of any rented units.
4.0 DETAILS

4.1 The previous appeal

4.2 The Council originally refused the application on 5 grounds: loss of employment land; density; standard of accommodation; overlooking of Victoria School; and bulk. On appeal, following Counsel’s advice in preparation for the public inquiry and the submission of further material by the appellant, the first four reasons for refusal were not pursued. This ‘further material’ included convincing evidence that the reuse, or economic redevelopment of the site for employment purposes would be unlikely. The Council submitted the following position statement following receipt of comments from the West Area Committee and consultation with the chair of the Sustainable Development Committee:

4.3 Further to the Council’s letter dated 24 July 2006 withdrawing reason for refusal one following further evidence provided by the appellant, on the basis of further material now provided by the appellant, the Council is satisfied that reasons for refusal two, three and four can be dealt with by condition. The Council will therefore no longer be pursuing these reasons for refusal.

4.4 Although the Council still considers the proposed development to be too bulky, in consideration of the Council’s withdrawal of the first four reasons for refusal and the benefits of the affordable housing to be provided by the proposed development which outweigh the harm caused, the Council recommends that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and a deed of planning obligation to secure affordable housing.

4.5 The Inspector agreed with the Council that the Unilateral Undertaking submitted by the appellant in support of their appeal was deficient with specific respect to securing affordable housing. The fundamental concern of both the Council and the Inspector was the fact that the Unilateral Undertaking precluded the provision of any rented units, which would therefore mean that the development would fail to meet the greatest need, contrary to UDP policy which says the Council will seek a mix of housing types for affordable housing having regard to the needs of local households in greatest need. The Inspector noted that the Council were led to believe that what would be provided would be 33 apartments for rent and 40 in shared ownership although this was not reflected in the proposed Unilateral Undertaking at the Inquiry. The Inspector therefore concluded that the Council’s request to amend the covenant to deliver this tenure mix was not unreasonable.

4.6 The Inspector concluded that, in the absence of rented units, the proposed development should not be permitted as it would be in direct conflict with the relevant UDP the London Plan and the Council’s Affordable Housing SPG.

4.7 The appellant’s failure to provide a Unilateral Undertaking securing the required rented units was the only reason the appeal was dismissed.

4.8 With regard to the suggested conditions, the Inspector found that the development would not impact adversely on highway safety, therefore there is no policy conflict and no condition is suggested.

4.9 The Inspector also considered the ecology implications of the proposed development and concluded that subject to a planning condition restricting quantum and lux level of external lighting, he was satisfied that the development would not cause any undue harm.

4.10 Despite the Inspector’s favorable decision on the highways and ecology issues, his finding on the failing of the Unilateral Undertaking led to an overall decision that the appeal should be dismissed.
4.11 The differences between the previous and current applications
4.12 Previously 10 one-bed flats, 52 two-bed flats and 11 three-bed flats were proposed. The main change from the previous refusal concerns the breakdown of two and three bed units. There would be a decrease of 7 two-bed flats and an increase of 7 three-bed flats. In total there would be 10 one-bed flats, 45 two-bed flats and 18 three-bed flats.

4.13 There are also relatively minor changes to the design of the development. Because of the improved housing mix the position of one of the entrances has been changed to a better location on the south facing elevation; there is also more defensible space outside windows and a design change at the top floor level. These changes are small but they all improve the scheme overall.

4.14 Affordable housing provision
4.15 The developer has now proposed rented accommodation as part of the housing mix. This application provides 100% affordable housing on the site, with Places for People, a developing Registered Social Landlord (RSL) in the borough, leading on the scheme. The Local Authority’s Housing section are supportive of this site providing 100% Affordable Housing. The initial view is that the scheme proposes a good mix of units, for this site, with 25% of the units as 3 bed units. The current application does not provide details of the tenure split that will be achieved on this site but negotiations are taking place with Places for People to ensure that a sustainable mix of tenure types is delivered on the site and this mix is secured in the S106. An appropriate level of wheelchair accessible units will also be provided.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS
5.1 213 neighbouring properties were consulted on 28 November 2006. Two site notices were posted on Friday 1 December 2006 and two press notices were posted on 14 December 2006. One objection has been received as of 14 December 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a problem with parking in the area and 36 spaces are not sufficient for 73 flats.</td>
<td>The Inspector reasoned in his report covering the appeal for the previous application that ‘In this case it is likely that the remedy to the existing problem lies in enforcement of the parking restrictions and there is no case for increasing levels of parking on the appeal site, which would increase dependence upon the private car in what is a highly sustainable location’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other bodies consulted
5.2 The Environment Agency, The Royal Parks Agency and the Primary Care Trust were consulted but no responses had been received from these bodies as of 22nd December 2006.

5.3 Feltham Police have no objection to the proposal. BAA have no objection subject to the recommended condition 25.
6.0 POLICY

6.1 Unitary Development Plan

| IMP.2.1a | Regeneration and enhancement of town centres |
| IMP.2.3 | Regeneration of Feltham town centre |
| ENV-N.1.11 | Protection and improvement of local open space |
| ENV-N.2.2 | Sites of regional/local nature conservation |

Table ENV-N.2: Nature conservation sites in the London Borough of Hounslow

| ENV-B.1.1 | New development |
| ENV-B.2.2 | Conservation areas |
| ENV-B.1.9 | Safety and security |
| E.1.2 | Employment location |
| E.1.5 | Loss of employment uses |
| H.1.1 | Location of new housing |
| H.2.1 | Affordable housing |
| H.3.5 | Release of employment land to housing |
| H.4.1 | Housing standards and guidelines |
| H.4.2 | Residential density |
| H.5.1 | Housing for people with disabilities |
| T.1.4 | Car and cycle parking |
| T.4.4 | Road Safety |

Proposals Schedule: M1

6.2 London Plan

| 3A.4 | Housing standards |
| 3B.4 | Mixed use development |

7.0 PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 The main planning issues to consider are:

- The principle of the development.
- Accommodation standards.
- The impact on neighbouring amenity.

7.2 The principle of the development

7.3 The principle of the development was established at the Public Inquiry in relation to the previous submission, subject to the provision of rented accommodation within the affordable housing mix. Following the dismissal at appeal the applicants have now amended their approach to the Unilateral Undertaking, in consultation with Housing and Legal officers, to include rented accommodation and therefore overcome the single reason for refusal, as concluded by the Inspector.

7.4 The establishment of the principle of this proposal being acceptable took place against a background of UDP policy, in particular the location of the site within Mixed Use Development site (M1) and London Plan policies, in particular in respect of density. The Public Inquiry inspector was “not convinced that the development would detract from the character or appearance of the environs of the site”, and was satisfied that the “scale and density of the scheme is acceptable in this highly sustainable urban location.”
7.5 **Accommodation standards**

7.6 The proposal is mainly for two-bedroom flats (45) with some one-bedroom (10) and some three-bedroom (18). The room sizes accord with Council standards set out in SPG 1997 and there would be no internal overlooking.

7.7 There is a concern that the proposed garden layout along the northern and eastern boundaries would result in overlooking due to the position of a number of habitable room windows on the ground floor. This can be covered by condition.

7.8 **The impact on neighbouring amenity**

7.9 The lack of a turning circle for service vehicles within the site could bring refuse vehicles into conflict with traffic using Victoria Road, particularly school traffic making morning drop-offs. This would be contrary to policy T.4.4 for safety reasons. This is a matter of detailed design and can be covered by condition.

7.10 The proposal would require ten 1100 litre euro bins for refuse. For recycling at least 3 sets of estate frames are required. The amenities of neighbouring properties could be reduced due to littering if the correct refuse and recycling facilities are not included. The developer has been informed of the requirements and asked to confirm compliance. This matter can also be covered by condition.

8.0 **EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 The proposed housing meets lifetime homes standards and is therefore acceptable in this respect.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The only significant change between this scheme and that considered on appeal is that this proposal secures a much better position with respect to affordable housing. This is the issue that the appeal inspector saw as the only reason to dismiss the appeal. This revised scheme is therefore recommended for approval.

10.0 **PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

10.1 UDP policy IMP.6.1 states that the Council will seek to ensure that a developer enters into a planning obligation to secure planning related benefits related to the development. Planning decisions impact on the local area and it is important when assessing a planning application to examine the consequences of a proposal on the locality and what the impact of a development will be. Where these consequences can be mitigated by off-site measures, planning obligations may be appropriate. Therefore, if approval were to be considered, it would be appropriate to secure the following measure by a S106 legal agreement:

- The provision of 100% affordable housing to include a specified amount of housing to rent.

Details of the agreed Unilateral Undertaking will be reported in an addendum report to Committee.
11.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

Reasons:
Subject to the appropriate safeguarding conditions the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a part four/part five-storey building comprising of 73 affordable housing units with 35 associated parking spaces, landscaping and access to the site, because of its position, design and appearance, would be acceptable and complementary to the visual amenity of the locality, and would not be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining and neighbouring properties. The development is in accordance with policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-B.1.8 (Access and facilities for people with disabilities), ENV-B.1.9 (Safety and security), ENV-W.2.3 (Other waterways), ENV-P.1.3 (Surface water run-off), ENV-P.1.4 (Waste water management), E.1.5 (Development involving loss of or changes in employment uses), H.1.1 (Location of new housing development), H.2.1 (Affordable housing), H.3.5 (Release of employment uses to residential), H.4.1 (Housing standards and guidelines), H.4.2 (Residential density), T.1.2 (The movement implications of development), T.1.4 (Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments) and T.4.6 (Off-street parking) of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

Conditions:
1  A1a (Time limit)  A1R
2  B5 (Detailed applications)  B5R
3  B4 (Materials to match samples)  B4R
4  Before commencement of operations, a method scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority detailing the routes and types of construction traffic. The scheme shall be followed for the duration of the construction process.  

To ensure that the construction does not detrimentally impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties or road users.
6  J11 (Landfill)  J11R
7  C23 (No external plant)  C23R
8  C29 (Hours of construction) Insert ‘8am to 5pm’ and ‘9am to 1pm’  C29R
9  C34 (Illumination, mud and dust on construction sites)  C34R
10 The use hereby permitted shall not be begun until details of the arrangements for storing of waste and recycled materials have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The arrangements for storing waste and recycled materials shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any approval given and shall be completed before any part of the accommodation hereby permitted is occupied.  D4R
11  E1 (Landscape design proposals)  E1R
12  E2 (Landscape works implementation)  E2R
13 E5 (Boundary Treatment)  
14 E6 (Landscape management plan)  
15 G7 (Parking – Maintained, Buildings) Insert “VW22/PL500LP”  
16 Details of external lighting, to include lux levels, direction and screening, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the use hereby permitted commences. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
17 The construction of the site drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority before the development commences. To prevent pollution of the water environment.  
18 J10 (Contaminated Land Site Investigation)  
19 No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated ground. To prevent pollution of groundwater.  
20 The construction of the site foundations shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences. To prevent pollution of groundwater.  
21 The windows for all bathrooms and toilets shall be obscure glazed, hinged to open inwards and shall not be repaired or replaced otherwise than with obscured glazing. To prevent overlooking of the nearby residents.  
22 Before commencement of operations, a detailed plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming that ground floor windows facing garden areas do not create overlooking. To prevent overlooking of the nearby residents.  
23 Before commencement of operations, a plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority indicating how an 8.23m long refuse vehicle would be able to turn within the site without endangering cyclists, drivers, pedestrians and other road users. To ensure the safety of drivers, passengers, cyclists, pedestrians and other road users as well as residents of the flats.  
24 Before commencement of operations, a plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority indicating a gap of at least 1.3m between parking spaces 6&7. To enable the 1100 euro bins to be manoeuvred safely from the bin storage areas to the refuse truck.  
25 Before commencement of operations, a method scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing how the control of breeding, roosting or loafing of birds on the building shall be undertaken. The approved scheme shall be implemented as approved and shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. To avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft through the attraction of birds.  
26 Any Environment Agency conditions
Informatives:

1 Please note that under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act (1991) the prior written consent of the Agency is required for certain proposed works which may affect the flow of the Longford River (Ordinary Watercourse).

Contact Lydia Bruce-Burgess on 01707 632402 for further details.

2 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld.

Contact Consents Department on 01707 632475

3 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for dewatering from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse.

Contact Consents Department on 01707 632475
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF PART FOUR / PART FIVE STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING 73 AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS AND 36 ASSOCIATED PARKING SPACES, LANDSCAPING AND ACCESS.
1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 This report recommends approval for a proposal for extensions to an existing three-storey office building that is currently vacant. The site is located on the south side of Chiswick High Road in Chiswick Town Centre.

1.2 The proposal is to extend the ground floor and convert it to an A2 (office) or A1 (retail) use. It is proposed to extend the first and second floors to the rear and convert to 6 x 1-bed flats and 2 x studio flats.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 This application relates to a site of 0.058ha located within a predominantly commercial area of Chiswick Town Centre. No 305-307 is a 3-storey office building on the southern side of Chiswick High Road. The rear boundary of the site adjoins Turnham Green Conservation Area. The premises are outside the primary and secondary shopping areas of Chiswick Town Centre.

2.2 On the ground floor, there is currently a vehicular access leading to the rear yard, which is hard surfaced and used for car parking.
2.3 The building adjoins the 3 storey terrace of 281-303 Chiswick High Road to the east, which has a mixture of shops, restaurants and A2 uses on the ground floor, and residential above. To the west it adjoins a similar 3 storey concrete building, which has retail uses on the ground floor and office above. The eastern boundary of the rear parking area abuts the garden area of Arlington mansions, a 5-storey residential mansion block. To the rear lie the three dwellings that make up Arlington Cottages.

3.0 HISTORY

3.1 00248/305-307/P5

Erection of 3 storey office building with car park at rear

Approved 08.09.71

3.2 00248/305-307/P6

Erection of single-storey rear extension and change of use of ground floor from office to A4 (pubs and bars), installation of new extract duct to side elevation, rear extension to first and second floors to create 6 x one bed flats and 2 x studio flats

Refused 15.11.05

Reasons:

1. Loss of employment use.

2. Scale, bulk and location of ground floor extension detrimental to outlook and amenity.


5. Loss of rear servicing likely to prejudice free-flow of traffic.

6. Unacceptable form of residential development through poor layout, lack of amenity space, inadequate refuse and recycling and noise.

4.0 DETAILS

4.1 This application differs from that which was previously refused in the following key respects:

- The proposed ground floor extension has been reduced in size. The height is reduced from 4.1m to 3.5m and the depth is reduced by 3m so as to be set some 6m from the rear boundary.

- The floorspace at ground floor level has been reduced from 501 sq m to 460 sq m.
• The proposed use of the ground floor accommodation is for A1 (retail) or A2 (professional office).

• The side windows to the flats are to be high level and obscurely glazed.

4.2 It is proposed to convert the extended upper floors to provide the following residential accommodation:

- First floor front: a one-bedroom flat (44m²) and a studio flat (32m²).
- First floor rear: 2 one-bedroom flats. 43m² and 45m²
- Second floor front: a one-bedroom flat (44m²) and a studio flat (32m²).
- Second floor rear: 2 one-bedroom flats 43m² and 45m²

4.3 The proposed net residential density would be 533 hr/ha based on the area of the site to be occupied by the residential element of the development. The overall density of development would be more intense because retail activity would be provided at ground floor level.

4.4 No car parking or loading areas are proposed within the site. Refuse and recycling facilities are to be provided within the building together with secure cycle parking provision.

4.5 Supporting information provided with the application indicates that there is little prospect of the offices being let and provides evidence of demand for retail units of the size proposed. Furthermore, it is suggested that alterations to the front elevation and the introduction of ground floor retail use would enhance the street frontage and that the proposed uses would contribute to the vitality of the area and could support the night-time economy if the retail use continued into the evening.

4.6 It is proposed to infill the ground floor at the front, and to extend over much of the rear parking area and use the extended ground floor as a retail shop or professional office within Class A1 or A2. The ground floor addition would abut the side boundaries and would extend to within 6m of the rear boundary, retaining an open yard at the rear. Access to the flats above would be from Chiswick High Road.

4.7 An extension 2.7m deep would be added to the rear elevation at first and second floor level. It would be set in 2.3m from the adjoining building at No 309, and set in 6.5m from the boundary with No 303. Windows are proposed in the side and rear elevations. One 1-bed flat and a studio flat would overlook Chiswick High Road. The other 2 x 1-bed flats overlook the rear. The second floor layout would replicate the first floor.
5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 The application was notified to over 50 nearby properties on the 4th October 2006. Press and Site Notices were displayed and the application was placed in Chiswick Library. Two replies have been received raising the following objections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental to adjacent properties, including Listed Buildings in Turnham Green Conservation Area</td>
<td>See paragraphs 7.13 &amp; 7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension oppressive, close to rear windows of Arlington Mansions</td>
<td>See paragraph 7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of parking spaces and no parking provision for proposed development</td>
<td>See paragraph 7.18 &amp; 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic adding to congestion and pollution</td>
<td>See paragraph 7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential noise pollution from external plant</td>
<td>This would be a matter for Environmental health. See also condition 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of light and privacy for neighbouring residents</td>
<td>See paragraph 7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and disturbance during construction</td>
<td>This would be a matter for Environmental Health. Hours would be controlled by condition 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 The West Chiswick & Gunnersbury Society objects to the planning application for the following reasons:

1. The extension would detract from the character of the adjacent Conservation Area, particularly in relation to Arlington Cottages and Arlington Park Mansions.
2. No amenity space provision for the residents of proposed 8 flats.

3. No parking provision. Existing on-street parking bays are in heavy demand and cannot be exclusively reserved for residents or visitors to this site.

4. No access, above ground level, for disabled persons.

5. No disabled parking to be provided.

6. The loss of 17 parking spaces in an area of heavy demand is unacceptable.

7. Do not object to proposed residential accommodation but concerned about the proliferation of eating establishments in the vicinity.

5.3 A letter of objection was received on 5\textsuperscript{th} December 2006 making the following comments:

- Does this mean that all commercial premises on this side of Chiswick High Rd. will be able to get planning permission to develop the rear area?

RESPONSE: Each application must be dealt with on its merits.

- Has there been a change in policy or is the proposal for A1/A2 use rather than A4?

RESPONSE: The proposal is for A1/A2 use, not A4 as in the previous application.

- If the proposal is accepted then there should be no use of the roof, which would cause overlooking and any mechanical plant should be either silent in operation or housed within the building.

RESPONSE: Condition 8 would prevent use of the roof as a terrace and condition 4 would control the installation of mechanical plant.

5.4 An e-mail was received from the Chair of the West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society on 7\textsuperscript{th} December raising the following concerns:
• How does the development enhance or promote the Conservation Area?

RESPONSE: Development is required to preserve or enhance the character of a Conservation Area. This development is outside the Conservation Area boundary and would preserve its character as it would present a satisfactory appearance and would be inset 6m from the rear boundary.

• Where will residents park and how can no–car housing be enforced?

RESPONSE: The terms of the S106 agreement would ensure that residents would not be eligible for parking permits within the adjoining CPZs.

• Why is there no disabled access above ground floor?

RESPONSE: There is no lift within the building at present and none is proposed in this scheme. However, the accommodation complies with Part M of the Building Regulations with regard to disabled access.

5.5 Cleansing Services
No objection.

5.6 Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention
No objection.

5.7 Environmental Strategy
Recommend conditions requiring the submission of details to ensure adequate sound insulation and ventilation for the proposed dwellings in order to protect future residents from external noise and poor air quality.

5.8 Environment Agency
A flood risk assessment is required. The applicant has commissioned a report, which will be available before the area committee meeting. An initial appraisal indicates that flooding should not be an issue and that any surface water run-off can be dealt with. This will be subject to further consideration by the Environment Agency.

A flood assessment has been provided, which provides the following conclusions:
• It is considered that there is a low risk of flooding at the site. The flood levels provided by the Environment Agency show that the existing level of the site is 1.6m above the 1 in 1000 year flood level;

• There will be no increase in the impermeable area of the site, therefore it is not considered that runoff rates will be increased;

• It is not considered that finished floor levels will need to include a freeboard as the site level is over 1m above the provided flood level for the 1 in 1000 year event;

• As it is not considered that the site would flood during the 1 in 1000 year event it is considered that dry pedestrian access and egress to and from the proposed extension would be present during a flood event.

The Environment Agency has yet to comment on these findings

5.9 Chiswick Area Committee

The application was considered by the Chiswick Area Committee on 6th December 2006. Members made the following comments to be reported to Sustainable Development Committee:

• Members supported more retail units along the High Road but had some concern that the building of a large retail unit should not be seen as a way of getting change of use for a restaurant as there would be concerns about a restaurant of that size.

• There is no shortage of studio flats in this area and a proliferation of studio flats should not be encouraged.

• Members would prefer to see quality, larger units as more appropriate for the area.

6.0 POLICY

6.1 Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

IMP.1.2 The re-use and recycling of urban land.
IMP.6.1 Planning obligations
IMP.2.4 Enhancement of Chiswick Town Centre
ENV-B.1.1 All New development.
ENV-B1.8 Access and facilities for people with disabilities
ENV-B1.9 Safety and security
ENV-B2.2 Conservation Areas
ENV-B2.5 Development affecting the setting of a Listed Building
E.1.5 Development involving loss of or changes in employment uses
E.2.1 Environmental criteria
E.2.2 Mixed uses
H.1.1 Location of New Housing Development
H.2.1 Affordable Housing
H.3.3 The use of upper floors above shops and in town centres
H.3.5 Release of Employment Land to Residential
H.4.1 Housing Standards and Guidelines
H.4.2 Residential Density
T.1.1 The Location of Development
T.1.2 The Movement Implications of Development
T.1.4 & Appendix 3 Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing for Developments
T.2.1 Pedestrian Access
T.2.2 Pedestrian Safety and Security
T.3.3 Special Parking facilities for People with Disabilities
T.4.3 Traffic implications of new development

6.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance

General Standards and Controls
Residential Standards and Controls
Think Access
Turnham Green Conservation Area

6.3 London Plan

2A.1 Sustainability Criteria
2A.5 Town Centres
3A.1 Increasing London’s Supply of Housing
3A.2 Borough Housing Targets
3C.1 Integrating transport and development

4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
Table 4B.1 Density location and parking matrix

4B.3 Maximising the potential of sites
4B.7 Respect local context and communities
4B.10 London’s Built Heritage
4B.11 Heritage Conservation

6.4 London Plan Supplementary Guidance

Accessible London

6.5 Central Government Guidance

PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS 6 Planning for Town Centres
PPG 3 Housing
PPG13 Transport
PPG 15 Planning and the Historic Environment

7.0 PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 The main planning issues to consider are:

- Whether the application addresses the previous reasons for refusal
- The principle of the development
- Environmental conditions and impact on adjoining properties
- Traffic, parking and access
- Residential density and housing standards

Previous reasons for refusal
The application provides the following detail to address the previous reasons for refusal:

**Loss of employment use**

This application is accompanied by details of unsuccessful marketing and an assessment, which indicates that there is little prospect of the offices being let but suggests that there is demand for the size of retail unit that is proposed, which would provide retail employment potential.

**Scale, bulk and location of ground floor extension**

The height of the extension has been reduced so as not to be apparent above the side boundary wall. The depth has been reduced to a distance of 6m from the rear boundary.

**Unacceptable impact on Listed Building and Conservation Area**

The reduced height and depth of the extension would minimise its impact on the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings.

**Noise and disturbance caused by A4 use**

The proposed use is for retail purposes (A1) or office (A2) and would not create additional noise or disturbance.

**Loss of rear servicing**

This application is accompanied by an assessment of servicing requirements, which demonstrates that the proposed development can be adequately serviced from the highway. The existing service bay at the front of the site would be improved at the applicant’s expense.

**Unacceptable form of residential development**

The proposed dwellings provide a satisfactory layout and would not suffer noise from the proposed ground floor use. The applicant has agreed to provide contributions to fund improvements to Turnham Green and environmental improvements to Chiswick High Road to offset the lack of amenity space on site. Refuse and recycling facilities are to be provided and details would be required by condition 9. Soundproofing against external noise would be required by condition 11.

**Principle of the development**

The site is not identified as an employment site in the Unitary Development Plan. It is a stand alone office built in 1971. Policy E.1.5 of the Unitary Development Plan states that redevelopment or changes of use that would result in the loss of high trip-generating employment uses in town centres, edge of centre sites, or key employment locations will not be permitted. The proposed change of use would result in a loss of 562m² of office floor space.
within Chiswick Town Centre. Policy E.1.5 (paragraph 4) states that housing will be considered as an alternative use to employment uses where the re-use of employment land is unlikely.

7.4 The applicants have provided a marketing report, which states that the property has been vacant since August 2004 and parts have been unoccupied and available to let for at least five years. The second floor has been vacant since May 2001. The property has continued to be marketed, as a whole or on a floor by floor basis with limited interest due to there being very little demand and the availability of a better standard of accommodation. Therefore, it appears unlikely that these offices will be let.

7.5 The GLA published the Sub Regional Development Framework for West London (SRDF) in May 2006. Table 2A.1 of the SRDF states that in office locations, including Chiswick, 'speculative office development could be promoted on the most efficient and accessible sites in the context of wider schemes to enhance the environment and offer of the centre as a commercial location. This might entail some long-term loss of overall office stock through change of use of provision on less attractive sites.'

7.6 The extended ground floor would provide 460m$^2$ of retail floorspace, providing employment opportunities appropriate to this town centre location.

7.7 Notwithstanding this change in employment floor space, the introduction of additional housing on this town centre site meets government policy in PPG 3, and is reflected in Council Policy H 1.1 of the UDP, which states that:

'A systematic sustainable approach is applied to the selection of land for development giving preference to those sites which focus new development in town centres and regeneration areas, recycle brownfield sites, re-use buildings, are located near to and/or are accessible by public transport, and sites which utilise the capacity of existing infrastructure.'

7.8 Furthermore, the introduction of residential use on this town centre site would provide a mix of dwellings, which would contribute to the housing stock as well as the life and vitality of the Town Centre in accordance with policy H.3.3.

7.9 Where a proposal to change the use of a building from employment to residential use is acceptable with regard to policy E.1.5 the criteria in policy H.3.5 should be considered. The proposed development should be well located in relation to other employment opportunities, community, health, education and retail uses. The site should also be considered appropriate in terms of amenity for residential accommodation.

7.10 Policy IMP.2.4 (i) seeks to preserve and enhance Chiswick as a shopping centre and (viii) promotes the retention and re-introduction of residential use of upper floors. These premises are considered suitable for the proposed change of use, which would result in the replacement of office space by small residential units and retail use.
Environmental conditions and impact on adjoining properties

7.11 UDP policy ENV-B.1.9 seeks to ensure that developments are designed to create a safe and secure environment.

7.12 It is considered that the building lends itself to conversion and extension due to its position and site layout. The scale and appearance of the building and its curtilage are commercial and the proposal would not significantly alter the front elevation of the building. The building is located within a commercial frontage with residential buildings to the side and rear.

7.13 The proposed conversion would alter the site’s layout and increase the footprint of the building. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to the commercial premises either side of the site, which are located on ground and upper floors. It is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the adjoining premises by reason of unacceptable noise or other activity within the context of a busy town centre in accordance with UDP policies ENV-B.1.1 and C.3.2.

7.14 The proposed extension to first and second floor at the rear is considered to be acceptable in principle. The three-storey element of the extension would be positioned 6.5m from the eastern boundary and 2.3m from the western boundary. It would be some 38m from the southern boundary and would maintain satisfactory daylight angles to neighbouring properties. Windows that are proposed in the side elevations will be high level and obscurely glazed to avoid potential overlooking and loss of privacy.

7.15 The proposed ground floor extension would occupy most of the rear yard. However, it would be no taller than the existing boundary wall to the east and would have minimal impact on Arlington Park Mansions in terms of daylight and outlook. The rear face of the extension would be 6m from the rear boundary so as to maintain a separation from Arlington Cottages, which are Grade II Listed Buildings.

7.16 There would be no loss of daylight to adjoining residential properties because of the lowered height and reduced depth of the single-storey extension. There would be no loss of sunlight because the extension is to the north of Arlington Cottages and would not create any more shadowing than an existing structure adjacent to the boundary within Arlington Park Mansions. The extension would present an acceptable appearance and the development is considered to accord with policies ENV-B 1.1 and ENV-B 2.5 which seeks to protect the setting of Listed Buildings.

7.17 All the buildings surrounding the site to the south and east are within Turnham Green Conservation Area. It is considered that the proposed extensions would preserve the character of the Conservation Area in accordance with policy ENV-B 2.2. There is a Sycamore Tree at the rear of 309-317 Chiswick High Road, which is just outside the Conservation Area but contributes to the character of the Conservation Area. A tree report has been provided and measures have been identified to protect the tree. The
extension has been reduced so as to maintain sufficient distance for the tree to remain and a TPO is recommended.

Traffic and parking

7.18 Policy T.1.4 (Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments) of the UDP states that all developments must provide parking and servicing facilities to an appropriate level up to the Council’s maximum standards as found in Appendix 3. The proposal is for residential and retail use, which would require no more than 10 spaces.

7.19 The site is in the town centre, which is well served by buses, and is within walking distance of Chiswick Park tube and Gunnersbury mainline and tube station.

7.20 There is an existing vehicular access and parking spaces at the rear of the site, which are to be removed. The application is accompanied by a servicing and parking appraisal, which concludes that traffic associated with the development can be accommodated. The report also demonstrates that the service bay at the site frontage can be altered to increase its capacity. The traffic implications of the proposed development compared to the existing office use would not be significant in this town centre location.

7.21 The applicant has provided information to demonstrate that servicing and parking for the commercial use can be accommodated within the highway. There would be no parking provision for the residential units. The applicant has indicated that these dwellings would be car-free housing and part of a proposed S106 agreement would ensure that residents would not be eligible for parking permits within the adjacent CPZ.

7.22 This part of Chiswick High Road in front of the site is within the Inner Core area of parking controls, with pay and display bays for short term shoppers parking and loading bays for shops. Therefore, if parking permits were available to future residents they would be in the West Chiswick CPZ, which covers roads around the site, such as Chiswick Road to the north of Chiswick High Road, and Arlington Gardens to the south, where the West Chiswick CPZ is in operation and already approaching saturation. In this case, therefore, it would be appropriate to ensure that future residents of these premises in Chiswick High Road are not eligible for parking permits.

Residential Density and housing standards

7.23 Planning Policy Guidance Note. 3 (PPG 3) and the London Plan both encourage more efficient use of land in order to provide sustainable communities and to meet housing needs in the local area and within the broader London context.

7.24 Unitary Development Plan Policy H.4.2 (Residential Density) recommends that density should not exceed 250 Habitable rooms to the hectare (hr/ha) but states that, provided a high quality environment can be achieved, higher densities will be considered for predominantly non-family accommodation in
town centres. The submitted scheme would provide a density of 533 hr/ha based on net residential area. Density is only to be used as a guideline and policy H.4.2 states that density will be of secondary importance after taking account of the individual requirements of each site and the merits of each scheme.

7.25 The London Plan Density matrix (table 4B.1) suggests residential densities within the range 450-700 hr/ha for town centre sites such as this, comprising flats. Within urban town centres densities above 450 hr/ha may be considered. The proposed density based on net residential site area is 533 hr/ha and the accommodation would be non-family studio and one-bedroom units. According to the matrix, this is a site where high density development may be considered.

7.26 UDP guidance (Appendix 1) recommends a distance of 21 metres for privacy between habitable room windows that face each other. Windows in the proposed development would not face any other properties within 21 metres. Proposed balconies are flush with the building and would not provide opportunities for overlooking. However, there are side-facing windows at upper levels, which could give rise to overlooking. These windows are to be high level and obscurely glazed so as to maintain privacy.

7.27 Four of the proposed unit sizes meet the requirements of Policy H 4.1 and SPG 12 and are considered acceptable (see paragraph 4.2). Four units are below the standard but provide adequate room sizes and satisfactory internal layout. Supplementary Guidance lists appropriate minimum room sizes, which provide a useful guide to determining the quality of internal space to be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Required Size</th>
<th>Proposed 1 Bedroom 43m²</th>
<th>Proposed 1 Bedroom 44m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Bedroom</td>
<td>12m²</td>
<td>11.9 m²</td>
<td>12.5 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Bedroom</td>
<td>10m² or 6.5m²</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>3.7m²</td>
<td>3.7m²</td>
<td>3.7m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Kitchen &amp; Lounge</td>
<td>5.5m² + 14m² = 19.5m²</td>
<td>21.5 m²</td>
<td>21.5 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-Family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.28 The overall layout of units is acceptable and provides satisfactory daylight and outlook. SPG 10 (Private Amenity Space) sets a standard of 25sq m/unit, equating to 200sq m for this development. There is no amenity space proposed within the scheme. However, none of the proposed dwellings are family units and the applicant has offered S106 funding for the
open space at Turnham Green, which is a short walk (100m) to the east of the site.

8.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

8.1 UDP Policy IMP.6.1 seeks planning obligations to secure planning benefits related to the proposed development.

8.2 The main areas for inclusion into a S106 agreement are:

- In this case, in order to ensure a satisfactory living environment for future residents, it is desirable in accordance with ENV-B.1.1 and H.4.1 that the developer provides a contribution of £8,000 to open space provision in Turnham Green.

- A contribution of £6,000 to environmental improvements along this section of Chiswick High Road, including the provision of cycle-racks and/or other street furniture to benefit the proposed retail and residential uses.

- The scheme makes no parking provision for the residential units so it is appropriate that future occupants should not be eligible to obtain car-parking permits within the Inner Core or West Chiswick Controlled Parking Zones.

- S 278 agreement to secure alteration of the service bay in front of the premises at the applicant’s expense.

9.0 CONCLUSION

The proposal is within an area where retail expansion and residential development are considered to be acceptable in principle. The design of development would be in keeping with the character of the High Street frontage and would respect the character of the Conservation Area. Housing space and layout standards are acceptable but there is no amenity space provision. S 106 contributions to Turnham Green would benefit future residents. There would be no material impact on neighbouring properties. Access and parking arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

That subject to the satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, the Director of Planning be authorised to issue planning permission for the development, subject to the following conditions and reasons.

GRANT

Subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions this application for extension to provide retail premises and residential development to provide 8 flats represents an acceptable form of development. It would not detract from the character of the area and would not be harmful to neighbours’ living
conditions or highway safety. On balance, the development is in accordance with Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-B.2.2 (Conservation Areas), ENV-B.2.5 (Development affecting the setting of a Listed Building), ENV-B.1.8 (Access & Facilities for People with Disabilities), IMP.2.4 (Enhancement of Chiswick Town Centre), H.4.1 (Housing Standards & Guidelines), H4.2 (Residential Density) and T1.4 (Car & Cycle parking) of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

**Conditions:**

1. **A1A**  
   *Time limits - 3 years*

2. **B4**  
   *Materials*

3. **B5**  
   *Strictly in accordance with plans*

4. **C23**  
   *No external plant*

5. **C29**  
   *Hours of construction (Mon-Fri 08.00-18.00, Saturday 09.00-13.00, not at all on Sundays, Bank & Public Holidays)*

6. **C34**  
   *Illumination, mud & dust on construction sites*

7. **D1**  
   *Obscure Glazing (east and west)*

8. **D3**  
   *Balconies*

9. **D4**  
   *Waste and recycled materials Storage*

10. **D5**  
    *Waste and recycled materials (implementation)*

11. **D9**  
    *Soundproofing-External Noise*

12. **E1**  
    *Landscaping design proposals*

13. **E2**  
    *Landscaping (implementation)*

14. **E5**  
    *Boundary Treatment*

15. **E12**  
    *Location of trees on or adjacent to development sites*

16. **F9**  
    *Close Access*

17. **Air quality**

Before the development is commenced a scheme for protecting the proposed residential accommodation from external air pollution shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and any works which form part of such a scheme shall be completed before any part of the development is first occupied or used.

**REASON:** D9
REPORT TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 15 JANUARY 2007

Burnetta Van Stipriaan: Tel 020 8583 4916
e-mail: burnetta.van-stipriaan@hounslow.gov.uk

References: P/2006/2354 00505/AP/P74
P/2006/2421 00505/AP/L22

Address: Gillette Corner, Great West Road, Hounslow
Ward: Osterley and Spring Grove

Proposal: 00505/AP/P74:
Comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide buildings of between 4 and 6 storeys for Class B1(a), B1(b) and B1(c) use, with cafe, associated landscaping and car parking (in outline) and conversion and extensions to Gillette Building for use as a hotel, with ancillary conferencing/meeting, bar/restaurant and gym facilities, basement car parking (in detail), provision of new landscaped areas and highway works.

00505/AP/L22:
Works of alteration, extension and demolition to facilitate the retention and conversion of the Gillette Building for hotel use, as part of the proposed comprehensive development of the Gillette site.

Drawing numbers: See drawing schedule attached hereto as an appendix but noting that the following revised drawings were received 13 December 2006:

- A-G-PR-2000 A (Gillette Building Lower Ground Floor Plan Proposed)
- A-G-PR-2001 A (Gillette Building Ground Floor Plan Proposed)
- A-G-PR-2002 A (Gillette Building First Floor Plan Proposed)
- A-G-PR-2003 A (Gillette Building First Floor Mezzanine Plan Proposed)
- A-G-PR-2004 A (Gillette Building Second Floor Proposed)
- A-G-PR-2005 A (Gillette Building Third Floor Plan Proposed)
- A-G-PR-2006 A (Gillette Building Fourth Floor Plan Proposed)
• A-G-PR-4005 A (Gillette Building Bay Study West
  Elevation Proposed)
• A-G-PR-4006 A (Gillette Building Bay Study East
  Elevation Proposed)
• A-G-PR-5000 A (Gillette Building Exterior
  Elevations Proposed Noprth/N1 and South/S1
  Elevations)
• A-G-PR-5001 A (Gillette Building Exterior
  Elevations Proposed East/E1 and West/W1
  Elevations)
• A-G-PR-7001 A (Gillette Building Sections CC and
  DD Proposed)
• A-0-PR-5000A B (Site Elevations Proposed)

Reports received by Borough Planning 18 July 2006:
• Gillette Corner Masterplan – Planning Statement
  (Rolfe Judd, July 2006);
• The Gillette Corner Site: The Gillette Building,
  Syon Lane/Great West Road, Isleworth: Statement
  of Significance (HOK International Limited, 7 July
  2006)
• Bonnington at Gillette Corner (Bonnington Group
  PLC)
• Gillette Corner Site – Archaeological desk-based
  assessment (Museum of London Archaeology
  Service, July 2006)
• Gillette Corner – Sustainability Report (Buro
  Happold, 14 July 2006)
• Gillette Corner – Environmental noise report
  (Sandy Brown Associates, 14 July 2006)
• Detailed Air Quality Assessment for Gillette Corner
  Development – Summary Statement on Scope and
  Methodology (Bureau Veritas, undated)
• Gillette Corner Development, Energy Strategy
  Report (Buro Happold, July 2006)
• Marketing Report in Support of Planning
  Application (NAI Fuller Peiser, 10 July 2006)
• Proposed Mixed-Use Development Gillette Corner,
  Hounslow – Transport Assessment (Motion, 14
  July 2006)
• Bonnington Gillette Corner – Design and Access
  Statement (July 2006)
• Bonnington Gillette Corner – Design and Access
  Statement Appendix (July 2006)
• Environmental Site Investigation and Risk
  Assessment (ERM, 10 November 2005)
• Gillette Corner – Flood Risk Report (Buro Happold,
  April 2006)

Cumulative Traffic Impact Assessment, received by
Applications received: 18 July 2006

1.0 SUMMARY

The planning application for a business led-mixed use development

1.1 The planning application (00505/P/P59) has been submitted in hybrid form. The proposal for the conversion and extension of the Gillette Building to create a hotel with ancillary facilities has been submitted in detail with the business component in outline (siting, design and access to be considered, with appearance and landscaping reserved for further consideration).

The listed building consent application

1.2 The listed building consent application (00505/AP/L22) is for works of alteration, extension and demolition to facilitate the retention and conversion of the Gillette Building for hotel use, as part of the proposed comprehensive development of the site.

Key issues and topics

1.3 The proposed development raises a series of detailed issues for the Council and it is important that they are considered in a logical sequence. The key issues and topics that are addressed in the body of the report are:
1. Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable? Is it an appropriate location for a high trip generating use? Does the development support or undermine economic regeneration and employment objectives? Is the re-use of and are the extensions to the listed building acceptable, including the proposal for demolition?

2. Traffic, parking and transport issues (including whether the scheme can be accommodated in terms of access and public transport and whether the proposed parking provision is appropriate)

3. If a sound case can be made for the development would the details of the scheme be satisfactory? Is the site appropriate for high buildings? Is the scale of the development acceptable in relation to the surrounding environment?

4. Is the proposed development acceptable in environmental terms (noise, air quality, flood risk, wind and contamination) and with regards to archaeological and cultural heritage?

5. Are sustainable building principles applied?

6. Is the balance of community benefits appropriate to mitigate the impact of the development?

Summary of Issue 1

1.4 An unspecified part of the Great West Road is identified in the London Plan as a Strategic Employment Location (SEL) (specifically, as an Industrial Business Park). SELs are not identified in the UDP. The UDP identifies proposal sites, the Gillette site being within the Great West Road Employment Area, which is a Key Employment Location. The site is also identified within the UDP as within the wider Brentford Regeneration Area. Under the Brentford Area Action Plan (Preferred Options) the site is identified as an employment proposal site. Under the Employment DPD (Preferred Options) the site is identified within the Great West Road Industrial Business Park.

1.5 Assessed against planning policy the view of Officers is that the principle of the proposed development on the site is acceptable subject to securing (i) the delivery of the mixed-use scheme especially in terms of the business component; and (ii) ensuring high levels of public transport accessibility and a high quality design and environment.

1.6 The proposal would not result in the loss of high trip generating employment use from this site (in that the B1 and hotel floorspace are high trip generating, with the proposal resulting in an increase in the number of job opportunities on the site) and would present economic benefits, therefore helping to promote area regeneration within the Brentford Regeneration Area.

1.7 The proposal constitutes brownfield development and the re-use of the Gillette Building would help bring the listed building back to beneficial life and good repair. The re-use of, and the extensions to, the listed building are considered acceptable (including the proposal for demolition); the proposal would preserve (if not enhance) the building, the features of special architectural/historic interest which it possesses, and its setting – subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions on the grant of any planning permission and/or the prior completion of a Section 106 deed.
Summary of Issue 2

1.8 In the context of both existing and emerging policy, the suitability of the site for the business-led mixed-use development proposed is linked directly to the accessibility of the site.

1.9 The parking provision for the proposed hotel and its ancillary facilities (214 spaces) falls between the Council’s minimum and maximum parking standards and this level of provision is considered to be acceptable for this location and for this type of development. The proposed 470 parking spaces for the business component would comply with the maximum UDP and London Plan standards on the basis of 47,000sq.m of B1 floorspace being provided. Subject to mitigation measures and improvements to pedestrian, cycle and public transport being secured by condition (e.g. with regards to cycle parking) or as part of the Section 106 deed (e.g. with regards to travel plans and proposed improvements to the accessibility of the site), it is considered that the scheme would be accommodated terms of traffic, parking and transport issues.

Summary of Issue 3

1.10 As summarised above, the re-use of, and extensions to, the listed building are considered acceptable. The view of Officers is also that Buildings A through F would be accommodated on site with acceptable impact on their surroundings and without resulting in significant harm to sensitive areas – subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions on the grant of any planning permission and/or the prior completion of a Section 106 deed.

1.11 The proposed ‘greening” of the site, together with provision of publicly accessible open space is welcome subject to measures to secure the management and maintenance of the open space.

Summary of Issue 4

1.12 The proposed development would be acceptable in environmental terms (noise, air quality, flood risk, wind and contamination) and with regards to archaeological and cultural heritage – subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions on the grant of any planning permission and/or the prior completion of a Section 106 deed.

Summary of Issue 5

1.13 The proposal would apply sustainable building principles.

Summary of Issue 6

1.14 The heads of term for a Section 106 agreement have been scoped. The consequences and impacts of the development would be able to be mitigated and planning benefits able to be secured, subject to a satisfactory Section 106 agreement with phasing of development and contributions.
**Recommendation**

1.15 It is recommended that the Director of Planning be authorised to:

- grant planning permission subject to (i) the imposition of the conditions set out in this report and (ii) securing the planning obligations set out in this report by the prior completion of a Section 106 deed the exact terms of which shall be negotiated in conjunction with the Director of Legal Services; and

- grant listed building consent subject to the conditions set out in this report.

**2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

2.1 The site is 4.2ha and broadly triangular in shape. It is located at the junction of the Great West Road (A4) and Syon Lane, Isleworth. Harlequin Avenue lies to the east and the Centaurs Business Park (occupied by BSkyB) and a Tesco supermarket to the north and west.

2.2 The site comprises office, manufacturing and storage buildings purpose built for the Gillette Company. These include the Grade II listed Gillette Building with its distinctive main façade and clock tower, but neither the Grade II Listed National Westminster Bank building located east of the Gillette Building, along the Great West Road frontage, or the Grade II Listed kiosk located outside the Gillette Building; both fall outside of the application site.

2.3 The Gillette Building is also a landmark under UDP Policy ENV-B.2.8 (Views and Landmarks), being referenced as landmark C in both Table ENV-B.1 (Viewpoints and Landmarks) and on UDP Map ENV-B.2 (Viewpoints and Landmarks).

2.4 The Engineer’s House located immediately to the west of the Gillette Building is not independently listed but was clearly designed as part of the original Gillette Company complex and is considered to sit within the curtilage of the listed building.

2.5 There is a prominent front boundary wall along Syon Lane; its four Victorian cast-iron lamp standards (relocated from a different building) are Grade II Listed.

2.6 The applicant's Planning Statement (Paragraph 2.3.3) sets out that the existing buildings and facilities currently provide a gross internal area of 47,510sq.m of floorspace, which has been utilised by Gillette for a mix of Class B1(a) (office), Class B2 (manufacturing/industrial) and Class B8 (storage) purposes, and that when in full operation Gillette operated on a 24 hour basis 7 days a week.

2.7 A number of vehicular access points are provided into and out of the site from Syon Lane, Harlequin Avenue and the Great West Road. The principal access (two-way) into the site is from Syon Lane. 413 car parking spaces are currently provided on-site.
2.8 The nearest train station is Syon Lane, which is located approximately 220m to the south of the site. The closest London Underground Station is Osterley (Piccadilly Line), which is located approximately 1.8km to the west of the site. There are two bus-routes H91 (Hammersmith/Hounslow West) and the H28 (Bulls Bridge (Tesco) to Osterley); pedestrian footpaths on the surrounding roads, with a pedestrian subway under the Great West Road (there are no ‘at grade’ pedestrian crossing along this section of the Great West Road); and an existing cycle route along both sides of the Great West Road (refer UDP Proposals Map, Map 3).

2.9 A free minibus service, which is operated by local businesses, provides a link from the Osterley London Underground Station to the site.

2.10 The site has a PTAL of 2 (poor).

2.11 There are a range of different buildings and uses in the surrounding area. To the east of the Gillette Building, and as was noted above at Paragraph 2.2, is the Grade II Listed National Westminster Bank building. To the east of the site is Harlequin Avenue, including West Cross Business Park and New Horizons Court.

2.12 To the west of the site is a small landscaped park, with the applicant’s Planning Statement (Paragraph 2.6.10) stating that it is “maintained by Gillette in partnership with BSkyB and Harrods” and that it “…includes a pedestrian right of way, which links to Centaurs Business Park and the footpath running along to the north (along the eastern boundary of the Business Park).” Grant Way is located to the west of the park and to its west, fronting Syon Lane, is a Tesco Superstore with surface level car park and petrol filling station.

2.13 To the west and north of the site is the Centaurs Business Park, occupied primarily by BSkyB, but also by the Harrods depository and distribution centre (at the north end of the Centaurs Business Park).

2.14 On the opposite (southern) side of Syon Lane are a Shell petrol filling station, a small parade of shops (having no designation under the UDP) and two-storey residential dwellinghouses.

2.15 On the opposite (southern) side of the Great West Road and on the western side of Syon Lane are a vacant site (former petrol filling station) and two-storey residential dwellinghouses; on the eastern side of Syon Lane are retail units including Homebase and Comet.

2.16 Within the wider surrounding area are Wyke Green Golf Course (northwest of the site) and Boston Manor Park (northeast of the site), both of which are designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). In addition, Boston Manor Park is located within the Grand Union Canal and Boston Manor Conservation Area and has Grade I (Boston Manor House) and Grade II listed buildings within it. South of the site Syon House (Grade 1 listed) and Park (Grade 1 on English Heritage’s Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England) link the open land with RBG Kew, south of the Thames.

3.0 HISTORY

3.1 There are numerous planning records for the site.
3.2 The planning history for the site dates from June 1949 (reference 00505/AP/P1 for the construction of new male lavatory accommodation and male locker room inside building).

3.3 Applications have also been submitted for the neighbouring BSkyB site, as detailed elsewhere on the agenda.

4.0 DETAILS

Introduction

4.1 Gillette Company took the decision in 2003 to close their office and production facility and relocate their razorblade and razor manufacturing operations to Eastern Europe. Since this time Gillette Company has been progressively down-scaling their operation and relocating staff and equipment. All production activity ceased at the facility in April 2006 and Officers are of the understanding that Gillette Company have now vacated the site.

4.2 The Bonnington Group acquired the Gillette site at the end of 2005 and will take vacant possession of it in early 2007.

4.3 Two applications have been submitted on behalf of the Bonnington Group.

4.4 The planning application (00505/AP/P74) proposes the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide buildings of between 4 and 6 storeys for Class B1(a) (office), B1(b) (research and development, studios, laboratories, high tech) and B1(c) (light industry) use, with cafe, associated landscaping and car parking (in outline, with siting, design and access to be considered) and conversion and extensions to Gillette Building for use as a hotel, with ancillary conferencing/meeting, bar/restaurant and gym facilities, basement car parking (in detail), provision of new landscaped areas and highway works.

4.5 The listed building consent application (00505/AP/L22) is for works of alteration, extension and demolition to facilitate the retention and conversion of the original Gillette Building for hotel use, as part of the proposed comprehensive development of the site.

The planning application for a business-led mixed-use development

4.6 A Masterplan Framework specifies overall development thresholds. Paragraph 1.3.2 of the Planning Statement sets out that adopting a Masterplan approach,

...will enable an overall development framework to be defined for the site, which will establish development plots, building heights, floorspace thresholds/parameters etc, whilst providing sufficient flexibility to allow the individual buildings to be tailored to meet specific user/occupier requirements.

4.7 The retention and refurbishment of the Grade II listed Gillette Building would provide for a hotel (five star), including 505 bedrooms and other ancillary facilities (including bar and restaurant, meeting rooms, conferencing and function facilities and a gym), with basement parking for 214 cars. With regards to the hotel use, Paragraph 4.3.26 of the applicant’s Planning Statement reads:
In summary, the proposed hotel will occupy the prominent Gillette Building (which will be extended to accommodate the new use) will include the following facilities:

- a total of 505 bedrooms rooms, including both larger suites and longer stay serviced apartments;
- a central function room capable of accommodating…up to 500 people for a conferences/presentation/seminar or 300 people for a dinner function. The space will also be suitable for use as exhibition space, and other functions.
- meeting rooms and board room capable of holding meetings, seminars, training courses for between 6 and 100 participants. All rooms will be provided with state of the art audio visual equipment will be provided along with facilities for video conferencing and internet access.
- high speed internet access provided in all rooms;
- restaurant and bar facilities providing meals and refreshments to hotel residents and conference visitors. It also intended that these facilities be made available to the wider business community.
- a gym facility - including a swimming pool (at basement level), exercise machines, treatment rooms and the associated changing and relaxation areas. Again this facility will be available for use by hotel guests, but will also be open (on a membership basis) for use by those working in the immediate area;
- a basement car park including 214 parking space and 20 cycle parking spaces. In addition, coach parking will be provided on-site for 3 coaches;
- internal landscaped courtyard areas will provide an outside space for hotel guests to relax during the day and early evenings and well as adding that “extra dimension” to the views from hotel bedrooms.

4.8 In height, the hotel would be six storeys (including ground floor but not the proposed basement) on a replacement rear elevation and new centre link, with the existing four storeys retained on the main listed building.

4.9 The existing reconfigured building would have a gross external area of 14,470sq.m and the proposed extension would have 24,470sq.m, giving a total of 38,940sq.m.

4.10 The Planning Statement (para. 1.2.5) sets out that the hotel would cater specifically for the business tourism market, by providing a range of hotel accommodation and other facilities (conferencing facilities, meeting rooms etc) targeted specifically at the Great West Road business community.

4.11 It is also proposed to retain and protect certain other structures/buildings on site, notably the ‘Engineer’s House’ and the front wall, and the separately listed Grade II lamp standards.

4.12 The gross external area of the Class B1 uses would be maximum 47,000sq.m.

4.13 The Class B1 floorspace would be to rear of the main Gillette Building, in a series of new buildings. The preliminary area, height and parking schedule (refer the applicant’s Planning Statement) sets out that three of the six buildings proposed would be five storeys high (including ground floor) and that the
remaining three buildings would be six storeys high (including ground). However, the drawings show that Building F would be part four-storey part five-storeys high. There would be a maximum of 470 car parking spaces for the Class B1 uses, with the spaces to be provided under the raised piazza. There would also be servicing areas and an external café area, the cafe having a gross external area of 200sq.m.

4.14 The applicant envisages that the future Class B1 use floorspace will be “…developed in accordance with the proposed layout (and the identified plot areas), albeit there may be some minor adjustment required to meet occupier requirements” (Paragraph 1.3.6 of the Planning Statement).

4.15 The proposed layout is shown below, in plan (reproduced from the applicant’s Design and Access Statement).

4.16 The applicant’s Transport Assessment details access, servicing and parking stating (in part):

Vehicles will be able to access the site via the existing access to the factory service road on Syon Lane and via accesses located on Harlequin Avenue. The Syon Lane access will also be the primary vehicular egress. One of the existing accesses from Syon Lane to the parking area in front of the factory will be used as a secondary egress for use by taxis and other drop-off vehicles. The other access will be narrowed and become the pedestrian access to the hotel site.
3.7 Three in-bound accesses to the development will be provided on Harlequin Avenue. No vehicles will exit the site using these accesses. …

3.11 A number of surface parking spaces will be located in front of the hotel and will be for the use of guests while they check-in or by visitors. The main hotel car park will be situated at basement level. It will be accessed from the internal circulating roadway at a point on the northwestern corner of the hotel building. …A parking bay for three coaches will be provided within the site and facilities for parking 20 cycles will be located within the basement car park. All the servicing activity associated with the hotel will take place in areas accessed from the internal roadway and so will be entirely off-street.

3.12 Within the employment development, car parks will be located under Blocks A and F and under the podium courtyard and buildings for Blocks B-E. … Cycle parking for employees will also be provided under the buildings and parking for visitors’ cycles will be conveniently located close to the main entrances of the buildings. A loading bay adjacent to the internal circulating carriageway within the site and an off-carriageway layby in Harlequin Avenue will be provided for servicing the employment development.

4.17 Public transport improvements are proposed together with improvements to the existing pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the site (including the provision of new pedestrian crossing facilities across the Great West Road and Syon Lane). Paragraphs 4.3.54 and 4.3.55 of the applicant’s Planning Statement read:

4.3.54 …improvements to both pedestrian facilities and public transport in the area…will include the following:

- refurbishment and upgrade of the subway under the Great West Road;
- provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing on the western arm of the Great West Road at its junction with Syon Lane;
- replacement of the existing zebra crossing on Syon Lane with a signalised crossing (aligned with the main pedestrian entrance to the hotel);
- potential contributions towards public transport facilities in the Borough...

4.3.55 Notwithstanding the relatively low PTAL rating of the site, the Transport Assessment demonstrates that the development will be in an accessible location that will encourage workers, guests and visitors to utilise sustainable travel choices.

4.18 With regards to new employment opportunities, the applicant suggests that the proposal would create approximately 1,880 new jobs through the business space development and 400 part time and full time jobs as part of the new hotel. This is discussed further at Issue 1.

4.19 With regards to the proposed public realm and landscaping, Paragraph 4.4.8 of the applicant’s Planning Statement states, “The current proposals seek to create new and exciting open spaces for both public and private use.” Paragraph 4.4.10 sets out that the new areas of open space will include:
4.20 With regards to the potential of the proposed development to secure planning obligations, the applicant envisages (i.e. should planning permission be granted subject to securing obligations by the prior completion of a Section106 deed) obligations in respect of (but not necessarily limited to) the following:

- Intended off-site highways works;
- Improvements to pedestrian facilities along the Great West Road and Syon Lane;
- Improvement works to the pedestrian subway providing access under the Great West Road;
- Public transport improvements;
- Commitments to implement Travel Plans;
- Employment initiatives directed at promoting and improving local employment opportunities;
- Possible off-site environmental improvement initiatives.

Officer recommendations with respect to such Section 106 obligations are set out later in this report.

The listed building consent application

4.21 This is the detailed element of the application. The applicant stresses that the listed building consent application “…only relates to the Gillette Building and other buildings and structures falling within its curtilage at the time of listing in 1980, which have themselves formed part of the land since before 1st July 1948.” A separate site plan is appended to the listed building consent application specifically identifying those buildings to which the application relates. Elsewhere the proposals should have regard to the setting of the listed buildings.

4.22 Within the applicant’s Design and Access Statement it is stated (at Page 38):

The submitted scheme advances proposals for the demolition of a number free-standing subsidiary buildings and structures across the site, in addition to the northward extensions to the original west and east wings of the main building, the north wing linking the extended west and east wings, and the original, single-storey, working area contained behind the front block and between the original west and east wings. It is considered that only those free-standing buildings and structures which are located within the curtilage of the Gillette Building as it was at the time of listing in 1980 and which were constructed before 1948, may be considered as sharing in the listed status of the main building. Accordingly, justification is not required for the demolition of those
other buildings and structures falling outside the curtilage of the Gillette Building at the time of listing, or those buildings and structures within that curtilage constructed since 1948.

The individual buildings and structures include the following:
- The substantially original, but very utilitarian, covered car-parking shed and garages at the west end of the site adjacent to the boundary wall.
- The substantially altered and very utilitarian, twin-gabled, factory shed towards the north end of the site, with a two-storey brick frontage building to Harlequin Avenue, which, it is believed pre-dates the construction of the Gillette Building.

The parallel Statement of significance has concluded that neither of these buildings possesses any intrinsic architectural or historical significance nor contribute to the setting of the principle building. Accordingly, subject to their replacement with new development that will serve to ‘preserve’ the setting of the specifically listed principal building, it is considered that the proposed demolition of these buildings may be regarded as acceptable in conservation terms.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Letters of consultation dated either 1st or 2nd August 2006 have been sent to the following owners/occupiers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-9 (consecutive)</td>
<td>Amalgamated Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-89 (consecutive)</td>
<td>Braybourne Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-17 (consecutive)</td>
<td>Crowntree Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrods Ltd</td>
<td>Grant Way – Centaurs Business Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1 (Mace Supermarket), 6 (Sky Subscribers Services Ltd) and 7 (British Sky Broadcasting Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Westminster Bank</td>
<td>Great West Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comet Plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syon Hill Garage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 766-882 (even)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 863, 863A, 865C, 867, 869, 871, 879, 881, 883, 885, 891 (Adini), 891A, 924 (Gillette), 931 and 941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 971 (Carpet Right Plc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 971 (Currys Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (Carillion Building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (Tarmac International Transglo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (Tarmac Construction Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (Tarmac Management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (West Link House, George Wimpey &amp; Co Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (West Link House, Pasco International)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (West Link House, Schal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 981 (West Link House, T B V Power)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great West House (Pet Plan Group Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarage of St. Francis of Assisi</td>
<td>Harlequin Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socomit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dale &amp; Stepsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford Bearings Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 2 (Chimera Design Ltd) and 4 (Gillette)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avro House (Roman Crest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastion House (Hydro Pneumatic Services Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-36 (consecutive) and 38</td>
<td>Hexham Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 (Mace Ltd)</td>
<td>New Horizons Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 44</td>
<td>Northumberland Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1A, 1-12 (consecutive), 12A and 14-20 (consecutive)</td>
<td>Northumberland Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-12 (consecutive), 12A and 14-59 (consecutive)</td>
<td>Oaklands Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-5 (consecutive) and 7-23 (odd)</td>
<td>Rothbury Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opel Telecom</td>
<td>Ryan Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Amcor Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cross Centre 8 The Courtyard Drake Maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBL Wheelchair Ltd</td>
<td>Shield Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Print Factory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-3 (GBL Services), 2, 4-10 (consecutive), 11-13 (Hilti (GB) Ltd), 12, 14, 15, 17-21 (Vodafone Retail Ltd), 23, 25 and 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-53 (consecutive)</td>
<td>Stags Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and Units 8 and 11</td>
<td>Syon Gate Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebase Ltd</td>
<td>Syon Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco Stores Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 36-98 (even), 67, 100-124 (even), 128-140 (even), 141-151 (odd), 153-213 (even), 36A, 38A, 40A, 42A, 46A, 48A, 60A and 112A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-77 (consecutive), 79-101 (odd) and 2A</td>
<td>Syon Park Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 2-68 (even)</td>
<td>Warkworth Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Estate Management</td>
<td>West Cross Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1, 2 (BSkyB Ltd) and 6 (PC World)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.s 1-5 (Topnotch Health Ltd) and 6 (West Cross</td>
<td>Windsor Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Consultation letters were also sent to the following organisations/bodies:

- Ancient Monuments Society
- Brentford Chamber of Commerce
- Brentford Community Council
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)
- Council for British Archaeology
- English Heritage
- English Nature
- Environment Agency
- Feltham Police Station
- Georgian Group
- Greater London Authority
- Green Corridor
- Learning & Skills Council
- London Borough of Ealing
- Osterley and Wyke Green Residents Association
- Metropolitan Police
- Society for the Protection Ancient Buildings
- Thames Water
- Transport for London (TfL)
- Twentieth Century Society
- Victorian Society
- West London Business

5.3 Notices advertising the applications were placed in the Hounslow and Feltham Chronicle dated 10 August 2006.

5.4 Site notices in respect of major/significant development and works to a listed building were posted, dated 15 August 2006.

5.5 The following comments have been received:

**Ancient Monuments Society**

5.6 The Ancient Monuments Society has no objection, writing: “We have no adverse observations to offer but we defer to the Twentieth Century Society”.

**Brentford Community Council (BCC)**

5.7 The BCC whilst “…very impressed by the quality of the proposals, both relating to the restoration of the original building and the proposal for new work” has the following reservations:

- About the delivery of the proposed offices, with comment that “…the consent should define the servicing, layout, landscape and the height of all the buildings and the phasing”;

| News) | No.s 1-20 (consecutive) | Wyke Close |
• That the offices appear to be on back land, with comment that “…The access to the office complex should be on the west side of the site having its own frontage”; and
• With regards to Section 106 contributions, with calls for obligations (i) to make the A4 crossing safer and more attractive for pedestrians; (ii) to “…improve public transport and to extend the shuttle service operated by Sky to serve all the local stations and Brentford town centre and to make the service available to the public”; and (iii) towards “…re-opening the rail line to the north of the site and to providing a passenger station”.
• About the extent of the proposed parking and traffic flows, with comment “We…remain unconvinced that the additional building on these two sites plus the re-use of vacated offices will not generate excessive traffic”.

5.8 Similar comments have been made on the BSkyB proposal, as detailed elsewhere on the agenda.

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)

5.9 CABE are unable to comment on this scheme, writing “(Please note that this literally means ‘no comment’ and should not be interpreted as tacit endorsement of the scheme).”

English Heritage

5.10 English Heritage do not wish to offer any comments on either application, in relation to historic building and historic area matters, advising that the applications should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the Council’s specialist conservation advice.

Environment Agency (EA)

5.11 The EA objected to the proposed development (by letter dated 31 August 2006) for reason that the Surface Water Flood Risk Assessment is not acceptable: the surface water discharge rate has not been restricted to the Greenfield rate; 1 in 100 year on-site attenuation has not been provided; and the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage solutions has not been employed.

5.12 Following the submission of a Surface Water Floor Risk Assessment, the EA maintains its objection, stating (by letter dated 3 November 2006), “…the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) has not been maximised on site” and that “The Surface Water Strategy should be amended to maximise use of the most sustainable SUDS techniques, with any barriers to their use clearly justified”.

5.13 The applicant advises that further information shall be submitted to the Environment Agency.

Greater London Authority

5.14 The Greater London Authority (GLA) acknowledged (by letter dated 3 August 2006) that consultation received 3 August 2006.
5.15 This application and the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda are to be reported to the next Mayor's meeting (10 January 2007) for the Mayor's formal consideration. This matter will be reported on in an addendum if the GLA reports and the Mayor's formal views have been made available to the Council prior to the Committee.

London Borough of Ealing

5.16 The London Borough of Ealing objects to the proposal on grounds of harm to its road network and, should the application be approved, would wish to discuss benefits from a Section 106 Legal Agreement that may assist in mitigating impacts on “…the already congested Tentelow Lane (A4127) and Windmill Lane, which are under the jurisdiction of the London Borough of Ealing”.

5.17 It is not considered that the proposal would result in a harmful impact on the London Borough of Ealing's road network (traffic, parking and transport issues (including whether the scheme can be accommodated in terms of access and public transport) are addressed below at Issue 2).

Metropolitan Police

5.18 The Crime Prevention Office/Crime Prevention Design Advisor, Hounslow Borough Police commented (by letter dated 22 August 2006), “Due to the growing impact of car parks on vehicle crime, I would hope that the development's car park achieves the Safer parking Award”.

5.19 Further comment has been received (by letter dated 15 November 2006) that if CCTV were to be installed for the adjacent subway under the A4 it would be most effective if this could be relayed to the hotel security who could monitor this area as part of their duties and inform the Police of any incidents. Further, that “…a lot of the details…have yet to be decided…The mixed use of the site need not impact negatively on crime or public safety, however, without more detailed information, I cannot comment further.”

5.20 As detailed elsewhere on the agenda, BSkyB are offering to install CCTV for the subway and monitor it.

Thames Water

The planning application for a business-led mixed-use development:

5.21 Thames Water is concerned about the surface water discharge from the site and advises that it must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.

5.22 In stating that the existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development, Thames Water recommends the imposition of a restrictive condition as follows:

\[\text{Development should not be commenced until: Impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water). The studies}\]
should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point. Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with this additional demand.

The listed building consent application:

5.23 Thames Water has no objection with regard to sewerage infrastructure or water infrastructure. Thames Water notes that it has an easement to a foul sewer to the north of the site and will seek assurances that this will not be affected by the proposed development.

Twentieth Century Society

5.24 The Twentieth Century Society has “…been closely involved in pre-planning discussions with the applicant and…have had a chance to comment on the proposals from an early stage”. The Society is “…pleased with the outcome of this dialogue and do not wish to object to the scheme.”

West London Business

5.25 West London Business (WLB) supports the scheme for the following reasons:

- The WLB led Economic Development Strategy states that there is a need to ensure that there is sufficient development land of the right quality to meet the investment needs of West London. The high quality flexible business accommodation matches this objective...
- The Economic Development Strategy encourages mix use developments, and encourages sustainable development of appropriate strategic sites. The scheme provides an opportunity to develop the manufacturing heritage associated with the site, whilst meeting current business needs. …sustainable measures… An improvement of pedestrian facilities and a contribution towards improving public transport facilities within the borough will increase access to the area.
- …will be a boost for business within the West London sub-region. …WLB can ensure that other companies are aware of the plans…[and] promote the business space...
- The tourism industry has been recognised as a key growth sector for West London...
- …allow for the retention of the Grade II listed Gillette building….

Owners/occupiers

5.26 Four resident objections have been received and are summarised/reproduced in part below:

- There would be an extra 50 parking spaces.
- There would be an increase in traffic and resultant congestion, with associated health impact (e.g. dust).
- There are no plans to alter or improve the junction of Syon Lane and the Great West Road.
- Cumulative impact of this proposal with others (GSK, Wallis House, Brunel, the BSkyB proposal and the Campion House proposal)
What improvements will there be to public transport? Comment that there is limited public transport and that an “…aerial elevated tram service – mono-rail & bridges across Syon Lane & the Great West Road might answer your brave new world problem”.

“On a separate matter I believe Gillette own a site used for car parking adjacent to the Wyke Green Golf Club on Syon Lane, which does not appear to be included in this application. Has any application been made for this site?”

Question about consultation and “…who decides Syon Lane residents future?”

Question about remediation/the suitability of the building for re-use with reference, for example, to “…hydrogen gas tanks…”

Call for a residential estate instead.

Harrods Limited

5.27 Harrods Limited have sought (by letter dated 7 August 2006) to lodge a holding objection “…to take some time to review the plans prior to making a considered response”. They state, “Harrods Limited has a substantial warehouse on this business park and therefore has a vested interest in its future development.”

Standard Life Investments

5.28 Standard Life Investments have sought (by letter dated 5 September 2006) to lodge a holding objection pending further review of the application documents and drawings.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)

5.29 The LFEPA advises (by letter dated 28 November 2006) that “The Brigade is satisfied with the proposals, subject to agreement from the developers to the installation of additional Fire Hydrants at locations to be agreed in future consultation with our Water Office”.

Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee (Planning)

5.30 The applications were presented to the 9 November 2006 meeting of the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee (Planning) (IBAC). Minutes are reproduced below:

Members commented as follows:

* Members requested assurances that this building was listed and would therefore be safeguarded against the fate of the former Firestone building.
* Members supported the retention of employment on the site and the sympathetic design in respect of the listed building element.
* Members noted concerns on the development’s impact on local traffic, particularly with respect to pedestrians and cyclists and highlighted the cumulative impact of this scheme and the proposed BSkyB development. Officers were asked to submit details of the anticipated S106 contributions in the Heads of Terms when the application was submitted to SDC.
* Members highlighted the possibilities of generating S106 funding towards local infrastructure improvements from this combined development site
when seen in comparison to the smaller GSK development further along the Great West Road and requested that this be taken into consideration when entering into negotiations.

* Members acknowledged that the estimated number of employees for the hotel would be similar in number to the full time maximum staffing at Gillette.

* Members noted concerns that the proposed rear elevation and middle passage would detract from the visual amenity of the listed element as a result of their excessive height. It was acknowledged that the Conservation Officer was involved in consultation on the building design.

* Members asked for further clarification on the viability of Brentford Community Council's suggestion to re-open of the railway line to the north of the site (5.7 of the report), whether there would be a courtesy coach to and from Heathrow Airport and whether any plans were anticipated for the renaming of the building or the site when complete.

* Members agreed that the S106 negotiations should include access improvements to Syon Lane rail station in addition to improvements to local sports facilities in relation to local open space enhancements.

* Members accepted that the details of what would power the CHP plant and of the type of showers in guest bedrooms would be considered at a later stage in the application process.

* Members acknowledged that the developers had submitted details for the siting, access and design of the industrial units on site, including the number of storeys and the proposed floorspace measurements.

6.0 **PLANNING POLICY**

**NATIONAL AND STRATEGIC PLANNING POLICIES**

6.1 The relevant national planning policies are:

- PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPG4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms
- PPS6: Planning for Town Centres
- PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- PPS12: Local Development Frameworks
- PPG13: Transport
- PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment
- PPG16: Archaeology and Planning
- PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- PPS22: Renewable Energy
- PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control
- PPG24: Planning and Noise
- PPS25: Development and Flood Risk

6.2 The Circulars of relevance to this planning application are:

- 11/95: Use of Planning Conditions in Planning Permission
- 05/05: Planning Obligations
- 01/01: Arrangements for handling heritage communications – Notification and directions by the Secretary of State
UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

6.3 Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Hounslow is The London Plan Spatial Strategy for Greater London (London Plan) adopted by the Mayor in February 2004 and the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in December 2003, with material considerations including planning policy statements and planning policy guidance already discussed.

Relevant policies of the London Plan

6.4 The following London Plan policies are of relevance to the applications:

The Mayor’s Objectives

I.1 The Mayor’s Objectives

The Overall Strategy

2A.1 Sustainability criteria
2A.6 Spatial strategy for suburbs
2A.7 Strategic Employment Locations

Living in London Policies

3A.14 Addressing the needs of London’s diverse population
3A.15 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities
3A.20 Health impacts
3B.1 Developing London’s economy
3B.2 Office demand and supply
3B.3 Office provision
3B.5 Strategic Employment Locations
3B.10 Tourism industry
3B.12 Improving the skills and employment opportunities for Londoners

Connecting London Policies – Improving Travel in London

3C.1 Integrating transport and development
3C.2 Matching development to transport capacity
3C.3 Sustainable transport in London
3C.9 Increasing the capacity, quality and integration of public transport to meet London’s needs
3C.22 Parking strategy

Enjoying London Policies

3D.6 Visitors accommodation and facilities
3D.7 Realising the value of open space
3D.9 Metropolitan Open Land
3D.10 Open space provision in UDPs
3D.11 Open space strategies
3D.12 Biodiversity and nature conservation
London’s Metabolism Policies: Using and Managing Natural Resources

4A.4  Better use of aggregates
4A.6  Improving air quality
4A.7  Energy efficiency and renewable energy
4A.8  Energy assessment
4A.9  Providing for renewable energy
4A.11  Water supplies
4A.12  Water quality
4A.13  Water and sewerage infrastructure
4A.14  Reducing noise

Designs on London Policies
4B.1  Design principles for a compact city
4B.2  Promoting world-class architecture and design
4B.3  Maximising the potential of sites
4B.4  Enhancing the quality of the public realm
4B.5  Creating an inclusive environment
4B.6  Sustainable design and construction
4B.7  Respect local context and communities
4B.8  Tall buildings – location
4B.9  Large-scale buildings – design and impact
4B.10  London’s built heritage
4B.11  Heritage conservation
4B.12  Historic conservation-led regeneration
4B.14  Archaeology
4B.15  London View Protection Framework
4B.16  View management plans
4B.17  Assessing development impact on designated views

West London Sub-Regions Policies
5D.1  The strategic priorities for West London

Delivering the Vision Policies
6A.4  Priorities in planning obligations
6A.5  Planning obligations

6.5 Some of the London Plan policies listed above at Paragraph 6.24 are summarised below.

6.6 All policies in the London Plan promote sustainable development (p. 38). Policy 2A.1 sets out the criteria that guides the approach to development. Criteria include that development should optimise the use of previously developed land and vacant or underused buildings; use a design-led approach to optimise the potential of sites; occur in locations that are currently, or planned to be, accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and that are accessible to town centres, employment, housing, shops and services; and take account of (i) the capacity of infrastructure, (ii) the physical constraints on the development of the land and (iii) the impact upon natural resources, environmental and cultural assets and the health of local people.

6.7 Policy 3C.22 seeks to ensure that on-site car parking at new developments is the minimum necessary and that there is no over-provision that could
undermine the use of more sustainable non-car modes. It states that the only exception to this approach will be to ensure that developments are accessible for disabled people.

6.8 The London Plan states that London’s open space includes both spaces that are private and those that are accessible to the public.

6.9 Ensuring that developments maximise the potential of the site; are accessible, usable and permeable for all users; are safe for occupants and passers-by; and respect local context, character and communities are amongst the principles of design for a compact city set out at Policy 4B.1.

6.10 Policy 4B.3 seeks the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, the design principles in Policy 4B.1 and with public transport capacity, and provides a density location and parking matrix.

6.11 Policy 4B.5 requires that all future development meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion and Policy 4B.6 that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction are met. It states, for example, that sustainable design and construction will include measures to conserve energy, materials, water and other resources; and reduce the impacts of noise, pollution, flooding and micro-climate.

6.12 Policy 4B.7 calls for Boroughs to work with local communities to ensure proposed developments preserve or enhance local social, physical, cultural, historical, environmental and economic characteristics.

6.13 Policy 4B.11 calls for Boroughs to identify areas, spaces and buildings of special quality or character and adopt policies for their protection and the identification of opportunities for their enhancement, taking into account the strategic London context; and encourage and facilitate inclusive solutions to providing access for all, to and within the historic environment.

6.14 Annex 2 of the London Plan identifies Strategic Employment Locations with Table A2.2 setting out Industrial Business Parks including "13 Great Western Road (part)".

Relevant policies of the UDP

6.15 The following UDP policies are of relevance to the applications.

**Implementation Policies**

IMP 1.1 Integrating patterns of land use and the provision of transport
IMP 1.2 The re-use and recycling of urban land and buildings
IMP 2.1A Regeneration and enhancement of town centres
IMP 3.1 Brentford Regeneration Area
IMP 4.1 Primary locations for economic development
IMP 4.2 The Great West Road
IMP 5.1 High quality building and urban design
IMP 6.1 Planning Obligations

**Natural Environment Policies**

ENV-N.1.5 Protection of Metropolitan Open Land
ENPV-N.1.7 Development near the Metropolitan Open Land boundary
ENPV-N.1.10 Provision of new local open space
ENPV-N.1.11 Protection and improvement of local open space
ENPV-N.1.12 Retention of playing fields
ENPV-N.1.16 Historic parks and gardens
ENPV-N.2.3 Promotion of nature conservation management
ENPV-N.2.3A Species protection
ENPV-N.2.4 Habitat protection
ENPV-N.2.5 Habitat reconstruction
ENPV-N.2.6 Landscape features
ENPV-N.2.7 Trees and community woodlands
ENPV-N.2.8 Tree Preservation Orders

Built Environment Policies
ENPV-B.1.1 New Development
ENPV-B.1.2 High buildings or structures affecting sensitive areas
ENPV-B.1.3 High buildings in areas other than those listed in ENV-B.1.2
ENPV-B.1.5 Environmental improvements
ENPV-B.1.6 Public art
ENPV-B.1.8 Access and facilities for people with disabilities
ENPV-B.1.9 Safety and security
ENPV-B.2.2 Conservation areas
ENPV-B.2.3 Reuse of redundant historic buildings
ENPV-B.2.4 Demolition of listed buildings
ENPV-B.2.5 Development affecting the setting of a listed building
ENPV-B.2.6 Identification and protection of buildings of local townscape character
ENPV-B.2.7 Alterations to listed buildings and buildings of local townscape character
ENPV-B.2.8 Views and landmarks
ENPV-B.3.2 Sites of archaeological importance

Environmental Protection Policies
ENPV-P.1.1 Environmental sustainability: environmental impact statements and sustainability checklist
ENPV-P.1.2 Water pollution and water quality
ENPV-P.1.3 Surface water run off
ENPV-P.1.4 Waste water management
ENPV-P.1.5 Noise pollution
ENPV-P.1.6 Air pollution
ENPV-P.1.7 Light pollution
ENPV-P.1.8 Development proposals on or near contaminated land
ENPV-P.2.1 Waste management
ENPV-P.2.4 Recycling facilities in new developments
ENPV-P.2.5 Energy and resource efficiency
ENPV-P.2.6 Renewable energy

Employment Policies
ENPV-E.1.1 Location of new employment development
ENPV-E.1.2 Locations for business (B1) use
ENPV-E.1.5 Development involving loss of or changes in employment uses
ENPV-E.2.1 Environmental criteria
ENPV-E.2.2 Mixed uses
Improvement of employment sites
Disabled access
Local residents
Childcare facilities
Visitor accommodation

Community and Leisure Policies
Educational facilities
New or extended health facilities
Facilities for young children
Physical access to social and community facilities
Outdoor recreation
New small private sports and leisure facilities
Provision of new arts, cultural, entertainment and library

Shopping Policies
Main shopping areas
New retail development
Shop front design
Advertisements
Access to shopping facilities

Transport Policies
The location of development
The movement implications of development
Development affecting public transport services
Car and cycle parking and servicing facilities for developments
Pedestrian access
Pedestrian safety and security
Strategic and local cycle networks
Public transport infrastructure
Safety of public transport
Improvements sensitive to particular uses
Oppose overall increases in highway capacity for private vehicle and seeks reduction in traffic levels.
Traffic implications of new development
Road safety
On-street parking
Air quality implications of traffic
Reducing traffic nuisance in residential areas
Vehicle crossovers and hardstandings

SELs are not identified in the UDP. The UDP identifies proposal sites. The Gillette site is within the western extent of the "Great West Road Employment Area", which is referenced as "E10" both in the UDP Proposals Schedule and on the UDP Proposals Map (Map 3). The proposal (see page 225 of the UDP) reads "Key Employment Location. Area designated as suitable for flexible B1 uses and appropriate development of large free standing high quality office buildings". The comment then reads, "Development of sites should have regard to relevant planning briefs and the Great West Road Strategy."

The site is within the wider Brentford Regeneration Area (UDP Proposals Map (Map 3)) – for which UDP Objective IMP.3 and Policy IMP.3.1 (Brentford
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Regeneration Area) are relevant.

**Local Development Framework**

6.18 The Brentford Area Action Plan (BAAP) and Employment Development Plan Document (Employment DPD) form part of the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF), which will eventually replace the Unitary Development Plan. These are prioritised in the Council's Local Development Scheme, a project plan that sets out the documents to be included in the overall framework. For each document it provides information about timescales and when the public will be formally involved.

6.19 The last stage of consultation on the BAAP and Employment DPD in January 2006 outlined the Council's Preferred Options.

6.20 Under the BAAP (Preferred Options) the site is identified as Preferred Proposal Site BE1 – as an employment proposal site – where the preference is for B1(b) use, B1(c) use, high value B2 use and potentially an element of offices.

6.21 The Proposals Schedule of the BAAP (Preferred Options) states that the preferred use of the site would be:

| A use or variety of uses compatible with the designation of the site as a Strategic Employment Location. This could include B1(b), B1(c) and high value B2 activities and potentially an element of offices. Whilst there is an existing office use, the site is not ideal for these purposes due to its poor public transport accessibility. The amount of improvements necessary would be dependant on the nature and scale of the office use proposed. Whilst small scale, ‘walk to’ facilities such as a shop, café or nursery would all be considered as appropriate uses serving the needs of people working in the area, a proposal, which introduced other uses eg. other employment or training/higher education would need to prove that it would not compromise the industrial offer of the wider area and that it was in accordance with other development plan policies, specifically with regard to location and access and overall economic regeneration. |

6.22 The Proposals Schedule of the BAAP (Preferred Options) states that the key issues with regards to the site are:

| Policies seek to retain and enhance the listed building as well as maintain appropriate employment uses. The site currently has poor public transport accessibility and as such is suited to low trip generating development. High trip generating development would only be suitable if access by public transport could be substantially improved. Any new use or redevelopment should result in positive impacts on the SEL and the area as a whole. |

6.23 Under the Employment DPD (Preferred Options) the site is identified within the Great West Road Industrial Business Park in accordance with Policies 2A.7 and 3B.5 including Annex 2 of the London Plan.

6.24 It is not expected that the BAAP and Employment DPD will be adopted until 2008.
PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 This application raises a series of detailed issues for the Council and it is important that they are considered in a logical sequence. The key issues and topics to be addressed can be identified as follows:

1. Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable? Is it an appropriate location for a high trip generating use? Does the development support or undermine economic regeneration and employment objectives? Is the re-use of, and are the extensions to, the listed building acceptable, including the proposal for demolition?
2. Traffic, parking and transport issues (including whether the scheme can be accommodated in terms of access and public transport and whether the proposed parking provision is appropriate)
3. If a sound case can be made for the development would the details of the scheme be satisfactory? Is the site appropriate for high buildings? Is the scale of the development acceptable in relation to the surrounding environment?
4. Is the proposed development acceptable in environmental terms (noise, air quality, flood risk, wind and contamination) and with regards to archaeological and cultural heritage?
5. Are sustainable building principles applied?
6. Is the balance of community benefits appropriate to mitigate the impact of the development?

**ISSUE 1: Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable? Is it an appropriate location for a high trip generating use? Does the development support or undermine economic regeneration and employment objectives? Is the re-use of, and are the extensions to, the listed building acceptable (including the proposal for demolition)?**

**Issue 1(a): Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable? Is it an appropriate location for a high trip generating use? Does the development support or undermine economic regeneration and employment objectives?**

7.2 This section provides a summary of the planning policy assessment framework and then the applicant’s case before presenting Officers’ comments. The summary of Officers’ comments then concludes that the principle of the proposed development on the site is acceptable subject to (i) securing the delivery of the mixed-use scheme especially in terms of the business component; and (ii) ensuring high levels of public transport accessibility and a high quality design and environment.
Planning policy assessment framework

7.3 PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development), UDP Objective IMP.1 and UDP Policy IMP.1.2 encourage the beneficial reuse of previously developed land and buildings, where this is appropriate and sustainable (e.g. subject to ensuring high levels of public transport accessibility and a high quality design and environment). This approach is also laid out in London Plan Policy 4B.1, with the requirement to ensure that all development is readily accessible by sustainable modes also strongly expressed in UDP Policies IMP.1.1, T.1.1, E.1.1 and ENV-B.1.1.

7.4 UDP Objective IMP.3 promotes area regeneration, particularly in areas of the Borough that require physical improvement and the enhancement of the quality of life, housing and employment opportunities for local people.

7.5 UDP Policy IMP.3.1 is concerned with the Brentford Regeneration Area. It states that the Council will support and encourage regeneration of the physical environment and improvements to the local economy in order to achieve wider social and community benefits. Primary objectives include “(i) the maintenance and support of existing business whilst focusing on the creation of new jobs and encouraging new investment”.

7.6 The regeneration of the Brentford area is seen as a priority as reflected in the BAAP, which will establish a framework for future development, having been given priority in the preparation of the Borough’s LDF (see Section 6.0 above).

7.7 UDP Policy IMP.1.1 states that a sequential test will be applied to the location of all major trip-generating developments. The requirement for a sequential test to be applied is also laid out in UDP Policies IMP.4.1, E.1.1 and E.1.2, which are discussed in turn below.

7.8 In locating economic development, UDP Policy IMP.4.1 seeks to direct new major, trip generating economic development to the Borough’s town centres, followed by edge of town centres and, “In the event that suitable sites are not available within town centres”, states that new economic development that generates a high number of trips should be concentrated within specific development nodes, including the Great West Road.

7.9 UDP Policy E.1.1, concerned with the location of new employment development, reads (in part):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New employment development should be located in accordance with the Council’s framework for development and regeneration set out in the Implementation Chapter of the UDP. When considering new employment proposals the Council will encourage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Patterns of land-use which contribute to urban regeneration and the reuse of previously developed land;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) A sequential test approach to all major trip generating developments…both to enhance the role of existing centres and to encourage more sustainable patterns of travel;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) development in the key employment locations, namely the Great West Road…where economic development cannot be accommodated in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existing centres or edge of town centre locations, provided that such areas are or can be made accessible by a wide choice of transport modes, in particular on foot, by bicycle or by public transport (See Policies IMP.1.1 and IMP.4.1);

(iv) only limited extensions to or redevelopment of existing major trip generating employment uses that are not located in or on the edge of a town centre or within a key employment location;

(v) development of other sites allocated for appropriate employment uses in the Proposals Schedule and shown on the Proposals Map;

(vi) a diverse range of employment opportunities, both in type and size, which are accessible and sustainable within the Borough.

7.10 UDP Policy E.1.2, concerned with locations for business (B1) use, states (in part):

In the event that suitable sites are not available within or on the edge of town centres, new B1 developments which generate a high number of trips should be concentrated within the Great West Road, Chiswick Business Park and Bedfont Lakes…

7.11 These policies are in accordance with PPS6 (Planning for Town Centres), which defines:

- offices, both commercial and those of public bodies; and
- arts, culture and tourism (theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels, and conference facilities)

as amongst the main town centre uses to which the policy statement applies.

7.12 UDP Policy E.1.5 is concerned with development involving loss of or changes in employment uses. It sets out that redevelopment that would result in the loss of high trip generating uses in key employment locations will not be permitted, and that mixed use sites including employment uses are normally required to retain a reasonable proportion of Class B uses. The policy goes on to state that changes of use from employment generating uses will not be permitted within proposal sites. Employment generating uses are defined within the policy to include those outside Class B “…for example the retail and services sector (Class A) and hotels”.

7.13 UDP Policy IMP.4.2 is referred to within UDP Policy E.1.5 and encourages business uses, including high quality offices, along the Great West Road in order to ensure that it continues to be a prime employment area. Criteria to be taken into account under UDP Policy IMP.4.2 include the contribution which the development makes to the accessibility of the area by non car modes and the impact on traffic congestion, air quality and the local highway network; the contribution the development makes to the competitiveness and regeneration of economic activity of this identified development node in West London; the visual appearance of the building and its contribution to improving urban design in the area; the effect on adjoining residential areas and on sensitive areas; and the contribution the development can make to enhancing the role of the Great West Road as London's primary 'Gateway'.
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7.14 UDP Policy E.5.1 is also of relevance, stating that proposals for new hotels will be viewed positively provided that:

(i) the proposal accords with other Council policies, particularly Environment (ENV-B.1.1 and ENV-B.2.1 to ENV-B.2.7), Employment (E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4 and E.1.5) and Housing (H.3.1 and H.7.4);
(ii) large scale accommodation (greater than 1000 sq.m) is well placed in terms of access by a wide choice of transport modes and to Heathrow, Central London, local visitor attractions and businesses by public transport;
(iii) the density of schemes is sympathetic in design terms to the surrounding area;
(iv) there is no significant disturbance to the neighbouring area in terms of traffic and parking, and if necessary, off-street car and/or coach parking is provided as part of the development;
(v) all new developments and extensions to existing buildings are accessible to people with disabilities;
(vi) new accommodation facilities should be registered with the London Tourist Board;
(vii) consideration be given for pick up and set down facilities for coach and taxis as part of the overall design of the scheme.

7.15 In the London Plan Policy 3D.6 is concerned with visitors accommodation and facilities. It sets out (in part), “The Mayor will work with strategic partners to implement London’s Tourism Strategy and to achieve 36,000 additional hotel bedrooms by 2016 and to improve the quality, variety and distribution of visitor accommodation and facilities”, but does not state that a sequential approach need be applied to site selection.

The proposal – the applicant’s case

7.16 In summary, the case being made by the applicant is that:

- the site is a currently developed urban employment site that is allocated within adopted and emerging policies for employment use;
- there is a clear need to ensure the comprehensive regeneration of the site following Gillette’s relocation by bringing this important gateway site back into employment use;
- there are no suitable or available sequentially available sites and the Gillette Corner site provides the most appropriate location for the scale of business floorspace proposed;
- there is a significant need for new hotel accommodation within Hounslow and the wider Western London Sub-Region:
  (i) e.g. the Hotel Demand Study (June 2006) identifies a predicted growth in business tourists, with forecasts carried out in 2001 projecting a growth in all business tourism trips of 39% by 2011; and
  (ii) e.g. “Even following the completion of the hotel at Gillette Corner there will be additional need for further hotel development within the Borough” (Paragraph 4.3.53 of the applicant’s Planning Statement)
- the proposed hotel is specifically designed to cater for the business tourism market (e.g. at Page 3 of the applicant’s Marketing Report it is stated that the hotel and business component would be “mutually
complementary”) and ideally placed to respond to the projected growth in this sector of the tourism industry;

- a further benefit of providing a hotel as part of the redevelopment is the opportunity to retain and make significant improvements to the Gillette Building;

- other uses/facilities (conferencing and meeting facilities, restaurant and bar areas, gym facility and café) will act only as ancillary or secondary uses;

- it is not considered that there will be any direct impact upon the vitality or viability of Brentford Town Centre or any other town centres within the Borough; and

- it is proposed to undertake a number of improvements to both pedestrian and public transport in the area.

The proposal – Officers’ comments

7.17 The proposal constitutes brownfield development and the re-use of the Gillette Building would help bring the listed building back to beneficial life and good repair subject to the proposal preserving (if not enhancing) the building, the features of special architectural/historic interest which it possesses, and its setting – matters that are discussed below at Issue 1(b) and Issue 3.

7.18 The applicant was requested to submit evidence that the sequential approach has been applied in respect of the proposed hotel in accordance with UDP Policies IMP.1.1, E.5.1, E.1.1 and PPS6; the applicant was asked in doing so to assess the Syon Park site. The information that the applicant has submitted (received under covering letter dated 20 November 2006) assesses the proposed hotel in light of planning permission 00707/E/P93 granted in March 2004 for a hotel at Syon Park, London Road1. The assessment is that the Syon Park site is not available, suitable or viable for the provision of a new hotel in accordance with the Bonnington Group’s business model.

7.19 Furthermore, the purpose of the application is to provide a mixed-use development of which the hotel element, an employment use in its own right, would ensure the restoration of the listed Gillette Building.

7.20 The view of Officers is that the scheme is acceptable in this location when assessed against UDP Policies:

(i) having regard to the applicant’s statement that the hotel and business component would be “mutually complementary”;

(ii) taking into account that the Bonnington plans anticipate the hotel opening in the summer of 2009 (based on planning approval being granted by the end of 2006) with the completion of the remainder of the site being developed concurrently;

(iii) noting that the scale of the proposed business component could not be accommodated within the Borough’s existing town centres (due to their

1 Erection of a 155 bed hotel & health spa, covered walkway, glass house, creation of service access from London Road, the reinstatement of the historic landscape at Syon Park including formal and informal landscaping reconfiguration of car parking and garden centre storage areas and demolition of various buildings.
capacity) and their role and function within the hierarchy of town centres in the London Plan (Policy 2A.5 and Annex 1); and

(iv) given that it is not the intention of PPS6 to seek the arbitrary sub-
division of proposals (see Paragraph 3.18 of PPS6).

7.21 As it is accepted that the site is the most preferable location for the proposed hotel with its emphasis on business tourism as part of a mixed-use site, then the delivery of the business component must to be secured on the grant of any planning permission by the prior completion of a Section 106 deed, for without the business component (i.e. synergy) there would be less justification for a hotel here.

7.22 UDP Policy E.5.1 also requires that the proposed hotel be well placed in terms of access by a wide choice of transport modes; that there is no significant disturbance to the neighbouring area in terms of traffic and parking; and that consideration be given for pick up and set down facilities.

7.23 Similarly, and accepting that the site is sequentially the most preferable location for the business-led mixed-use development being proposed, Class B1 uses would be consistent with UDP Policies E.1.1, E.1.2, IMP.4.1 and IMP.4.2 provided that the applicant demonstrates that sustainability objectives can be achieved, particularly in terms of the accessibility of the site.

7.24 In relation to the BAAP (Preferred Options) (see Section 6.0 above), the (re)development of this site for a business-led mixed-use development would seem acceptable subject to careful consideration in particular of transport considerations.

7.25 In relation to the Employment DPD (Preferred Options) (see Section 6.0 above) Members should note that the glossary of the London Plan defines Industrial Business Parks as:

| Strategic employment location designed to accommodate general industrial, light industrial and research and development uses that require a higher quality environment and less heavy goods than a PIL. They can be accommodated next to environmentally sensitive uses. |

and that PIL is an abbreviation for ‘Preferred Industrial Location’ (the other type of Strategic Employment Location), defined as “…normally suitable for general industrial, light industrial and warehousing uses”.

7.26 Officers are in discussions with the GLA about the identification of Strategic Employment Locations in the emerging LDF.

7.27 For the purpose of determining the application for planning permission Members should note that, in the context of both existing and emerging policy, the suitability of the site for the uses proposed is linked directly to the accessibility of the site. Traffic, parking and transport issues (including whether the scheme can be accommodated in terms of access and public transport) are addressed below at Issue 2. Suffice to note here that the site
has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL\(^2\)) of 2 (poor) and accessibility improvements would be required for the proposal to be in accordance with planning policy.

7.28 In the context of the policies discussed above, the proposed quantum of floorspace also needs consideration. A maximum of 86,140sq.m (GEA) is proposed, the breakdown of which is set out in the table below. The table also provides a breakdown of the existing 47,508sq.m of floorspace (GIA), using figures from the applicant’s Planning Statement based on information they were provided by Gillette.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Floorspace</th>
<th>Square metres (GIA)</th>
<th>Proposed Floorspace</th>
<th>Square metres (GEA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1a (Office)</td>
<td>18,887 (39.8%)</td>
<td>Flexible B1</td>
<td>47,000 (54.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (General industry)</td>
<td>23,141 (48.7%)</td>
<td>Hotel (C1)</td>
<td>38,940 (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 (Storage or distribution)</td>
<td>5,480 (11.5%)</td>
<td>Café (A3)</td>
<td>200 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,508</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.29 The table shows that there would be an absolute increase in B1 floorspace from 18,887sq.m to a maximum of 47,000sq.m (an increase of 28,113sq.m) and a relative increase in the proportion of B1 floorspace from 39.8% to 54.6% (an increase of 14.8%). The B2 and B8 uses would be lost. However, in terms of Use Class B floorspace the (maximum) 47,000sq.m proposed is comparable with the existing 47,508sq.m and is considered in accordance with the designation of the site in the UDP (as part of the E10 "Great West Road Employment Area" and a "Key Employment Location") (see Section 6.0 above).

7.30 In terms of jobs, the applicant anticipates that the new business floorspace will create up to 1,880 jobs, with the hotel employing a total of 400 part and full time staff ranging from management staff, catering, bar/restaurant staff and cleaners. The applicant also anticipates 15 staff would be employed in managing and operating the business campus. The following table (figures from the applicant) summarises the anticipated jobs to be created compared to the previous Gillette use. It shows that when Gillette was operating at full capacity in 2001 total staff numbered 1,250 (with 750 of those employed as office based staff), equivalent to 1,244 full-time workers (full-time equivalent). The proposal would therefore result in an increase in the number of job opportunities on the site.

\(^2\) PTAL is a measure of the accessibility of a point to the public transport network taking into account walk access time and service availability (i.e. rather than a measure of accessibility per se).
The Masterplan Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Gillette’s Company*</th>
<th>The Masterplan Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1(a), B1(b)</td>
<td>750 (all office B1(a) staff)</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2, B8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>1,244***</td>
<td>1,885****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Gillette employment figures from 2001 – when site was operating at full capacity
** Anticipated staff to employed in managing and operating business campus (i.e. security, café staff, estate management etc)
*** Gillette has indicated that at this time 10% of staff were part-time
**** Assumes 10% of staff will be part-time.

7.31 The applicant states (at Page 10 of the Planning Statement) that some temporary accommodation could be available when public transport is not available to hotel employees. With the supporting text for London Plan Policy 3D.6 stating, “…boroughs should seek arrangements to provide staff accommodation as part of hotel development…” Officers asked the applicant to provide further information. The information that the applicant has submitted sets out that the preference will be to recruit the majority of staff working at the hotel from the local area and as such the demand/need for on site accommodation is considered to be minimal (restricted to emergency overnight accommodation). The applicant states that spare rooms (likely to total around 50 rooms even when operating at typical capacity) will be made available for staff use as and when required and anticipates that the management of overnight accommodation for staff use will form part of a ‘Training and Employment Strategy’.

Summary of Officers’ comments

7.32 The proposal constitutes brownfield development and the re-use of the Gillette Building would help bring the listed building back to beneficial life and good repair subject to the proposal preserving (if not enhancing) the building, the features of special architectural/historic interest which it possesses, and its setting – matters that are discussed below at Issue 1(b) and Issue 3.

7.33 The proposal would not result in the loss of high trip generating employment use from this site (in that the B1 and hotel floorspace are high trip generating) and would present economic benefits, therefore helping to promote area regeneration within the Brentford Regeneration Area.

7.34 In summary, the view of Officers is that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable subject to:

- securing the delivery of the mixed-use scheme especially in terms of the business component; and
• with regards to the hotel and business component, ensuring high levels of public transport accessibility (discussed below at Issue 2) and a high quality design and environment (discussed below at Issue 3).

Issue 1(b): Is the re-use of, and are the extensions to, the listed building acceptable (including the proposal for demolition)?

7.35 The principle of the re-use of the listed building was discussed at Issue 1(a) above.

7.36 The proposals for retention, rehabilitation and (part) restoration of the Engineer’s House, of the front boundary wall along Syon Lane and its four Victorian cast-iron lamp standards and of the greater part of the boundary wall running down the north-west side of the site are welcomed.

7.37 It is not considered that the demolition works proposed would unduly harm the special architectural and historic character of the Grade II Listed Gillette Building – subject to the work being carried out with care and attention to detail, in accordance with the specification described by the applicant and subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions to cover such things as window replacement of window frames and glass.

7.38 The works proposed include the formation of a basement across the rear of the building, under and extending beyond the footprint of the new rear replacement wing and new service road. This would need to be carried out with due regard to preserving the integrity of the external walls of the original retained building.

7.39 Since the applications were presented to IBAC (see Section 5.0 above) drawings have been submitted in response to a request for further information about the pod proposed ‘behind’ the existing clock tower. That analysis shows that the pod would not be readily visible from the public highway given the perspective effect. Of note, the section submitted shows that a person standing in front (south) of the Gillette Building’s clock tower would need to be a distance of 120m away for the pod to be visible – assuming that there are no obstructions (such as the Shell petrol filling station on the opposite (southern) side of Syon Lane) in the viewer’s foreground to mask views. The area that might be in view would be stepped, and the effect of new backlighting to the tower that might result would be examined in more detail and controlled through conditions.

7.40 Since the applications were presented to IBAC Officers have also met with the applicant with regards to the design of the extensions to the east and west faces. Officers consider that the amendments now formally submitted (received 13 December 2006) satisfactorily address the concerns previously raised about the transition from ‘old’ (the original Gillette Building) to ‘new’ (the north wing) and in relation to the impact on short views.

7.41 Whilst the justification for the additional storey of the north wing is principally commercial it is considered that, assessed on balance, the works proposed (i.e. the replacement six-storey north rear wing which would project to the ends of the original building and so form visual extensions to the east and west elevations) would preserve the original building. By comparison with the existing extensions, and with the quality of materials, form and detailed design
proposed by the drawings, the building, it’s setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses would be enhanced. This would be subject to the work being carried out with care and attention to detail, in accordance with the specification described by the applicant and subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions.

7.42 Amongst the matters that would need to be secured by the imposition of condition/s and/or by the completion of a Section 106 deed would be the internal works proposed to the listed building and a management plan for the clock tower and its lighting.

7.43 In assessing the business component of the proposed development and, in particular, the impact of buildings A through F on the setting of the listed buildings (not only the Gillette Building but also those that adjoin the site) account needs to be taken that the proposal has been submitted in hybrid form, with the business component in outline (siting, design and access are to be considered, with appearance and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval).

7.44 The buildings proposed would be taller than the buildings that they would replace and would also be taller than the main Gillette Building excluding its clock tower. An assessment therefore needs to be made whether the site is an appropriate location for buildings A through F.

7.45 The Gillette Building is impressive in scale and acts as a landmark (see Paragraph 2.3 above). Although the reason for its angled siting along Syon Lane is not known, the result allows for the impressively long plinth building, a forecourt and a magnificent tower still quite close to the junction with the Great West Road.

7.46 That the proposal would involve an increase in the existing height of building on the site is considered acceptable in principle (i.e. given the Golden Mile location of the site), subject to an assessment of the siting and design of buildings A through F in relation to surroundings.

7.47 Hounslow’s high building policies (in particular, UDP Policy ENV-B.1.2) assess sensitive areas; this includes the setting of listed buildings.

7.48 The listed Bank building (not in the applicant’s ownership) relates strongly to the style and materials of the Gillette building, but is very small and is sited along the Great West Road. Although provided with a taller-than-necessary façade to the main block, its subsidiary wings of accommodation each side are small domestic scale, and at the rear is of much lesser impact and quality.

7.49 The National Westminster Bank is currently crowded adversely by the rear utilitarian parts of the Gillette subsidiary building/s. However the brickwork and modelling of the main buildings currently along the Great West Road help to provide a relationship, anchoring it to the perimeter. By contrast the replacement Building F would not relate in length, form or relative heights to the Gillette building or in particular to the Bank. At present there is insufficient detail to assess how much landscape setting and/or permeability would be possible amongst the roads, ramps and bunding between the Bank and Building F, or how much mitigation this would provide to the Bank’s isolation. The view of Officers is therefore that Building F, as proposed, would harm the setting of the National Westminster Bank.
Bank building. In this case, it is recommended that conditions be imposed to control the design (including modelling and height) of Building F to ensure a satisfactory relationship.

7.50 With regards to the remaining buildings (A through E), Officers are of the view – given their relative distance from the Great West Road and the screening effect that the Gillette Building and (an amended) Building F would afford them – that they would not cause undue harm subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions.

7.51 In summary, the re-use of, and the extensions to, the listed building are considered acceptable (including the proposal for demolition) – subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions on the grant of any planning permission and/or the prior completion of a Section 106 deed. This issue is discussed further at Issue 3 below.

**ISSUE 2: Traffic, parking and transport issues (including whether the scheme can be accommodated in terms of access and public transport and whether the proposed parking provision is appropriate)**

**Planning policy assessment framework**

7.52 Transport guidance puts much emphasis on the need for integration between transport modes with improvements to pedestrian, cycle, bus links to stations and taxi rank facilities being sought. Parking should be provided at a level that encourages alternative means of travel other than the private car. All developments should provide access for people with disabilities. When considering works to the highway, the safety of all users must be a priority (PPS1 and PPG13).

7.53 The Council’s parking standards (UDP Policy T.1.4 and Appendix 3) are considered to be the maximum desirable provision unless there are exceptional circumstances, with UDP policies (e.g. ENV-P.2.5) seeking to reduce the need to travel, reduce reliance on the private car and promote the use of sustainable modes.

7.54 London Plan Policy 3C.22 (Parking Strategy) similarly seeks to ensure that on-site car parking at new developments is the minimum necessary and that there is no over-provision that could undermine the use of more sustainable non-car modes.

**UDP standards**

7.55 For hotels, the parking standard specified in Appendix 3 of the UDP is as follows:

- **Minimum:** 1 space per 5 bedrooms plus 1 space per 25sq.m conference facilities plus 1 coach space per 200 bedrooms or part thereof.
- **Maximum:** 1 space per 2 bedrooms plus 1 space per 5sq.m conference facilities.

The comment reads, “The application of minimum and maximum standards will largely relate to the PTAL of the site and its anticipated use in relationship with adjoining land uses and occupiers.”
7.56 For B1 uses within the Brentford Regeneration Area, the maximum parking standard specified is 1:100sq.m. Disabled persons provision is required at a standard of one wider space per 1,000sq.m and thereafter “1 per 2,500sq.m where development requires”.

7.57 For cafés the standard specified is 1 space per 16sq.m of public area within controlled parking zones or else 1 space per 8sq.m of public area. For each 80sq.m of public floor area, one parking space should be wider and allocated for people with disabilities (subject to a minimum of one space). The comment reads,

**In some instances it may be appropriate for a contribution to be made for public transport improvements/shoppers and residents parking schemes, rather than having on site provisions. In these instances applicants will be expected to enter into a s. 106 agreement with the Council.**

7.58 There is no specific cycle provision requirement for either hotel or business floorspace in Appendix 3 of the UDP; however, 1 space is required per 550sq.m of retail floorspace and one space per 140sq.m of pub/restaurant floorspace.

**London Plan standards**

7.59 For hotels, the London Plan sets out that car parking should generally be assessed on an individual basis using a transport assessment.

7.60 The London Plan specifies the standard for employment uses in Hounslow as being not more than 1 space per 100 – 600 square metres of gross floor area with the level of parking within the range to be informed by PTAL and a Transport Assessment. The London Plan states, “Normally they [the range] should not be used to increase the level of parking beyond the range indicated unless there is an identified regeneration need”.

7.61 The London Plan specifies that developments should provide for sufficient secure cycle parking, noting that TfL has indicative guidance on cycle parking standards.

**The proposal**

**Cumulative traffic impact assessment**

7.62 A joint cumulative traffic impact assessment for the proposed redevelopment of the Gillette and BSkyB sites has been submitted in addition to the Transport Assessment related to the site. Submitted on 29 September 2006 it, “In summary…shows that the proposed highway improvements are able to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic from both…sites”.

7.63 A second report (submitted on 12 October 2006) considers the cumulative impacts of the BSkyB and Gillette schemes, with two indicative scenarios for possible future redevelopment of the Harrods site at the eastern end of Grant Way. The following measures were identified as available to mitigate against the anticipated cumulative traffic flows:
1. Widened approach on Syon Lane
2. Widened approach on Grant Way
3. A link road across both Harrods' land and along the northern boundary of BSkyB's northwest car park, allowing a redistribution of traffic to Harlequin Avenue.

Parking

7.64 The applicant has confirmed that 214 parking spaces are proposed for the hotel, as per the documents submitted with the application in July 2006. In this case, with a maximum of 470 spaces proposed for the business component, the proposal would increase the number of car parking spaces provided on site from the current level of 413 to 624. There would also be three coach spaces and pick up and set down facilities for taxis (see Paragraph 4.16 above).

Access

7.65 Access would be from Syon Lane and Harlequin Avenue (see Paragraph 4.16 above).

Planning obligations

7.66 The applicant envisages obligations as set out at Paragraph 4.20 above. Of note, the applicant’s stand alone Transport Assessment includes draft travel plans in respect of (i) the hotel, (ii) the development as a whole (to be implemented by the development management company) and (iii) that individual companies within the development would adopt.

Officers’ comments

7.67 The parking provision for the proposed hotel and its ancillary facilities (e.g. conference facilities) (214 spaces) falls between the Council’s minimum and maximum parking standards and this level of provision is considered to be acceptable for this location and for this type of development.

7.68 The proposed 470 parking spaces for the business component would comply with the maximum UDP and London Plan standards on the basis of 47,000sq.m of B1 floorspace being provided; if less floorspace were provided, then the parking provision would need to be commensurately reduced.

7.69 Safeguarding conditions would also need to be imposed on the grant of any planning permission to secure:

- the proposed coach parking and pick up and set down facilities for taxis;
- car parking/car-based access for disabled people;
- car parking for the A3 floorspace that is in outline;
- sufficient secure cycle parking; and
- details of all accesses within the site, including the internal roads and footpath layout.

7.70 The Council’s Head of Traffic and Road Safety and the Council’s Head of Transport, having examined the applicant’s stand alone Transport Assessment
and both Cumulative Traffic Impact Assessments, consider that the analyses are robust and that the mitigation measures proposed are adequate.

7.71 In terms of the traffic impact of the proposed hotel and business component, account must be taken of the likely impact of the existing approved uses for the site were the site to be fully occupied. Comparing the potential traffic flows of a fully operational existing site with the traffic flows that are considered likely to result from the proposed hotel and business component indicates that there is only a minimal difference between the two scenarios.

7.72 Consequently, the development does not necessitate changes for traffic capacity purposes at any of the immediate junctions, namely Syon Lane / Grant Way, Syon Lane / A4 Great West Road and Harlequin Avenue / A4 Great West Road. However, the applicant is proposing the introduction of a signal controlled pedestrian crossing facility across the western arm of the A4 at the Syon Lane junction and this will necessitate some slight changes to the traffic signal timings. It is noted here that the BSkyB development discussed elsewhere on the Agenda proposes the signalisation of both the A4 / Harlequin Avenue and the Syon Lane / Grant Way junctions.

7.73 The applicant is also proposing to relocate the zebra crossing in Syon Lane near Grant Way to a more central location between the Grant Way and the A4 junctions and to convert the crossing to signal control. In addition, as part of a Section 106 deed, funds would be provided towards the costs of improvements to the pedestrian subway under the A4 at Gillette Corner and for general improvements to footways between the site and Syon Lane station. This is further discussed at Issue 6 below.

7.74 Since the applications were presented to IBAC, the applicant has verbally advised Officers of having acquired the site that the Gillette Company used for overflow car parking (that adjacent to the Wyke Green Golf Club on Syon Lane) and that this site might be used as an overflow car park for “special events” associated with the ancillary uses that would support the function and role of the hotel. If this is indeed the case, then the use of this car park would need to be covered by imposition of a condition/Section 106 obligation to ensure that it does not merely become a general additional car parking area for the development site but rather its use is restricted to specific major events associated with the hotel.

7.75 Further planning obligations have been identified with regards to traffic, parking and transport issues and are listed below at Issue 6. With regards to public transport an obligation is required to increase the frequency and hence the capacity of the H91 bus service to ensure that it provides both an efficient and effective service. Together with the financial contribution relating to the BSkyB proposal detailed elsewhere on this agenda (i.e. should planning permission for that scheme be approved and the scheme be implemented) and financial contributions in respect of already approved schemes, an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service would be sought at peak time (7.5 buses per hour at peak time), with no requirement for shuttle buses currently operated by BSkyB and proposed by Bonningtons. The current H91 service frequencies are:
**Weekday**

12 minutes 0630-1700 (15 minutes evenings; 20 minutes very early mornings)  
(5, 4, 3 buses per hour respectively)

**Saturday**

12 minutes 0930-1700 (15 minutes evenings; 15-20 minutes before 0930) (5, 4, 4-3 buses per hour respectively)

**Sunday**

15 minutes 0930-2400 (20 minutes before 0930) (4,3 buses per hour respectively)

*Services are frequently overloaded in peak hours in the sector of highest loading: Gunnersbury to Osterley*

---

**ISSUE 3: If a sound case can be made for the development would the details of the scheme be satisfactory? Is the site appropriate for high buildings? Is the scale of the development acceptable in relation to the surrounding environment?**

**Planning policy assessment framework.**

7.76 The site contains the Grade II listed Gillette Building and adjoins listed buildings (see Section 2.0 above). Within the wider surrounding area are Wyke Green Park, Boston Manor Park (within which there are Grade I and II listed buildings) and the Grand Union Canal and Boston Manor Conservation Area and, to the south of the site, lie Syon Park (Grade 1) and Syon House (Grade 1) (see Section 2.0 above). Of particular relevance therefore are UDP Policies ENV-B.2.2, ENV-B.2.5, ENV-B.2.7, ENV-B.2.8, ENV-B.1.2, ENV-B.1.3, ENV-N.1.5, ENV-N.1.7 and ENV-N.1.16.

7.77 The relevant London Plan policies (in particular 4B.7, 4B.8, 4B.10, 4B.11, 4B.12 and 3D.9) confirm the need to respect local context and communities, protect and enhance built heritage and maintain the protection of MOL from inappropriate development.

**The proposal**

7.78 The applicant’s “Design and Access Statement” states (at Page 16),

*Unlike the restored main building, the new extension to the hotel will have standard hotel floor-to-floor heights. This offers the opportunity of introducing additional floor-space whilst keeping within the overall massing of the original development. The adjacent part of the site, with the business units, continues to respect this scale and gradually rises from four stories, opposite the hotel, to six stories at the rear of the site. This gives a maximum height of 28 metres above grade, or 50.14 from datum.*
In the centre of the business area will be a raised open space formed by the concealed parking below, at ground level. This landscaped area will have direct links, via generous steps and a lift, along the axis of the clock tower and will serve as an entrance piazza for the places of work.

In order to promote a high environmental quality to the spaces between the buildings, the courtyards and the street, a low rise approach to the building massing will be implemented. By being approximately 4.5 metres above ground level the buildings will appear lower and the quality of light in the space will be improved, and mitigate against the effects of wind turbulence. The proposed buildings are principally orientated north-south with reduced massing allowing in light into the proposed spaces.

7.79 The “Access and Design Statement” further states (at Page 24),

The massing of the new buildings has been carefully considered so as to ‘sit comfortably’ with the original building facing the Great West Road and Syon Lane. The rear of the hotel will step up by about three and a half metres from the existing and, by its location, will not be visible from ground level in front of the building. From the side, the extension will be clearly seen as something new and, with the incorporation of a set-back and by maintaining a similar scale, will not dominate or take away from the original.

The non-hotel parts of the site continue to respect the scale of the hotel, with the buildings in its proximity being the same height as it and those further back gradually rising by up to two floors.

The proposal – Officers’ comments

7.80 The re-use of, and the extensions to, the listed building are considered acceptable (including the proposal for demolition) (see Issue 1 above).

7.81 The acceptability of the business component of the proposed development and, in particular, the impact of buildings A through F, was discussed in part at Issue 1(b). Whether the business component would be of a high quality of design and sympathetic in terms of scale and form and other details (including the effect on the skyline in the longer/distant view, especially on sensitive areas) is discussed further below.

7.82 The heights proposed are not tall in absolute terms (i.e. the referable height is 30m), but are tall in context with existing buildings now in the vicinity. The site lies on relatively high ground (approximately 22-23m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD)). The central piazza is located at first floor level over the parking area, and is an effective way of hiding the parking and can create good townscape, although it can be visually as well as practically divisive. The opportunity for mature trees within this area would have to be designed in and protected, although the service road between the hotel and the piazza would be at grade. The 4.5m change in level is more than normally needed for parking, and so could be expected to accommodate pits for sizeable trees; this would be conditioned.

7.83 The maximum height of the proposed buildings (6 commercial storeys) is approximately the same in AOD and local height terms as the taller part of
Harrod’s warehouse. However the site is not on the edge of lower ground or immediately adjacent to Metropolitan Open Land. It lies within an area of commercial buildings, which although currently lower, include motley redundant structures and industrial containers.

7.84 Building F was discussed at Issue 1(b) with a recommendation that conditions be imposed on the grant of any planning permission to control its design (including modelling and height). With regards to the remaining buildings (A through E) the view of Officers is that the buildings would:

- by reason of their relative distance from the Great West Road and the screening effect that the Gillette Building and (an amended) Building F would afford them;
- by reason of their relative distance from Boston Manor House and Park together with the effect of foreground buildings, trees and perspective;
- by reason of not being not on a direct line of sight along the Grand Union Canal; and
- subject to safeguarding conditions

be accommodated on the site with acceptable impact on their surroundings and without resulting in significant harm to sensitive areas. In addition, when assessed against London Plan Policy 4B.8 the view of Officers is that the proposed business component would help to provide a coherent location for economic clusters of related activities (i.e. given that they would provide for B1 floorspace) and also support economic regeneration and employment objectives (see Issue 1(a)).

7.85 With regards to the relationship of spaces, the applicant’s “Design and Access Statement” states (at Page 10) that the masterplan concept is “…a development conceived as a permeable development arranged around a new public space at the rear of the site, linked to a new court yard at the heart of the hotel.” The document describes landscape areas as the forecourt, the inner gardens, the landscape envelope, the boulevard, the avenue, the crossover and the piazza. These are numbered sequentially on the following diagram wherein number 8 is the business district.
7.86 The view of Officers is that:

- the landscape envelope is dependant largely on off site planting maintained by others – so that it would be reasonable to expect a Section 106 contribution for the maintenance and improvement of this amenity benefit to the site and towards broader environmental improvements;
- there is a lack of any edge envelope to the Harlequin Avenue boundary – so that safeguarding conditions would need to be imposed on the grant of any planning condition (i.e. to allow for variation in the footprint of the buildings and/or set in of lower storeys so as to enable tree planting of a satisfactory scale along the Harlequin Avenue boundary and in order that the Council may be satisfied as to the location and protection of tree pits against encroachment by hard landscaping and services; and
- the avenue and piazza, whilst offering a pedestrian environment that would improve permeability, would not provide the full range of recreational opportunity normally associated with public open space – but what is proposed is a business-led mixed-use development.

7.87 The proposed ‘greening’ of the site, together with provision of publicly accessible open space is welcome, therefore, subject to measures to secure the management and maintenance of the open space.

7.88 With regards to the management of the open space, the applicant advises (by letters dated 9 November 2006 and 20 November 2006) that it is envisaged that it will be made available for use by the general public during normal office hours and daylight hours at the weekend. Outside these hours the applicant anticipates that the open space will only be available for use by those working or employed at the site – which would be enforced/managed by on-site security. The applicant proposes that there be an obligation requiring an ‘Open Space and Security Management Plan’ for the business component.
In summary, it is considered that the details of the scheme would be satisfactory and that the impact of the proposed development would be acceptable subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions and/or the prior completion of a Section 106 deed. Microclimate is discussed below at Issue 4(d).

### ISSUE 4: Is the proposed development acceptable in environmental terms (noise, air quality, flood risk, wind and contamination) and with regards to archaeological and cultural heritage?

Moving away from the principles of the development, any acceptable scheme would still need to be address the issues outlined below.

#### Issue 4(a): Noise

**Planning policy assessment framework**

7.91 London Plan Policy 4A.14 states that boroughs should reduce noise by minimising the potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, or in the vicinity of, development proposals; by reducing the impact of traffic noise through highway management and transport policies; and by containing noise from 24-hour activities.

7.92 The Council has a general policy on noise pollution, which states that the Council will not allow any development proposals that could result in unacceptable levels of noise nuisance to nearby existing or future occupiers; the stated reason for UDP Policy ENV-P.1.5 is to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers, the aim being to reduce as far as practicable noise from all sources. UDP Policy ENV-B.1.1 is also relevant.

**The proposal**

7.93 The site is adjacent to the A4 and, consequentially, parts of the site will be subject to high levels of traffic noise. The site is also affected by noise from aircraft passing overhead.

7.94 Amongst other things, the applicant’s environmental noise assessment states that noise egress from the site will not adversely impact on the surrounding area and will be lesser than that from the site when the factory was in production.

7.95 The Council’s Environmental Projects Officer does not wish to make any comment, advising that this is because the applicant is intending to build to BS8233 "Good" internal design standards.

7.96 Conditions would need to be imposed on the grant of any planning permission with regards to external plant.

#### Issue 4(b): Air quality

7.97 The whole Borough was declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in March 2006. However, whilst the designation of the AQMA is indicative of a certain level of air quality, this in itself does not prevent development.
The major emissions source, influencing air quality, would be the generation of additional traffic (see Issue 2 above).

The Council’s Environmental Projects Officer advises that the air quality model covers the same area as that for the BSkyB proposed development,

...and shows an exceedance of the EU limit for NO2 of 40µgm-3 at all nearby receptors in 2005 and for all receptors to be within 3µgm-3 of this value in 2010.

It should be noted that the traffic flows were taken from the London Atmospheric Emissions Inventory and therefore will not reflect the cumulative impact of Gillette with BSkyB and other developments in Brentford.

Given the above and notwithstanding any proposed mitigation measures (i.e. sustainable transport measures) it is considered that a Section 106 contribution would be required, with the money to be spent on projects related to air-quality management as allowed by PPS23 (Planning and Pollution Control).

Issue 4(c): Flood risk

The objection of the EA is set out at Paragraph 5.11 above. This matter will be reported on in an addendum if further information is received prior to the Committee meeting. Notwithstanding, it is considered appropriate to deal with this matter (SUDS) by the imposition of a condition on the grant of any planning permission (particularly as the business component is in outline), requiring approval of details prior to the start of works.

Issue 4(d): Wind

London Plan Policy 4B.6 states that the Mayor will and boroughs should ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction, including measures to conserve energy, materials, waste and other resources (discussed at Issue 5 below) and to reduce the impacts of micro-climatic effects.

UDP Policy ENV-B.1.2 states that high buildings or structures should take account of the microclimate.

The design incorporates open spaces and these would be sensitive areas of the site in terms of wind impact.

There is reference to mitigation against the effects of wind turbulence within the applicant's Design and Access Statement (see Paragraph 7.78 above), but the applicant has not provided evidence of having assessed the wind environment. The applicant requests, given that the business component is in outline, that this matter be dealt with via a condition requiring the submission of a wind assessment at the detailed design (or reserved matters) stage – and Officers consider this appropriate (e.g. with landscaping reserved for further consideration). Nevertheless, the applicant’s view is that the “…development (as a whole) will not impact detrimentally upon the local wind environment (both internally within the site and externally throughout the surrounding area).”

Issue 4(e): Contamination
7.106 The site is undergoing decontamination works. The Council’s Land Quality Officer advises that as the works are yet to be completed and validated it would be prudent, on the grant of any planning permission, to impose the Council’s standard phased condition for use with development on, or adjacent to, land with a former industrial use (including landfill).

**Issue 5(e): Archaeological and cultural heritage**

7.107 Built heritage is addressed at Issues 1 and 3.

7.108 The site is not within any of the Council’s Archaeological Priority Areas (UDP Map ENV-B3). Notwithstanding, UDP Policy ENV-B.3.2 requires the Council to promote the conservation, protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage of the Borough and its interpretation and presentation to the public. London Plan policies, including Policy 4B.14, confirm the need to protect archaeological assets.

7.109 The Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) has carried out an archaeological desk-based assessment for the applicant. MoLAS suggests that the most appropriate further investigation strategy, should further investigation be requested, would likely entail an archaeological trenching evaluation. It is stated that a preliminary investigation could also include the archaeological monitoring of any geotechnical pits dug for engineering purposes.

7.110 The comments of English Heritage’s Archaeological Advisory Service have been sought and will be reported in an addendum if received prior to the Committee meeting.

7.111 Appropriate measures would be secured on the grant of any planning permission by the imposition of condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE 5: Are sustainable building principles applied?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Planning policy assessment framework**

7.112 Sustainability underpins many of the UDP policies and those of the London Plan. These require developments not only to be sustainable in transport terms but also to include appropriate recycling facilities and to minimise waste; to include energy efficiency measures and promote the use of renewable energy; and not to significantly increase the requirement for water supply or surface water drainage.

7.113 The proposal can make a substantial contribution to sustainable development in the Borough and it is important that it recognises and adopts sustainable development principles.

**The proposal**

7.114 The applicant’s “Bonnington at Gillette Corner” document sets out a strategy for achieving sustainable development. It states that the Bonnington Group have an environmental policy that, amongst other things, gives hotel guests the opportunity to make their own decisions in certain areas (e.g. replacement of towels); maintains an environmentally friendly approach to the upkeep of the gardens and external areas, using organic products; and reduces the use of
water and materials through awareness programmes and through designing efficiency into new buildings, equipment and working practices.

7.115 With regards to materials and waste, the document states that “The majority of the materials arising from demolition of some buildings will be recycled and not sent to land fill” and “Where possible, recycled materials will be used in new construction, for example, as aggregate in low-strength concrete and for landscaping”. It also states that “Where possible, recycled-content building products will be used…” and that “In operation, the hotel will implement a waste management plan…”

7.116 Part B of the applicant’s “Access and Design Statement” (Section 7.0, Page 26) considers waste management, also stating that a waste management programme would be developed.

7.117 With regards to water, the applicant’s “Bonnington at Gillette Corner” document sets out demand reduction and efficient use measures as follows:

- Low-water-use appliances, systems and fittings will be used wherever practical and suitable.
- Rainwater will be collected and used for irrigation of the site.
- During operation, guests will be offered a number of measures that will lead to reduced use of water, including rooms fitted with low-use appliances, showers in all rooms and reuse of towels to reduce water used for laundering.

7.118 With regards to energy, the same document states that the following particular measures would be utilised:

- Creating a low carbon hotel development by maximising the use of passive and active energy saving measures.
- Reduce energy demand by active control of lighting and use of efficient light fittings and use of low-energy-rated appliances.
- Enhance solar shading to reduce energy needed for cooling.
- Install low water use systems and fittings to reduce the energy demand for hot water.
- Promote hotel guests choice to reduce their carbon footprint by enabling the choice to reduce reliance on mechanical cooling, i.e. opening windows interfaced with mechanical cooling.
- Use a sophisticated Building Management System to monitor, control and optimise heating, air conditioning and lighting, for example deactivating systems when rooms and larger areas of the building are not occupied.
- Utilise clean renewable energy sources where feasible.
- Utilise micro generation in the form of combined heat and power (CHP) plants where suitable.

7.119 The applicant has also submitted an “Energy Strategy Report”. Prepared by Buro Happold, it sets out that a detailed energy assessment and strategy will be developed to address energy use and carbon emissions and that a strategy for the reduction of water use within the development will be stated within it.

7.120 A draft Energy Strategy and Assessment Report has been issued to the GLA and, on request, to the London Borough of Hounslow.
7.121 The applicant’s “Sustainability Report”, also prepared by Buro Happold, outlines the environmental sustainability features of the proposed development, containing a summary of the sustainable features and an outline of how they would be delivered. The summary reads (in part):

In summary the main environmental sustainability features are as follows:

- Retention, refurbishment and reuse of an existing listed building of national importance.
- Reduced carbon dioxide emissions through avoidance of mechanical ventilation where possible, thermal insulation exceeding requirements of Building Regulations, Part L (2006) and use of low-energy appliances (e.g. luminaries)
- Use of heat energy generated and distributed via an efficient CHP plant
- Sustainable urban drainage with no increase in flood risk or impact on hydrological conditions
- Significant use of reclaimed/recycled materials
- Low water-usage appliances
- Management of the construction process to help to minimise the environmental impact of its operations by avoiding and reducing waste during construction, and reducing the potential for pollution of soil, water and air.

These key points, alongside the sustainable design features and considerate approach to construction demonstrate the developer’s desire to produce environmentally-responsible and economically-viable buildings.

The proposal – Officers’ comments

7.122 The location of the proposed development on previously developed land with the proposed re-use of the listed building and retention of the Engineer’s House (i.e. notwithstanding the proposed replacement of other existing buildings with new-build development) accords with the principles of sustainable development.

7.123 The Council’s Senior Cleansing Services Supervisor has no objection with regards to refuse collection. Nonetheless, and particularly with the business component in outline, conditions would need to be imposed on the grant of any planning permission.

7.124 The Council’s Environmental Projects Officer advises that a condition/s should be imposed on the grant of any planning permission with regards to energy efficiency and renewable energy. Officers also consider that there should be an obligation to do a joint energy study with BSkyB if that proposal, detailed elsewhere on this agenda, is granted planning permission.

7.125 In summary, there seems little doubt that the development could comply with sustainable building principles; as such, it is considered appropriate to deal with these matters by the imposition of appropriate safeguarding conditions on the grant of any planning permission and/or obligations secured by the prior completion of a Section 106 deed.
7.126 UDP Policy IMP6.1 (Planning obligations) states that the Council will seek to ensure that a developer enters into a planning obligation to secure planning benefits related to the proposed development and Circular 05/2005 sets out the tests for planning obligations.

7.127 London Plan Policy 6A.4 (Priorities in planning obligations) states (in part) that "Affordable housing and public transport improvements should generally be given the highest importance..." (emphasis added) (see also Paragraph 7.27 above).

7.128 The following table sets out the heads of terms in three categories in line with the Code of Practice. It also sets out the potential planning obligations that have been identified and either confirmed or are in the process of being negotiated between Officers and the developer. It should be noted that all payments would be index linked and the phasing of the payments and the construction programme subject to detailed negotiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures needed for the development to go ahead</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Agreed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the listed Gillette building following demolition work, of the listed lamp standards and of the Engineer's House – to include a management plan for the clock tower and its lighting</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic, parking and transport:

| Syon Lane/A4 junction improvements (signalised crossing across the A4) See Issue 2 above | Section 278 work, with all costs (including stats (e.g. cabling)) to be met by the developer | On offer by the applicant. The applicant:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) is proposing the introduction of a signal controlled pedestrian crossing facility; and</td>
<td>(ii) offers commuted maintenance payment for new traffic signals, approximate cost £50,000</td>
<td>(i) the applicant offers £10,000 towards study cost; but (ii) implementation cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to traffic management (e.g. CPZ in area around the site, if required)</td>
<td>Study cost £10,000 &amp; Implementation cost, if required £150,000 – with payback</td>
<td>In principle, in part:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) the applicant offers £10,000 towards study cost; but (ii) implementation cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mechanism should the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and any CPZ required as a result of that scheme overlap with any required as a result of this application to be agreed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public transport improvements:</th>
<th>Amount to be advised</th>
<th>In principle: the applicant offers £135,000 per annum for three years Subject to negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H91 bus service</td>
<td>£1.67 million (approximately) in joint payments in respect of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) this application;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda should it be approved and implemented; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) financial contributions in respect of already approved schemes towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount in respect of this application to be advised</strong> – with payback mechanism should the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and some of the total £1.67 million (approximately) joint payments towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time be unused (unless otherwise committed to further improvement of the H91 service).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public transport improvements: £20,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Contribution Details</th>
<th>Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades to bus stops</td>
<td>(two x £10,000) for upgrades to two local bus stops to disability standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to cycle routes</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Subject to discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Syon Lane pelican crossing in front of Gillette Building</td>
<td>(i) Section 278 work, with all costs (including stats (e.g. cabling)) to be met by the developer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Footway improvements on Syon Lane and Gillette Corner junction</td>
<td>(ii) <strong>£60,000</strong> (there would be £100,000 in joint payments for footway improvements in the surrounding area should the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Improvements to subway</td>
<td>(iii) <strong>£40,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel plans</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above and to include management of overnight accommodation for staff use</td>
<td>Yes: see Paragraph 4.20 and Issues 1(a) and 2 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a car club</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Yes: the applicant offers a car club to be located in Harlequin Road and made available to the public and occupiers of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park management</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issue 2 above</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures directly related to the proposed development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment and training:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative</strong></td>
<td>The developer will appoint a representative to co-ordinate its training/employment activities in relation to the Section 106 deed and liaise on its behalf with the Council’s appointed representative on all local economic matters relating to the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Construction training initiatives** | To support construction training  
& **Amount to be advised**  
on commencement of work towards the cost of providing construction training and work placements in the Borough | In principle: amount to be advised and agreed |
| **Job readiness and job brokering within the Council’s Area** | To encourage the training and recruitment of local people into jobs provided by the development  
& **£100,000 (approximately (amount to be advised))**  
on commencement of work towards the cost of providing job brokerage services to recruit, train and place local people into jobs provided by the development or elsewhere in the Borough in the first instance if it is not possible to place them on the development itself | In principle: amount to be advised and agreed |
| **Sector specific support for the hotel and hospitality industry** | E.g. advertisement of supply opportunities  
& | Subject to discussion |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Development of a programme of hotel and hospitality sector awareness, education, vocational training and work experience for 14 -19 year olds in Hounslow schools through Hounslow Education-Business Partnership (HEBP)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount to be advised on completion of works towards the cost of providing support for local businesses within (or potentially within) the development’s supply chain or elsewhere if in the first instance it is not possible for the developer to provide such opportunities directly</strong></th>
<th><strong>£100,000 over 5 years (£20,000 per annum, starting on commencement of works) towards the cost of the HEBP scheme</strong></th>
<th><strong>Subject to discussion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-work training (the object of this is to develop the skills of local employees as a means of increasing motivation, knowledge, productivity and enhanced employment and progression opportunities)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount to be advised on commencement of works towards the cost of providing in-work training for local employees (the developer may wish to undertake such training itself or it may wish to appoint a training provider to deliver the training in question)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subject to discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Employment Strategy for the hotel</strong></td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
<td>Yes – see Issue 1(a) above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Environmental improvements, public and historic realm improvements  
  (e.g. TfL/A4 street scene improvements and Section 278/38 highway works) | To include:  
  (i) £100,000 for TfL/A4 street scene improvements (as part of improvements to the Golden Mile) and maintenance  
  (ii) £30,000 for Harlequin Avenue street scene improvements and maintenance | In principle, in part:  
  (i) see above under traffic, parking and transport (Section 278/38 highway works would need to be at the applicant's expense)  
  (ii) the applicant offers to pay a contribution (unspecified amount) towards maintenance of the landscaped area in front of the Gillette Building and the neighbouring park/carry out the works or to carry out the works (subject to land ownership issues) |  
| Air quality  
  (i.e. contribution to projects related to air-quality management) | £80,000 | In principle: amount to be agreed |  
| Energy strategy  
  See Issue 5 above | Flows naturally from the development: see Issue 5  
  Obligation to do a joint energy study with BSkyB if that proposal, detailed elsewhere on this agenda, is granted planning permission and implemented | In principle |  
| Public access  
  (e.g. ‘Open Space and Security Management Plan’) | Flows naturally from the development | Yes – see Issue 3 above |  
| Considerate constructor scheme | Flows naturally from the development | In principle |  
| Monitoring costs | Associated with compliance with the Section 106 deed | To be discussed |
### Measures directly related to the development to provide an acceptable balance of uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community infrastructure:</th>
<th>Amount to be advised</th>
<th>In principle – the applicant offers, for example, to investigate the need for a crèche and if a need is established to offer a suitable area of land within the development for crèche use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community infrastructure fund and crèche/childcare facilities and health facilities in the local area (if required))</td>
<td>Amount to be advised</td>
<td>In principle – the applicant offers, for example, to investigate the need for a crèche and if a need is established to offer a suitable area of land within the development for crèche use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism/visitor attraction to promote Isleworth and Brentford/the Borough (e.g. promotion of historic parks, green routes, etc. through leaflets/pamphlets, tourism trails/history tours etc)</td>
<td>Amount to be advised (approximately £35,000 for promotional/ interpretative materials)</td>
<td>In principle (in part) – the applicant offers to agree a scheme for the promotion to occupants of the Hotel and to implement the agreed scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key aspects of the phasing are in relation to (i) the restoration of the listed buildings; (ii) the delivery of the business component (i.e. to ensure that it is realised and complementary to the hotel); and also (iii) bringing forward appropriate mitigation at the right time.

Given the cross-references to the BSkyB proposal (including at Paragraph 5.20 above), should that scheme be approved then the respective Section 106 deeds would need to be drafted to address joint payments/pay-back mechanisms.

### 8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 and ENV-B.1.8 seek to ensure that development proposals and refurbishments are designed so as to be fully accessible to people with disabilities or impaired mobility and have regard in particular to the Council’s supplementary planning guidance Think Access – Design for Accessibility (April 2000).

8.2 The Mayor’s Supplementary Planning Guidance Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment sets out that to address the shortage of accessible hotel accommodation in London, the Mayor will and boroughs should require that all proposals for hotels meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion; further, that the overarching London Plan Policy 4B.5 ‘Creating an inclusive environment’ applies to hotels and other tourist facilities (of note, the policy states that the Mayor will require all future development to meet the highest standards of accessibility of accessibility and inclusion).

8.3 The applicant’s “Bonnington at Gillette Corner” document sets out (at Page 6) that the hotel will have “…some 500 rooms, including 2 presidential suites and 45 serviced apartments located on the ground, second, third and fourth floors…” and that “It is planned that some 10% of the bedrooms will be
designed for people with disabilities and all areas of the hotel will be accessible to guests in wheelchairs.”

8.4 The applicant has also submitted an “Access and Design Statement”. The applicant has confirmed (by letter dated 20 November 2006) that the reference to a ‘first stage Access Design Statement’

...acknowledges that the scheme is still at an early stage in the design process (particularly in relation to the business component). Hence it is envisaged that the proposals will be further developed at the detailed design stage (particularly in relation to the business component) to ensure that the development is accessible to all.

8.5 It is considered appropriate to deal with this matter by the imposition of a condition on the grant of any planning permission (particularly as the business component is in outline), requiring approval of details prior to the start of works.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

9.1 It is recommended that the Director of Planning be authorised to:

• grant planning permission subject to (i) the imposition of the conditions set out in this report and (ii) securing the planning obligations set out in this report by the prior completion of a Section 106 deed the exact terms of which shall be negotiated in conjunction with the Director of Legal Services; and

• grant listed building consent subject to the conditions set out below.

9.2 Application for planning permission

Summary reasons for approval subject to Section 106 deed:

1/ The proposed development would not result in the loss of high trip generating employment use from this site in that the B1 and hotel floorspace are high trip generating, the (maximum) 47,000 sq.m Use Class B floorspace proposed is comparable with the existing 47,508 sq.m and because the proposed development would result in an increase in the number of job opportunities on the site as compared to the previous Gillette use. The proposed development therefore meets policies of the London Borough of Hounslow UDP (under which the site is identified as being within the Great West Road Employment Area, which is a Key Employment Location), including IMP.1.1 (Integrating Patterns of Land Use and the Provision of Transport), IMP.1.2 (The Re-use and Recycling of Urban Land and Buildings), IMP.3.1 (Brentford Regeneration Area), E.1.1 (Location of New Employment Development), E.1.2 (Locations for Business (B1) Use), E.1.5 (Development Involving Loss of or Changes in Employment Uses) and E.5.1 (Visitor Accommodation), as well as those of the London Plan (under which an unspecified part of the Great West Road is identified as a Strategic Employment Location), including 3D.6 (Visitors Accommodation and Facilities).

2/ The proposed re-use of, and the extensions to, the listed building are considered acceptable (including the proposal for demolition); the
The proposal would preserve (if not enhance) the building, the features of special architectural/historic interest which it possesses, and its setting, subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions and/or planning obligations, so would meet London Borough of Hounslow UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-B.2.3 (Reuse of Redundant Historic Buildings), ENV-B.2.4 Demolition of Listed Buildings), ENV-B.2.5 (Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building), ENV-B.2.7 (Alterations to Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Townscape Character) and ENV-B.2.8 (Views and Landmarks) of the Hounslow UDP and London Plan policies.

3/ The level of parking provision proposed is considered to be acceptable subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions and/or planning obligations that would include mitigation measures and improvements to pedestrian, cycle and public transport. The proposed development would, therefore, be accommodated terms of traffic, parking and transport issues, so would meet London Borough of Hounslow UDP Policies including ENV-T.1.1 (New Development), T.1.2 (The Movement Implications of Development), T.1.4 (Car and Cycling Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments), T.2.2 (Pedestrian Safety and Security), T.4.3 (The Traffic Implications of New Development), T.4.4 (Road Safety), T.5.3 (Vehicle Crossovers and Hardstandings) and T.2.4 (Public Transport Infrastructure) and London Plan policies.

4/ The proposed development would be acceptable in environmental terms (noise, air quality, flood risk, wind and contamination) and with regards to archaeological and cultural heritage, subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions and/or planning obligations. In this case, and as the proposed extensions and buildings can be accommodated on site with acceptable impact on their surroundings and without resulting in significant harm to sensitive areas, subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions and/or planning obligations, the proposed development meets London Borough of Hounslow UDP Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-P.1.5 (Noise Pollution), ENV-P.1.6 (Air Pollution), ENV-P.1.3 (Surface Water Run Off), ENV-P.1.8 (Development Proposals on or Near Contaminated Land), ENV-B.3.2 (Sites of Archaeological Importance), ENV-B.1.2 (High Buildings or Structures Affecting Sensitive Areas), ENV-B.1.3 (High Buildings in Areas Other than those Listed in ENV-B.1.2), ENV-B.2.5 (Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building), ENV-B.2.7 (Alterations to Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Townscape Character) and ENV-B.2.8 (Views and Landmarks) and London Plan policies, including 4B.6 (Sustainable Design and Construction).

5/ The Section 106 Deed prescribes the nature of development and provides a package of contributions that fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development therefore meeting London Borough of Hounslow UDP Policy IMP.6.1 (Planning Obligations), London Plan Policy 6A.4 (Priorities in Planning Obligations) and the requirements of Circular 5/2005.

Conditions and reasons:

1. A1A (Time limit for commencement of development – full part)
2. B5 (Detailed drawings – implementation in accordance with approved plans – full part)

3. A2 (Outline part permission – approval of reserved matters shall be obtained)

4. A3 (Outline part permission – implementation of reserved matters in accordance with plans to be submitted)

5. A4 (Time limit – application for the approval of the reserved matters)

6. A5 (Time limit – outline part – commencement of development)

7. B6 (Phased development and timetable of development and timing of construction)

8. B4 (Materials to match/samples (including those to be used in the construction of pedestrian and road surfaces))

9. B8 (Prior approval)

10. C14 (Restriction on use – Class C1 Use, Class B1 Use and Class A3 Use)

11. Total non-residential (Class C1 Use, Class B1 Use and Class A3 Use) floorspace

12. C16 (Mezzanine floor/s (no additional floor space))

13. C23 (No fans, louvers, ducts or other external plant)

14. D12 (Soundproofing – any plant/machinery)

15. C25 (Hours of use (Class A3 Use – outline part))

16. C26 (Hours of use (amplified or other music (Class A3 Use – outline part)))

17. Class A3 Use amenity impact – outline part – no outside areas to be used without express approval

18. C28 (Hours of deliveries – commercial (no deliveries by vehicle from A3 use premises)

19. C29 (Hours of construction): 8.00am to 6.00pm on weekdays (Mondays to Fridays) and 8.30am to 1.00pm on Saturdays and none shall take place on Sundays and Public Holidays without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority

20. C34 (Illumination, mud, dust, temporary landscaping along the Great West Road site boundary, interior illumination of buildings on construction sites and other measures that would be implemented to regulate the environmental impact of the construction process)
21. D4 (Waste and recycled materials storage (details to be submitted and implementation (to include a waste management strategy))

22. D18/D20 (Control of fumes and ventilation equipment (details and implementation))

23. E1/E2 (Landscape design proposals (both hard and soft landscape works including permeable pavement design, green roofs, fire hydrants, internal boundary treatment (e.g. any enclosure of publicly accessible open space), details of all accesses within the site (including the internal roads and footpath layout) and how the setting of the listed buildings and the pedestrian environment of Harlequin Avenue would be enhanced through landscaping within the application site) and landscape works implementation)

24. E3 (Details of earthworks – including location and protection of tree pots against encroachment by hard landscaping and services)

25. E5 (Boundary treatment)

26. E6/E7 (Landscape management plan and schedule of landscape maintenance – landscape areas to be managed and maintained for a minimum of five years)

27. E14/E15/E16 (Provision for tree planting, protection of any retained/planted tree and replacement tree planting within a five year period from the date of planting/replanting)

28. F2/F13 (Access road (details) – full part)

29. F2/F13 (Access road (details) – outline part)

30. F6 (Sightlines – full part)

31. F6 (Sightlines – outline part)

32. G8 (Limit on number of car parking spaces (including restriction on overflow parking and by phase, having regard to any details already approved))

33. Cycle parking spaces: Details of cycle parking within the curtilage of the site (by phase, having regard to any details already approved, and to be available for use within each phase before the first occupation of the buildings within the relevant phase))

34. G2/G3 (Parking and loading facilities): Details of vehicular and cycle access to and within the car park (including directional signage), coach spaces and pick up and set down facilities for taxis) as well as plans and particulars for the management thereof and of surface car parking, including allocation of parking spaces between uses)

35. Lighting (details and implementation – external and street lighting and
backlighting to the existing clock tower of the Gillette Building that might result from the pod)

36. Soakaways (no soakaways in contaminated ground)

37. J1/J2 (Provision for disabled people to gain access to all parts of the development within the relevant phase (including details of the number and location of disabled parking bays/car-based access for disabled people and access ramp systems))

38. J4 (Outline part permission – heights of buildings)

39. J12 (Phased contamination condition – including potential for the pollution of the water environment)

40. Impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure determining the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system (and implementation) – refer Paragraph 5.22 above

41. Surface water source control measures and foul and surface water drainage works (SUDs) (to include details of water harvesting and conservation measures)

42. Archaeological matters (programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (to include a watching brief))

43. Wind testing – outline part (to include details of mitigation measures and the timetable for any mitigation measures to be carried out (using Lawson Criteria))

44. Shop front for Class A3 Use – outline part

45. Sustainable sourcing of materials

46. Details of energy conservation measures and implementation

47. Notwithstanding the details submitted, amended details for the siting and design of Building F to address its relationship with the Grade II Listed National Westminster Bank shall be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority before any development starts on site or in accordance with a timetable agreed in advance and in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

48. Notwithstanding the details submitted, amended details for the siting and design of Buildings F and D to allow for variation in the footprint of the buildings and/or set in of lower storeys so as to enable tree planting of a satisfactory scale along the Harlequin Avenue boundary and in order that the Council may be satisfied as to the location and protection of tree pits against encroachment by hard landscaping and services shall be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority before any development starts on site or in accordance with a timetable agreed in advance and in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Informatives:

1. **S106 planning benefits**: The application is subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

2. **S106 restrictions on use**: Further restrictions on use are set out in the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

3. **S106 staging of development**: The staging of the development (order in which the parts shall be carried out) is also regulated in part by the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

4. **Petrol/oil interceptors**: Thames Water recommends that you fit petrol/oil interceptors in all car parking facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol/oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourse.

5. **Surface water drainage**: With regard to surface water drainage it is your responsibility to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, this is the major contributor to sewer flooding. Thames Water recommends that you:
   
   (i) Look to ensure that new connections to the public sewerage system do not pose an unacceptable threat of surcharge, flooding or pollution;

   (ii) Check the proposals are in line with advice from the DETR which encourages, wherever practicable, disposal on site without recourse to the public sewerage system – for example in the form of soakaways or infiltration areas on free draining soils;

   (iii) Look to ensure the separation of foul and surface water sewerage on all new developments.

6. **Public sewers**: Thames Water advises, “There are public sewers crossing this site, therefore no building will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water’s approval.”

9.3 **Application for listed building consent**

**Reason:**

It is considered that the proposal would not unduly harm the special architectural and historic character of the listed buildings, subject to the work being carried out with care and attention to detail, in accordance with the specification described by the applicant and subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions, therefore in accordance with Policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), ENV-B.1.2 (High Buildings or Structures Affecting Sensitive Areas), ENV-B.1.3 (High Buildings in areas other than those listed in ENV-B.1.2), ENV-B.2.3 (Reuse of Redundant Historic Buildings), ENV-B.2.4 (Demolition of Listed Buildings), ENV-B.2.5 (Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building), ENV-B.2.7 (Alterations to Listed Buildings and Buildings of
Conditions and reasons:

1. H1 (Time limit for implementation (listed building consent))
2. H2 (Listed building consent – notification of work to English Heritage with a copy to the Local Planning Authority)
3. Detailed drawings – implementation in accordance with approved plans
4. H3 (Listed buildings – materials to match (works of making good))
5. Schedule (including reasoned justification) of repairs and works and subsequent record:

A schedule (including reasoned justification) of repairs and works to the external fabric of the Gillette Building and the interior areas highlighted in the submitted drawings and all repairs and works to the four Grade II listed lamp standards along Syon Lane shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. The schedule shall include detailed design of connections/linkages to original fabric and detailed design of adaptations/additions where these affect the appearance and/or character of the listed buildings (notwithstanding Condition 3, including details of window replacement of window frames and glass). Any part of the listed buildings consented to be demolished or hidden by new work shall be recorded photographically and an archive noting locations kept; a copy of the annotated archive shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority (with a copy for the Twentieth Century Society) in accordance with a timetable to be agreed, in advance and in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Supporting notes:

(a) This may build upon reports (e.g. the Statement of Significance) submitted with and in support of the development hereby permitted.

(b) A log book describing detailed work to the listed buildings should be provided to the managing agent for a permanent base record and as reference material for any future work, such as management agreements.

6. Sample panels
7. The extensions to the Gillette Building to which demolition consent is hereby granted shall not be demolished before a contract for the carrying out of the work of redevelopment of the site has been let.
Sustainable Development Committee
15 January 2006

Addendum Report of the Borough Planning Officer

This report contains additional information relating to agenda items not available at the time of publication of the main agenda.

Agenda Item 11 (Pages 141-201)
Gillette Corner, Great West Road
00505/AP/P74
00505/AP/L22

1. Update – GLA Stage 1 report and letter (refer Paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 of the agenda report)

1.1 On 10 January 2007 the Mayor considered the GLA Stage 1 report on this proposal.

1.2 The GLA Stage 1 report identifies strategic issues as follows:

| Loss of strategic employment land, location of hotel and offices outside a designated town centre without appropriate sequential test being undertaken, quantum of car parking and energy |

1.3 The body of the GLA Stage 1 report states (in part):

| 15. The proposed refurbishment and new build do not raise any strategic design objections. … |
| 20. …Primarily, the applicant should clearly set out why the site cannot be developed for employment uses more likely to be compatible with the Industrial Business Park. The marketing report in particular is required to address this matter. If hotel uses is still sought, the regeneration benefits of a hotel in this area must also be clearly demonstrated. |
| 21. There are concerns, however, over the loss of industrial land in this strategic employment location. … |
| 41. In summary, the LDA has reservations with regard to the acceptability of the principle of the uses proposed. the potentially exceptional circumstances surrounding this building/site need to be robustly rehearsed along with the strengthening of the employment re-provision in order for the GLA group to consider how it could be made acceptable within SEL. |
| 42. A robust energy strategy for the development is needed, with commitments consistent with the London Plan policies both current and emerging. In line with the draft further alterations to the London Plan, developments should examine opportunities to extend beyond site boundaries. … |
43. …a number of highway improvements have been agreed which should accommodate the additional traffic generated by both developments [reference is to BSkyB].

44. The highways improvements include the introduction of a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing on the western arm of the Syon Lane junction with the A4, and a new controlled crossing on Syon Lane. This will improve safety for pedestrians by providing a new controlled crossing on the busy Great West Road. At present the only pedestrian crossing facility in this section of the A4 is a subway under the eastern arm of the junction with Syon Lane, and many pedestrians prefer to cross the dual carriageway at surface level (uncontrolled). As part of the highways improvements secured for this development the subway is also being upgraded. The details of these highway improvements will be agreed with TfL and Hounslow Council as part of the Section 278 agreement.

45. … As the H91 bus service is already at capacity in peak hours, TfL has requested funding towards capacity enhancements. The applicant has agreed to provide £135,000 per annum over three years, which will be combined with other Section 106 contributions secured from nearby developments to increase the frequency of the service.

46. The car parking proposed as part of the application was initially 214 spaces for the hotel (which complies with the London Plan) and 470 spaces for the employment element of the development. The proposed employment parking has since been reduced from 470 to 350 spaces following extensive discussions with TfL. However, the London Plan employment parking standards allow a maximum of one space per 200 square metres for a site with a public transport accessibility level of 2, which equates to 235 spaces. Therefore the proposed provision of 350 spaces still exceeds the maximum allowance by 115 spaces. The applicant has not provided any convincing justification for the proposed level of parking.

47. Apart from the parking provision, which should be reduced further, TfL is satisfied that the transport issues have been addressed. A travel plan has been provided, which will need to be secured as part of the Section 106 agreement. Cycle parking is to be provided in accordance with the London Cycle Network minimum parking standards. A bus service contribution and several highways and pedestrian improvements have been secured.

1.4 The recommendation of the GLA Stage 1 report is:

That Hounslow Council be advised that the development proposal is not supported by an appropriate sequential test for the hotel and office uses and as such is contrary to the London Plan, which is the most up to date element of the development plan in force, and will introduce non-compliant uses within the Great Western Road SEL and thus harm the reservoir of industrial land within the West London sub-region and be contrary to the best interests of planning in Greater London. In addition, the quantum of car parking proposed is excessive and is contrary to the London Plan and as such does not promote sustainable transport.
1.5 Having considered the GLA Stage 1 report, the Mayor:

…has expressed concerns about the proposed 5 star hotel development on the grounds that it is a development that will be located in an unsustainable location in respect of travel, contrary to the London Plan, PPS1, PPS6 and PPG13.

The application represents EIA development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999. The Mayor has taken the environmental information made available to date into consideration in formulating his comments.

1.5 The applicant has advised LBH Officers (by email sent 12 January 2007):

We will be responding to the issues raised in the report and by the Mayor comprehensively next week, and we are confident that issues raised can be resolved. …the GLA has suggested though that if your Committee resolve to approve on Monday, it would be sensible to allow us time [to] be sure that the GLA is satisfied with our responses before setting the 28 day period running for the Mayor’s final decision.

See also ‘3. Further information submitted’ below.

1.6 With regards to the comment about the proposed development being EIA development, Members should note:

1 that the Secretary of State, in response to a screening request, directed (by letter dated 25 April 2006) that the proposed development described in the applicant’s request and documents submitted with it is “…not ‘EIA development’ within the meaning of the 199 Regulations”; and

2 that the proposed development, as submitted, falls within the scope as described in the applicant’s screening request – so is not EIA development.

2. Car parking

2.1 By letter dated 9 January 2007 the applicant has advised of a reduction in the car parking provision for the business component from 470 (refer Paragraphs 1.9, 4.13, 7.64 and 7.68 of the agenda report) to 350.

2.2 Officers welcome this reduction in the car parking provision (refer Paragraph 7.68 of the agenda report) and would secure it by condition (Condition G8).

2.3 With reference to Paragraph 7.74 of the agenda report, the applicant comments:

…you have referred to the possibility of agreement by the applicant to restrictions on the use of their car park site in Syon Lane. The offer to accept restrictions on the use of this car-park was put forward in an attempt to persuade TfL to accept our proposal for 470 spaces on the application site. TfL did not agree to this, so the car park at Syon Lane is no longer part of the equation, and should not be referred to in condition 32 of the planning permission.

2.3 Officers remain of the opinion that the use of this car park would need to be covered by imposition of a condition/Section 106 obligation to ensure that it does
not merely become a general additional car parking area for the development site
but rather its use is restricted to specific major events associated with the hotel.

3. Further information submitted

3.1 The applicant has submitted further information as follows:

(i) Energy Strategy and Assessment Report revision 1 final (Buro Happold, January 2007) – received by Borough Planning by email on 12 January 2007


(iv) Surface Water Flood Risk Assessment – Revision 01 (Buro Happold, January 2007) – received by Borough Planning by email on 9 January 2007

3.2 Officers are reviewing the revised Energy Strategy and Assessment Report, which the applicant advises was submitted to the GLA on 5 January 2007 (refer Issue 5 of the agenda report and Paragraph 1.3 above).

3.3 The sequential approach is considered at Issue 1 of the agenda report. Having reviewed the Sequential Assessment received on 10 January 2007 Officers consider it acceptable as evidence that more sequentially preferable sites are either not appropriate or available (and therefore not viable) for the type of development proposed. The applicant has effectively demonstrated that the scale of development proposed, either in a disaggregated form or as a whole, could not be accommodated within the Borough’s town centres, due to their capacity, and role and function within the hierarchy of town centres in the London Plan (Policy 2A.5 and Annex 1).

3.4 Given the GLA Stage 1 report and letter and with reference to Paragraphs 6.14, 6.16 and 6.18 to 6.24 of the agenda report Officers wish to highlight that the Great Western Road SEL is not defined in an adopted development plan (or draft) and it is stated in Policy 3B.5 of the London Plan that it is for Boroughs to identify the SELs.

3.5 The Business Component Marketing Strategy Report “…provides a framework for the delivery of the Business Component…with a particular emphasis on the promotion of the B1 b/c component. …through an intense marketing campaign…” – and would be secured through planning obligation (refer Issue 6 of the agenda report and, in particular, the paragraph following the table).

3.6 With reference to Paragraphs 5.11 to 5.13 and Issue 4(c) of the agenda report, Officers wish to highlight that the revised Surface Water Flood Risk Assessment was also sent to the Environment Agency.
4. Section 106 and conditions (refer Issue 6 and 9.0 of the agenda report)

4.1 With reference to the table at Issue 6 of the agenda report and conditions set out at 9.0 in relation to the listed building consent the applicant comments as follows (by way of letter dated 12 January 2006):

Turning to the outline heads of terms of the proposed Section 106 Agreement as referred to in the Planning Committee report, whilst these are, in the main, generally acceptable to our Client, there are a number of issues that we would wish to draw to your attention, as follows:

1 Contribution to traffic management

The study cost of £10,000 is agreed. The implementation cost however is not agreed yet and the report should be corrected. Until the study establishes the extent of the CPZ it is not possible to establish what the likely cost of the Implementation Scheme will be. A provision requiring a figure to be agreed can be included within the Section 106 Agreement. We do not feel that the pay back mechanism in relation to BskyB deals with this issue. The amount to be charged to our client should not be set until the work that is required to establish the level of contribution required has been carried out.

2 Contribution to Cycle Routes

This has not been discussed with us at any point in our lengthy discussions on this application. We will however agree to consider with officers whether there is a need for improvements to cycle routes arising from the scheme, and if so, whether there are any improvements within the vicinity that reasonably relate to the development proposed and at that time appropriate improvement works, or a reasonable contribution to such works, may be agreed.

3 Environmental Improvements, Public and Historic Realm Improvements

Our client has not agreed to the inclusion of £100,000 for TFL/A4 Street Scene Improvements (as part of improvements to the Golden Mile) and maintenance and £20,000 for Harlequin Avenue Street Scene Improvements and maintenance. This has not been discussed with us during the discussions on the application and has not been requested by TFL. The applicant is willing however to review with officers whether any such works are necessary in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related to the development, prior to entering into any such commitment.

4 Air Quality

The applicant has asked the Council to justify the request for this contribution in policy terms. We have yet to receive a response. The amount has not been agreed and the report should be modified to read ‘Amount to be Advised’.

5 Tourism/Visitor Attraction to Promote Isleworth and Brentford Borough

We would request that the figure of £35,000 in the report be disregarded. As noted the applicant has offered to agree a scheme for promotion to the occupants of the hotel and to implement the agreed scheme. The costs of doing this should be set off against any required obligation and the figure of £35,000 appears excessive.
4.2 In light of the above, an updated table follows to replace that at Issue 6 of the agenda report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures needed for the development to go ahead</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Agreed?</th>
<th>Addendum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the listed Gillette building following demolition work, of the listed lamp standards and of the Engineer’s House – to include a management plan for the clock tower and its lighting</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, parking and transport:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syon Lane/A4 junction improvements (signalised crossing across the A4) See Issue 2 above</td>
<td>Section 278 work, with all costs (including stats (e.g. cabling)) to be met by the developer</td>
<td>On offer by the applicant. The applicant: (i) is proposing the introduction of a signal controlled pedestrian crossing facility; and (ii) offers commuted maintenance payment for new traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to traffic management (e.g. CPZ in area around the site, if required)</td>
<td>Study cost <strong>£10,000</strong> &amp; Implementation cost, if required <strong>£150,000</strong> – with payback mechanism should the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and any CPZ required as a result of that scheme overlap with any required as a result of this application</td>
<td>In principle, in part: (i) the applicant offers <strong>£10,000</strong> towards study cost; but (ii) implementation cost to be agreed</td>
<td>Study cost is agreed Implementation cost is not agreed. Until the study establishes the extent of the CPZ the applicant considers it is not possible to establish what the likely cost of the implementation scheme will be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Public transport improvements: H91 bus service  
See Issue 2 above | **£1.67 million (approximately) in joint payments in respect of:**  
(i) this application;  
(ii) the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda should it be approved and implemented; and  
(iii) financial contributions in respect of already approved schemes towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time. | In principle: the applicant offers **£135,000 per annum for three years** Subject to negotiation |  

**Amount in**
respect of this application to be advised – with payback mechanism should the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented and some of the total £1.67 million (approximately) joint payments towards an eight-minute frequency of the H91 service at peak time be unused (unless otherwise committed to further improvement of the H91 service).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public transport improvements: upgrades to bus stops</th>
<th>Amount to be advised</th>
<th>In principle: the applicant offers <strong>£20,000</strong> (two x £10,000) for upgrades to two local bus stops to disability standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to cycle routes</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Subject to discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Syon Lane pelican crossing in front of Gillette Building</td>
<td>(i) Section 278 work, with all costs (including stats (e.g. cabling)) to be met by the developer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Footway improvements on Syon Lane and Gillette Corner junction</td>
<td>(ii) £60,000 (there would be £100,000 in joint payments for footway improvements in the surrounding area should the BSkyB application detailed elsewhere on this agenda be approved and implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>(iii) £40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel plans</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above and to include management of overnight accommodation for staff use</td>
<td>Yes: see Paragraph 4.20 and Issues 1(a) and 2 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a car club</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issues 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Yes: the applicant offers a car club to be located in Harlequin Road and made available to the public and occupiers of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park management</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development: see Issue 2 above</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures directly related to the proposed development**

**Employment and training:**

| Representative | The developer will appoint a | To be discussed |
representative to co-ordinate its training/employment activities in relation to the Section 106 deed and liaise on its behalf with the Council’s appointed representative on all local economic matters relating to the development

| Construction training initiatives | To support construction training & **Amount to be advised** on commencement of work towards the cost of providing construction training and work placements in the Borough | In principle: amount to be advised and agreed | Not acceptable in the way that it is framed – the applicant is agreeable to the principle but wishes to have an option to implement specific schemes and arrangements as an alternative to making financial contributions

| Job readiness and job brokering within the Council's Area | To encourage the training and recruitment of local people into jobs provided by the development & **£100,000 (approximately (amount to be advised))** on commencement of work towards the cost of providing job brokerage services to recruit, train and place local people into jobs provided by the development or elsewhere in the Borough in the first instance if it is not possible to place them on the development itself | In principle: amount to be advised and agreed | Not acceptable in the way that it is framed – the applicant is agreeable to the principle but wishes to have an option to implement specific schemes and arrangements as an alternative to making financial contributions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector specific support for the hotel and hospitality industry</th>
<th>E.g. advertisement of supply opportunities &amp; <strong>Amount to be advised</strong> on completion of works towards the cost of providing support for local businesses within (or potentially within) the development’s supply chain or elsewhere if in the first instance it is not possible for the developer to provide such opportunities directly</th>
<th>Subject to discussion</th>
<th>Not acceptable in the way that it is framed – the applicant is agreeable to the principle but wishes to have an option to implement specific schemes and arrangements as an alternative to making financial contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a programme of hotel and hospitality sector awareness, education, vocational training and work experience for 14 - 19 year olds in Hounslow schools through Hounslow Education-Business Partnership (HEBP)</td>
<td><strong>£100,000</strong> over 5 years (£20,000 per annum, starting on commencement of works) towards the cost of the HEBP scheme</td>
<td>Subject to discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-work training (the object of this is to develop the skills of local employees as a means of increasing motivation, knowledge, productivity and enhanced employment and</td>
<td><strong>Amount to be advised</strong> on commencement of works towards the cost of providing in-work training for local employees (the developer may wish to undertake such training itself or it may wish to appoint a training</td>
<td>Subject to discussion</td>
<td>Not acceptable in the way that it is framed – the applicant is agreeable to the principle but wishes to have an option to implement specific schemes and arrangements as an alternative to making financial contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression opportunities provider to deliver the training in question</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Employment Strategy for the hotel</td>
<td>Flows naturally from the development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – see Issue 1(a) above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental improvements, public and historic realm improvements (e.g. TfL/A4 street scene improvements and Section 278/38 highway works)</th>
<th>To include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) £100,000 for TfL/A4 street scene improvements (as part of improvements to the Golden Mile) and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) £30,000 for Harlequin Avenue street scene improvements and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In principle, in part:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) see above under traffic, parking and transport (Section 278/38 highway works would need to be at the applicant's expense)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) the applicant offers to pay a contribution (unspecified amount) towards maintenance of the landscaped area in front of the Gillette Building and the neighbouring park/carry out the works or to carry out the works (subject to land ownership issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not agreed £100,000 for TfL/A4 street scene improvements and maintenance nor £30,000 for Harlequin Avenue street scene improvements and maintenance. The applicant states that this has not been discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Air quality**  
(i.e. contribution to projects related to air-quality management) | **£80,000** | **In principle: amount to be agreed** | The applicant seeks justification for amount sought and requests an amendment to read “Amount to be Advised” |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Energy strategy**  
*See Issue 5 above* | Flows naturally from the development: see Issue 5  
Obligation to do a joint energy study with BSkyB if that proposal, detailed elsewhere on this agenda, is granted planning permission and implemented | **In principle** | |
| **Public access**  
(e.g. ‘Open Space and Security Management Plan’) | Flows naturally from the development | **Yes – see Issue 3 above** | |
| **Considerate constructor scheme** | Flows naturally from the development | **In principle** | |
| **Monitoring costs** | Associated with compliance with the Section 106 deed | **To be discussed** | |
| **Measures directly related to the development to provide an acceptable balance of uses** | | | |
| **Community infrastructure:** | | | |
| Community infrastructure fund and crèche/childcare facilities and health facilities in the local area (if required)) | **Amount to be advised** | **In principle – the applicant offers, for example, to investigate the need for a crèche and if a need is established to offer a suitable area of land within the** | |
Tourism/visitor attraction to promote Isleworth and Brentford/the Borough (e.g. promotion of historic parks, green routes, etc. through leaflets/pamphlets, tourism trails/history tours etc)

| Amount to be advised (approximately £35,000 for promotional/interpretative materials) | In principle (in part) – the applicant offers to agree a scheme for the promotion to occupants of the Hotel and to implement the agreed scheme | The applicant requests that the figure of £35,000 be disregarded (appears excessive) and that the cost of works on offer be set off against any required obligation. |

5. **Recommendation**

5.1 Replace the first line of Paragraphs 1.15 and 9.1 of the agenda report with:

“In the event that the Mayor of London does not issue a direction to refuse the planning application it is recommended that the Director of Planning be authorised to:”
1.0 SUMMARY
1.1 The proposed roof extension would not harm the living conditions at the adjoining property or the appearance of the house and the area as a whole.
1.2 Approval is recommended

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION
2.1 This is a two storey semi-detached property on the northern side of Great West Road. The property is finished in red facing brickwork on the lower half of the elevations with white painted render above and a tiled roof.
2.2 The property has a two-storey side extension incorporating a single storey front element, a single storey rear extension and an outbuilding to the rear of the site.
2.3 No. 198, the other half of the semi, has a similar single storey front extension and a single storey rear extension.
2.4 No. 194, the semi adjoining to the west, has a roof extension in the side roof slope and a single storey rear extension.
2.5 There is no difference in levels between the application property and those adjoining.

3.0 HISTORY
3.2 00505/196/P2 Erection of part two storey/part single storey flank extension. Approved on 2 June 1994 and erected.
3.3 00505/196/P3 Retention of single storey extension to provide a larger garage and an enclosed porch. Approved on 3 November 1998. Permission included a condition requiring the retention of the garage for parking of vehicles.
3.4 00505/196/P4 Conversion of garage into habitable room. Approved on 1 November 2005 but not yet implemented
3.5 A single storey out building has been erected at the rear of the site. This was built under permitted development.
4.0 DETAILS
4.1 The rear roof extension would measure 3.5 metres wide, 1.78 metres high to top of flat roof projecting 2.7 metres at top. It would be set down 0.5 metres from main ridge level, set up 0.5 metres from eaves level and set in 0.8 metres from the boundary line of No. 198, the other half of the semi. It would be set in 1.2 metres from the side slope of the two-storey side extension. One roof light would be incorporated on the front roof slope.

4.2 Two parking spaces are provided on the frontage in addition to the existing garage.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS
5.1 8 neighbouring residents were notified on 30 October 2006. No replies were received.

6.0 POLICY
6.1 Unitary Development Plan
ENV-B.1.1 All New Development.
H.6.4 Extensions and Alterations.
T.1.4 Car and Cycling Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments

6.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance
Section 5 Roof extensions and roof lights.

7.0 PLANNING ISSUES
7.1 The main planning issues to consider are the impact of the proposal on the appearance of the property and area, the living conditions of neighbours and parking provision.

7.2 The Unitary Development Plan policies seek to ensure that any development is compatible with the character of the area, and enhances it in terms of size, scale, materials and design and is consistent with the Council’s Residential Extension Guidelines.

7.3 Dormer windows must be constructed in the centre of the roof space. A dormer to a semi-detached house should be set at least 300m below ridge level, at least 500m above eaves level and at least 500m from the sides of the roof. On larger detached and semi-detached houses these set ins should be increased to at least one metre.

Appearance
7.4 The proposed rear roof extension would comply with the required set ins from ridge level and eaves level and more than comply with the set in from the side roof slope. It would not quite provide the one metre set in from the boundary with No.198, as required in the guidelines. However, the extension has been positioned so that the window would be centrally above the existing first floor window. As the extension would be located well within the roof slope and given the amount of rear roof slope remaining it is considered that the 0.8 metres set in provided is adequate.

7.5 It is not considered that the roof light on the front roof slope would harm the appearance of the house or the area as a whole
Effect on neighbours

7.6 The rear roof extension would be situated well within the roof slope and is not considered to cause any harm to the neighbour’s living conditions.

Parking

7.7 The Council’s maximum UDP parking standards require two off-street parking spaces for this type of property. The property currently has two off-street spaces in addition to the garage. The proposal therefore accords with the Council parking standards and UDP policy T.1.4.

8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are none

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered that the proposal would not harm neighbours’ living conditions or the appearance of the area. Sufficient parking is provided.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

Reason:
The proposed rear roof extension and front roof light would be acceptable due to their position, design and appearance. The development would not harm the appearance of the area, neighbours’ living conditions or highway safety and complies with policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), H.6.4 (Extensions and Alterations) and T.1.4 (Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments) of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

Conditions:

1  A1  Time limit  
   REASON: A1R

2  B3  Matching materials  
   REASON: B3R

3  B5  Detailed applications  
   REASON: B5R
RESULTS OF PLANNING APPEALS

Report by: Director of Legal Services

Summary

The report gives an outline of appeal decisions received since the middle of August 2006, categorised by the relevant area. The decision letters are available for inspection in the Members' Suite.

CHISWICK AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING)
HESTON AND CRANFORD AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING)
WEST AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING)
ISLEWORTH AND BRENTFORD AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING)
CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE (PLANNING)

Chiswick Area Committee (Planning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tideway Scullers School, Chiswick Bridge, Dukes Meadow, Dan Mason Drive, London W4 2SH</td>
<td>27 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Challenger House, 125 Gunnersbury Lane</td>
<td>27 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>11 Lawford Road</td>
<td>27 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>17 Lattimer Place</td>
<td>6 December 2006</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Tideway Scullers School, Chiswick Bridge, Dukes Meadow, Dan Mason Drive, London W4 2SH

Planning permission for new building as a boathouse with boat storage at ground floor to accommodate single sculls, and at first floor an “ergometer suite” with changing facilities; and car parking provision at the east end of the site.
(Refusal of planning permission, 12 January 2006, committee decision, officer recommendation approval with legal agreement and conditions)

Appeal Dismissed 27 November 2006.

The Council considered that the size and height of the building would be unsuitable for the area and detrimental to visual amenity of views from A316 and across the river. The Council also considered that the design and size of building would be over-development and have an unsuitable appearance for the river frontage. The Council considered that the proposal would raise concerns about pedestrian safety, inappropriate parking arrangements and that traffic problems would be created by trailers manoeuvring.

The Inspector considered that the height of the building is well in excess of the inferred 4 metre (single storey) limit. The Inspector found that the proposed building’s dimensions are such that it would protrude above the railway footings and bridge parapet and partly block views over and detract from the openness of the environment the policy aims to protect. The Inspector considered that the visual impact of the building would be far greater than is attributable to the outside storage of boats. The Inspector concluded that any benefits of the proposed scheme would not outweigh the permanent harm identified, and failure to comply with policy.
2. Challenger House, 125 Gunnersbury Lane, Chiswick, London W3 8LH

*Installation of telecommunications base station comprising antenna, equipment cabinet and ancillary development on the roof, and equipment cabinet at ground floor level, and increase in height of existing parapet wall.*  
*(Planning permission refused 25 May 2006, delegated decision).*

**Appeal Dismissed 27 November 2006.**

The Council considered that the proposed installation of telecommunication equipment and a raised parapet wall at Challenger House is unsatisfactory as the development fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The proposed parapet wall will result in the Challenger House building having an overbearing appearance within the street scene, and will not be in keeping with its surroundings.

The Inspector considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area. The Inspector did not consider that the appeal building has any particular conservation merit. The proposed vertical extension of the concrete rendering would appear as an incongruous addition which would exacerbate the situation of existing rendering on other buildings which does little to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. The Inspector also considered that the materially noticeable increase in height of the proposed building would be an awkward and unsympathetic addition, which would result in unacceptable domination of the adjacent terrace. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

3. 11 Lawford Road, Chiswick W4 3HS

*Erection of roof extension/loft conversion to house.*  
*(Planning permission refused 23 March 2006, delegated decision).*

**Appeal Dismissed 27 November 2006.**

The Council considered that the development, by reason of its size, appearance and design, in particular its large hip to gable appearance, would detract from the street scene, and would not preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area.

The Inspector considered that while the proposed side extension of the roof of No.11 resembles that existing on No.13, the benefit in terms of pair symmetry would in my view be clearly outweighed by the uncomfortable visual relationship with No.9 and the run of adjoining original and unencumbered roof forms. The proposal would be detrimental to the street scene and the size and massing of the proposed side roof extension would also further erode the spaciousness that contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The Inspector considered that the scheme fails to attain the high standards expected in Conservation Areas and does not reflect the design and character of the original building. The Inspector concluded that the appeal scheme would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would be unacceptable harmful.
4. **17 Lattimer Place, London W4 2UD**

_Erection of carport to front of existing garage adjacent to 12 Bedford Close and at the rear of 13 Lattimer Place. (Planning permission refused 5 April 2006, committee decision, officer recommendation approval)._  

**Appeal Allowed 6 December 2006.**

The Council considered that the proposal by reason of its location and appearance would create unnecessary clutter in the street scene, which is out of character with the area. The Council concluded that the proposal would be out of keeping with the appearance and design of the total area.

The Inspector considered that given its slimline appearance and modest scale, the proposed carport would not appear cluttered, prominent or dominating from public viewpoints. He considered that whilst the proposal adopts a contemporary design with a different architecture, it would not therefore adversely harm the character and appearance of the street scene. The Inspector noted however that there is no reason why the proposal should set a general precedent for carports in the Estate.

---

**Heston And Cranford Area Committee (Planning)**

**NO.** **SITE** **DATE** **OUTCOME**

1. 82 Firs Drive, Cranford 15 November 2006 Dismissed

---

1. **82 The Firs Drive, Cranford, Hounslow TW5 9TD**

_Appeal against refusal of planning permission for single and two storey side and rear extension and part first floor rear extension to house. (Refused 23 May 2006, delegated decision)._  

**Appeal dismissed, 15 November 2006.**

The Council considered that the proposed extensions would, by reason of their size, scale, and appearance infill an important visual gap, and appear as obtrusive features, resulting in harm to the appearance of the building and character and appearance of the Cranford Village Conservation Area.

The Inspector considered that the main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Cranford Village Conservation Area. The Inspector considered that the proposal was not in line with SPG or relevant planning policy, and that the proposal would significantly reduce the visual gap between the appeal property and No.80 and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector was also of the view that the characteristics and the bulk of the proposal would be noticeably at odds with the prevailing form of buildings nearby and so would harm the character and appearance of the area.
West Area Committee (Planning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20 Gladstone Avenue, Feltham</td>
<td>20 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>17 Southville Road, Bedfont</td>
<td>20 November 2006</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **20 Gladstone Avenue, Feltham TW14 9LL**

*Appeal against refusal of planning permission for an existing outbuilding to rear of the house. (Refusal 7 February 2006, delegated decision).*

**Appeal Dismissed, 20 November 2006.**

The Council considered that the outbuilding, because of its position, size, scale and appearance constitutes a bulky and obtrusive feature that harms the character and appearance of the original house and surrounding area as a whole. It reduces the outlook for the adjoining property at No.72 as well as resulting in a loss of daylight and sunlight here.

The Inspector considered that owing to the height, position and length of the appeal building along the boundary of No.70, the neighbours at No.72 are largely justified in their representations concerning its unneighbourly effects. The Inspector concluded that the retention of the appeal building would be unacceptable and not in accordance with the development plan.

2. **17 Southville Road, Bedfont, Feltham TW14 8AX**

*Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the erection of a front porch to the house. (Refusal 5 January 2006, delegated decision).*

**Appeal allowed 20 November 2006.**

The Council considered that the porch extension, because of its position, design and appearance, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and streetscene in general.

The Inspector considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector considered that the proposal would comply with the Residential Extension Guidelines, as they allow a larger front extension where the front elevation of a house is staggered, provided that the extension is single storey and set well back from the part of the house nearest the road (as in this case). The porch would align with neighbouring properties and in the Inspector’s view would not be prominent within the street scene and would not harm the character or appearance of the area. The Inspector considered that a condition requiring matching materials would be appropriate in the interests of the appearance of the area.
Isleworth And Brentford Area Committee (Planning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>17 Mandeville Road, Isleworth</td>
<td>16 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>26 Glenhurst Road, Brentford</td>
<td>20 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Thameside House, 42-50 High Street, Brentford</td>
<td>22 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>219 Twickenham Road</td>
<td>22 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>40 St Marys Crescent, Isleworth</td>
<td>11 December 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Spring Grove Court, Spring Grove Road</td>
<td>12 December 2006</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Isleworth Crown Court, 36 Ridgeway Road</td>
<td>14 December 2006</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **17 Mandeville Road, Isleworth TW7 6AD**

   *Appeal against refusal of planning permission for retention of development consisting of rear roof extension to existing house.*
   *(Planning permission refused 11 April 2006, delegated decision).*

   **Appeal Dismissed, 16 November 2006.**

   The Council considered that the roof, by virtue of its size and lack of set down from the ridge of the roof, is neither subordinate nor complimentary to the original house design and is harmful to the appearance of the dwelling and the visual amenity of the area.

   The Inspector considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of No.17 and Mandeville Road. The Inspector considered that the dormer as constructed has the appearance of a large box which dominates and is disproportionate to the rear roof of No 17. Further, it is visible from the streetscene and adjacent gardens and is contrary to the character of the area.

2. **26 Glenhurst Road, Brentford, Middlesex TW8 9BX**

   *Appeals against refusals to grant planning permission for erection of a brick tower to incorporate two advertisements to existing site.*
   *(Planning permissions refused 18 April 2006, delegated decision).*

   **Appeals Dismissed 20 November 2006.**

   The Council considered that the proposed advertisement tower in this location would be inappropriate and unacceptable in the context of surrounding development. The development would be detrimental to the street scene and local visual amenity, as well as residential amenity and neighbours’ living conditions, and would potentially result in a loss of available on-site car parking and place increased pressure on parking in the locality. The Council also concluded that the advertisement proposal, by virtue of its size, siting and illumination of the advertisements would represent a potential distraction to motorists, to the detriment of the safety and free flow of traffic and the interests of public safety.
The Inspector considered that there are three main issues in these appeals. Firstly, the Inspector concluded that the proposals would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the locality. The brick tower would be very prominent and would constitute a dominating and largely alien feature in the street scene, almost entirely unrelated to the scale, form and massing of adjacent buildings. In the Inspector’s opinion, the advertisements and their illumination would also serve to emphasise the isolated and inappropriate relationship of the tower to the locality.

Secondly, the Inspector considered that the scheme would have a negative effect on the living conditions of neighbours in terms of outlook and visual amenity. In the Inspector’s opinion, the size, height and location of the tower in relation to adjoining dwellings is such that both it and the advertisements would appear as unduly visually intrusive from the opposite side of Glenhurst Road, the illumination would exacerbate the situation.

Thirdly, the Inspector raised concerns about highways safety on the M4, A4 and Glenhurst Road arising from the proposed advertisements and the reduction in car parking on the site. The Inspector considered that the dominant advertisements with frequent changes of content would distract drivers’ attention, creating a hazard. The Inspector considered that the proposals would be materially harmful to the interests of highway safety on the M4 and A4, and that also to a limited degree the proposals would increase pressure on Glenhurst Road through loss of off street parking space.

3. Thameside House, 42-50 High Street, Brentford, London TW8 0BB

Appeal against refusal of planning permission for development of two additional floors on top of the existing structure to provide an additional 10 2-bedroom residential apartments (planning permission refused 1 June 2006, delegated decision).

Appeal Dismissed 22 November 2006.

The Council considered that the proposal by virtue of its scale, massing and design would be unacceptable in the riverside location and would not make a positive contribution to the site’s waterside setting, harmful therefore to this important Thameside location and the amenities of neighbouring properties including a loss of outlook and to the character of the streetscene. The Council also considered that insufficient details have been provided with respect to car and cycle facilities, refuse and recycling provision, wheelchair provision, and pedestrian access within the building and the impact on the existing office. It is considered that the proposal would likely lead to pedestrian conflict and parking congestion.

The Inspector considered that although the appeal site is within Brentford town centre, public transport accessibility is below average and there is not justification for accepting a car fee development. The Inspector considered that the lack of parking provisions could not be overcome by conditions. The Inspector concluded on parking that in the absence of a proper assessment there would be a significant risk of making inadequate provision and suffering the consequences of congestion and safety problems that development plan policies aim to avoid. The Inspector did accept, however, that the scale, massing, height and design of the proposed extension of the appeal building are not inappropriate in its surroundings, and indeed would have a positive impact on the streetscene and appearance of the existing building. The Inspector also did not accept that the proposals would harm the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The Inspector concluded however, that none of the merits identified are sufficient to outweigh his adverse findings on parking provision, therefore on this basis the scheme is unacceptable.
4. 219 Twickenham Road, Isleworth, Middlesex TW7 6AA

Appeal against refusal of planning permission for change of use from A1 computer shop to takeaway. (Planning permission refused 11 August 2005, delegated decision).

Appeal Dismissed 22 November 2006.

The Council considered that the proposed change of use would result in the loss of a retail unit and give rise to an unacceptable increase in associated noise disturbance which is likely to be detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding properties. The Council also considered that the lack of off-street parking as a result of the proposal would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow of traffic and general safety in the immediate vicinity. The Council further considered that the proposed use lacks adequate facilities for people with disabilities.

The Inspector considered that the main issues in this case are the effect the proposal would have on: local shopping provision; the living conditions of nearby residents; and the highway safety in the vicinity.

With regard to shopping provision, the Inspector considered that although the proposal would increase the proportion of non-retail use, the parade would retain a strong local shopping function. The proposal would not adversely affect the balance of retail to non-retail including catering types uses or give rise to a dominance of Class A5 uses either within this parade or the frontage in general. Although the proposal would involve the loss of shop use, the Inspector considered that in this case it would not reduce the attractiveness to shoppers or erode the local shopping function.

In terms of the living conditions of the residents of the flats above the property, the Inspector considered that imposing a condition requiring approval of details of ventilation including for noise emission would deal effectively with cooking smells and odours. The Inspector considered that the 22.30 closing time would mean that any noise generated by the comings and goings of customers would not add appreciably to noise levels in the vicinity. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not significantly detract from the living conditions of nearby residents.

Finally, with regard to highway safety, the Inspector agreed with the view of the Inspector in the appeal on no. 193) that due to the lack of parking in the area (and none to be provided as part of the proposal) the circulation of cars searching for parking opportunities in the vicinity of the appeal site would increase turning movements and the potential for vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would involve a significant risk to highway safety in the vicinity.

The Inspector found in favour of the proposal with respect to local shopping impact, nearby living conditions and some other matters, however this is outweighed by the risk to highway safety, therefore the appeal cannot succeed.

5. 40 St Marys Crescent, Isleworth

Demolition of existing detached house and the construction of a new four bedroom house with additional vehicular access and conservatory. (Planning permission refused 4 April 2006, delegated decision).

Appeal Dismissed 11 December 2006.

The Council considered that the proposed development by reason of its size and scale, would be unacceptable, as it would have a harmful impact upon neighbours’ living conditions at both adjacent properties through loss of light, overshadowing and the creation of an unacceptable sense of enclosure.
The Inspector considered that it is the conservatory that is the matter of dispute for this application. The Inspector considered that the projection of the conservatory into the rear garden would have a limited effect on daylight, sunlight and outlook from no.38. The Inspector did consider however that the conservatory would substantially block the amount of daylight into the kitchen at no.42 and would appear excessively dominating and obtrusive from it. Although the residents at no.42 had not objected to the proposals, the Inspector considered that the proposals would harm their living conditions, and felt it necessary to safeguard the interests of future occupants.

6. Land West of Spring Grove Court, Spring Grove Road, Isleworth TW7 4AN

Erection of a detached one bedroom bungalow.
(Planning permission refused 1 February 2006, delegated decision).

Appeal Allowed 12 December 2006.

The Council considered that the proposed development due to its cramped appearance and position on the site would not be in keeping with the form, character and style of surrounding development, and also provide inadequate living accommodation for the occupants of the unit. The Council also considered that inadequate vehicle and pedestrian access would be provided for the development due to the narrowness and length of the existing road which serves the site. The Council considered that this would be harmful to highway safety.

The Inspector considered that the appeal building is of a modest scale and an unobtrusive design that would be viewed against the backdrop of the adjoining gardens, and in view of this low-key appearance and scale the proposal would not appear out of keeping with the detached garden outbuilding or garages. Given its position, scale and design, it would not harm the spacious character of this backland site or appear especially cramped within its setting. The Inspector considered that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the street scene or to the area in general.

The Inspector also considered that the outlook from the dwelling would not be poor due to open views and the fact the proposed dwelling is not close to any large buildings, therefore not causing harm to the living conditions of future occupiers. The Inspector was also satisfied that given the size of the dwelling and the plot, the amount of outdoor amenity space is adequate, meaning no harm would be caused to the living conditions of future residents.

In terms of highway safety, the Inspector considered that although the private driveway is narrow and the visibility with the footway is restricted, there would be no material increase in the use of the access, and therefore no harm to highway safety as a result of the appeal proposal.

The Inspector imposed conditions as put forward by the Council requiring details of facing materials, details of boundary treatment and removal of certain permitted development rights to restrict extensions and/or additional buildings/structures.
Demolition of a single storey car park building and removal of some trees. Development of site to include 5 additional crown courts as 2 storey extension for 6 new crown courtrooms and associated accommodation and conversion of 1 existing courtroom to ancillary and witness areas. Small single storey extension to custody accommodation, jury and general office areas and improvements to existing public entrance. Demolitions include single storey buildings currently used for secure parking and elements in association with the proposed single storey extensions. Parking provision and landscape altered to suit siting of the proposed tow storey courtroom extension.

(Planning permission and conservation area consent refused 21 March 2006 - committee decision, officer recommendation approval).

Appeal Allowed, 14 December 2006.

With regard to the planning application the Council considered that the proposed development by reason of its height, scale and massing would appear as a dominant and intrusive feature constituting an over development of the site, out of keeping with existing development to the detriment of the street scene and would result in loss of visual amenity and harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Council further considered that the site has poor pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility and is not accessible by sustainable modes. The proposed development, because of the traffic and parking generated in an area that is already heavily parked would give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety with increased danger, congestion and environmental intrusion.

In terms of the Conservation Area consent the Council considered that the proposed demolition would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and is not justified until an acceptable scheme for the extension of the building has been agreed.

The Inspector considered that the main issues are the effect of the proposals on: the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area; and highway safety and convenience, with particular respect to parking in the surrounding area, taking account of the availability of modes of transport other than the private car.

The Inspector noted that in contrast to the existing low-key structure, the proposed building would be visible from several viewpoints, particularly to the south and west. The Inspector considered that in the context of the mix of building form and scale in the wider surrounding area there is nothing to prevent a building of the size proposed from having a satisfactory relationship with its surroundings.

The Inspector is satisfied that despite the increased height and visibility of the extension it would sit comfortably in its landscaped surroundings and maintain the established character of this part of the conservation area. The Inspector considered that whilst the scale and design of the proposed building would contrast with its immediate neighbours, it would be appropriate for its intended use as a public building. The Inspector is satisfied that the space between the proposed extension and no’s 1 and 1A Osterley Road would be sufficient to prevent it having an overbearing impact on these buildings or harming the setting of the locally listed building at no. 1 Osterley Road. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would preserve the established character of the conservation area and be consistent with policy.
In terms of the impact on highway and other issues, the Inspector considered that the 5 additional court rooms would inevitably lead to an increase in the number of people travelling to and from the site. In looking at the site’s accessibility, the Inspector recognised that there are some shortcomings in the public transport options, however he considered that the site also has benefits which are sufficient to overcome any disadvantages presented by the site’s distance to stations and bus stops. The Inspector’s overall view is that it is a highly accessible location. The Inspector considered that between 40% and 50% of those travelling to and from the courts currently use non-car modes. The Inspector agreed a condition requiring a green travel plan and a car management plan for the site, along with obligations requiring improvements to pedestrian routes and signage. The Inspector considered that these measures are capable of increasing the percentage of visitors to the courts travelling by non-car methods sufficiently to offset the increase in number of visitors that would result from the proposed extension.

The Inspector considered that in order to prevent increased demand for parking in the roads surrounding the site, the proposal would need to ensure that the car park would be used to its full capacity. The Inspector recognised the importance of ensuring that the appeal proposal does not increase on street parking, however she considered that improved signage to the car park together with the implementation of a CPZ, would be successful in ensuring that the car park was fully used and prevent the proposed development from increasing parking pressure in the surrounding roads. The Inspector concluded that the condition and obligations would be effective in restricting vehicular traffic and the demand for parking in the surrounding roads and ensure that the proposal would not reduce highway safety in the locality.

The Inspector did not consider that any other matters outweighed his conclusions on the main issues and concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

Central Hounslow Area Committee (Planning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hedge at 55 Bath Road, Hounslow</td>
<td>22 November 2006</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Hedge at 55 Bath Road, Hounslow TW3 3BN**

*Appeal against a Remedial Notice to remedy the adverse effect of a high hedge, notice dated 31 May 2006 (delegated decision).*

*Appeal Dismissed 22 November 2006.*

The Council considered that the hedge is causing significant obstruction of daylight and sunlight to the complainant’s property, adversely affecting his living conditions and visual amenity. The Council considered that a reduction in the height of the hedge to 5.5 metres should be carried out and the health of the hedge reviewed once the remedial work has been undertaken. On balance, the Council considered that the harm caused by the hedge outweighs other factors and that remedial action should be taken.

The Inspector considered that in terms of the height reduction each case and circumstance has to be assessed on its own merits. The Inspector considered that the Council have made a considered and balanced decision and that the Remedial Notice is both appropriate and reasonable.
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