

63-71 High Street Hampton Hill

Notes of Matters arising at Pre-Application Meeting with LB Richmond 4th August 2016

Present

Anita Vedi	- LBR - Senior Planning Officer
Marc Wolfe-Cowen	- LBR - Urban Design Officer
Mary Toffee	- LBR - Highways Engineer
Svetlana Lomovtseva	- Greatplanet Limited - Director
Terry Holmes	- P2M - Project Manager
Richard Cornell	- Royal Haskoning - Highways / Traffic Engineer
Reinhard Weiss	- 3S - Architects & Designers
Paul Stanley	- 3S – Architects & Designers
Chris Francis	- West & Partners – Town Planning Consultants

1.0 Principle of Development

- 1.1 AV stated that while the site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of The Royal Park, which is designated Metropolitan Open Land, the principle of redevelopment was itself acceptable.
- 1.2 However, the extant Core Strategy policy CP19 and Local Plan policy CP19A both require retention / replacement of existing employment uses. This policy requirement is being carried forward in the ongoing Local Plan review at LP40. As it stood the proposed development was contrary to these policies. Any case advanced for the reduction of replacement employment space would need to include a sequential assessment.
- 1.3 The Council would want to see a significant level of employment use and AV considered the retail units too small to address this.
- 1.4 CF made the following points in response:
- The existing buildings could be converted to residential use, subject to prior approval, as permitted development. This had not been pursued to date but the fact that this was open to the applicant was a material consideration.
 - As set out in the Draft PDAS the premises have been vacant for over three years and have been extensively marketed: a full report detailing this would be submitted in support of the application.
 - Agent advice is that there is no viable demand which would support redevelopment of new office employment accommodation in this area.
 - The size of the retail unit has been set at a level which it is considered has a reasonable prospect of finding a tenant in this part of the High Street.
- 1.5 AV noted the point in respect of a PD rights and advised as a first step that an application be submitted for prior approval in order to provide the basis for a residential led redevelopment. It would also be necessary to provide justification for the size of the retail units as proposed.
- 1.6 AV advised that any marketing report that is submitted should have regard to Appendix 5 of the emerging Local Plan.

2.0 Layout, Access, Design & Appearance, Scale of Development

2.1 AV advised that Land Use issues aside there was a lot of the proposed scheme that was liked.

2.2 It is agreed that the existing buildings make no beneficial contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and that redevelopment would in principle enhance the overall setting of the Conservation Area and that this is welcomed. It was agreed that a contemporary design, as proposed, can achieve the required enhancement.

2.3 No concerns were raised regarding the principle of the proposed reinstatement of the historic building line or the proposed vehicular and pedestrian access points and there was general support for the courtyard approach to the scheme.

2.4 MC advised that there is an in principle concern about the proposed height of the building which officers consider to be detrimental to the character of the conservation area. This was a view shared by Robert Angus and it is thought that a floor less on the street frontage would be more appropriate.

2.5 In response CF PS and RW made the following points:

- The design had been developed to respond to the scale and character of this part of the CA (which it was agreed is diverse with no dominant form or building type)
- The scale is deliberately lowered to the north of the pedestrian entrance to the outer court to respond to the lower scale to the buildings to the north
- The scale of elements within the proposed design take cues from the neighbouring buildings while incorporating the requirements of the necessary floor heights to meet modern standards.
- The design follows the classical principle of base (the retail) a middle, and an attic storey. The latter in the form of the sculpted roof which has been developed taking references from the differing pitched roof landscape along the street.
- The site is towards the centre of a pronounced curve in views from north and south which influences the appropriate scale. When viewed from the north there is an escalation in rising up from the lower buildings and back down to the neighbouring locally listed building.
- The stepping of the building line and façade to articulate the curve in the road which also add verticality and emulates the rhythm of the neighbouring plots.

2.6 CF said that the comments of the officers on this issue were noted and that a review of the design would be undertaken and further discussions then held going forward.

2.7 MC indicated that in general they welcomed the approach to

- The courtyard layout
- The proportions of the building
- The stepping of the façade and verticality
- The form of the roof but not the height

MC expressed some concern regarding the separation between the semi-detached townhouses and adjacent townhouses and apartments. In response PS cited the London Square development in Teddington, which has similar separation distances. This was noted.

- 2.8 AV noted that a sustainability assessment justifying the demolition of the existing buildings will need to be submitted with the application.
- 2.9 AV raised a question regarding the scale of the proposals in relation to the existing recently converted B1 Office to Residential mews to the south.
- 2.10 PS advised that the proposed new building is on the same line as the existing building along this side of the site and that the top floor is set back. CF advised that initial review of the proposals indicated that any change from existing VSC daylight enjoyed by the neighbours was within the 0.8 of the existing value which the BRE guidance indicates that the change will not be noticeable. CF also noted that this adjoining development is itself unneighbourly and should not dictate and compromise our proposals.
- 2.11 AV noted 7 trees will be removed as part of the proposals. Whilst it is acknowledged that these are of limited value, the provision for replacement trees on the site should show a beneficial environmental improvement. CF advised that planting will be included as part of the design of the rear courtyard.
- 2.12 AV noted that in addition to CIL, there is an opportunity for developers to make financial contributions toward planting new street trees and this should be considered. LBR to put proposal forward (amount) for consideration.
- 3.0 Transport & Highways**
- 3.1 MT provided a list of comments for RH's review.
- 3.2 MT advised that a 2.4 x 2.1m sight line will need to be provided at the head of the ramp to afford pedestrian safety.
- 3.3 MT has concerns on safety issues with regard to the ramp design and pedestrian/traffic generation/waiting which need to be addressed. RC advised that vehicle swept paths had been checked and arrivals and departure numbers generated. MT indicated that the proposed single width ramp is acceptable with a traffic light system, noting that priority must be given to vehicles travelling down the ramp to mitigate any potential queuing on the public highway and the design needs to ensure space for waiting and passing is sufficient for 1 car to queue off the street and 1 car to pass. Also the ramp gradients need to be illustrated on the proposed drawings.
- 3.4 MT expressed some concerns regarding servicing to the retail units and the intended use of the 'community coffee space'. In respect of servicing RC advised a survey had been undertaken and this indicated, given the size of the unit, that servicing from the street was acceptable. In respect of the 'community space CF advised that this was something that was to be discussed with local residents. It is not seen as a commercial unit.
- 3.5 MT asked if the developer would consider accepting a S106 restriction regarding use (i.e. no food retail) – it was confirmed that this was acceptable.
- 3.6 Cycle storage in basement acceptable subject to being to London Plan standards. Space should also be provided for the retail units and this can also be within the basement. A preference for Sheffield Stands was noted.
- 3.7 There are two existing Sheffield Stands on the street frontage and these will need to be re-provided: it was agreed that this could be in the outer courtyard.
- 3.8 The basement parking arrangement was reviewed and found to be generally acceptable. MT noted that the depth of the garages should be no less than 5.5m and she recommended

review of the garage in T08 to allow easier vehicular access. It was confirmed that there is no dedicated space for the retail unit.

- 3.9 The principle of residents' bin stores within basement is acceptable with the holding area at ground floor – on proviso that this will be managed and the design is safe next to the vehicular access ramp. The application will need to include details of the proposed management of refuse collection and MT advised that this will need to address mitigation of the travel distances for residents to rubbish stores (no more than 30m)
- 3.10 MT advised that a draft Construction Management Plan will be required as part of the submission
- 3.11 Although the High Street is not currently in a CPZ (nor are there any current proposals to introduce a CPZ) the Council will seek a Section 106 undertaking to restrict resident's rights to apply for parking permits should a CPZ be adopted in the future.
- 3.12 The ownership status of the land between the current building frontage and the historic back edge of pavement was discussed. CF noting that there the title plans still indicate this to be part of the land owned by the applicant. MT will review with the highway engineer to establish if a stopping up order will be needed.
- 3.13 MT confirmed that only a Transport Statement would be needed to support the application (not a Transport Assessment), noting that accessibility will improve with the development of Crossrail 2 passing through Fulwell.

4.0 Affordable Housing

- 4.1 AV advised that Policy LP36 sets out a requirement for 50% affordable housing on site and seeks the maximum amount on the redevelopment of employment sites.
- 4.2 CF stated that as far as he was concerned the starting point needs to have regard to the Vacant Building Credit allowance/PD conversion, neither of which give rise to any requirement for affordable. Also as the Planning and Housing Act introduces a requirement for 20% of new developments to be provided as Starter Homes – which by definition are affordable - the developer would be looking for this to form part, if not all, of the affordable provision. CF noted that the Regulations bringing this legislation into practice had still to be made but that these are anticipated to be made soon after the resumption of parliament and therefore operative by the time the application will be determined.
- 4.3 This therefore is the preferred option. CF noted that the design does have the ability to include affordable housing but noted that RSLs may not find the scheme attractive because of the management costs associated with a scheme of this sort including basement parking.
- 4.4 AV advised that the final assessment will be subject to negotiation and a Viability Assessment.
- 4.4 CF advised that Turner Moran are appointed by the developer to agree the FVA and AV advised that Bespoke are appointed consultants who will be advising the LA on affordable housing contributions, unit mix and sizes. They are at Richmond one day a week and it was agreed that the discussions on this would be instigated.

5.0 Other Matters

- 5.1 Any successful application would have a contamination condition. TH advised that a full site investigation and contamination report had been carried out and this would be submitted and that a 'final report' condition would be acceptable

5.2 Other reports needed for any application were noted as:

- Ecology
- Archaeology n
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Energy / Sustainability
- FRA

5.3 It was confirmed that the flats and houses would accord with the Nationally prescribed Standards

5.4 AV was advised that the applicant is intending to undertake a public exhibition / consultation of the proposal for local residents in September and that we would provide details of this when fixed.

6.0 Going Forward

6.1 It was agreed that AV would not set out the comments provided on the scheme in writing and this would then allow the pre app to remain open and further discussions to continue.

6.2 It was agreed that all communication would be though West & Partners (Chris Francis) for the developer and Anita Vedi (for the LBR)

West & Partners

11 September 2016