

Ickenham Residents' Association

General Secretary: 6 The Chase, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8SR



23rd October 2014

Mr. James Rodger
Head of Planning, Sport & Green Spaces
London Borough of Hillingdon
Civic Centre
Uxbridge
Middx. UB8 1UW

Subject: [52129/APP/2014/2996](#) SIGNATURE SENIOR LIFESTYLE 88-94 LONG LANE ICKENHAM

Demolition of 5 existing dwellinghouses and redevelopment of the site for a 85 unit Class C2 care home for the elderly of 1.5 to 2.5 storeys in height with associated landscaping and car parking (40 spaces in total), stopping up of existing vehicular accesses on Long Lane and construction of new vehicular access onto Long Lane.

Dear Mr Rodger

This Association objects strongly to the above proposal.

We do however recognise the need for the provision of such facilities, but not at this level of intensity or occupation, nor at this particular site within the Ickenham Conservation Area and as such completely disagree with the conclusion reached in the Planning Statement

The Association would like to put this proposal into perspective, in that it is over 40% larger in terms of Gross Internal Area than the proposed Tesco store on the Master Brewer site.

Preamble

The Conservation Area at this point comprises of large detached houses with equally large settings. This proposal would alter completely from the foregoing description to one of a very large terraced commercial frontage, totally inconsistent with the existing Conservation Area.

The current footprint of five large detached houses with extensive green areas (gardens) and mature trees surrounding them will very largely be replaced with a massive concrete footprint supporting a highly dense form of accommodation.

Recent research of ours, printed in our last Ickenham Calling Newsletter indicated the following: "At the moment, Hillingdon has 64 care homes with 1200 beds, plus nine supported living units with 318 beds. The CCG (Hillingdon Clinical Commissioning Group) proposes to recruit two Community Specialist Nurses to support care homes in caring for residents, to avoid admission to hospital".

Page 1 of 4

This, we feel, indicates there is no particular lack of such provision in Hillingdon, despite the applicants' claim, and further indicates a possible move from institutional care to that of care in the community, i.e. at home.

One final point in our preamble is that of cost. We have been told that typical pricing for accommodation in this facility would be in the region of £2000 per week – far beyond the means of most people in the local area, even though it is planned to be an 'end of life' facility with an expected stay of probably less than two years.

Planning Issues.

1) Built Environment.

One of the key factors of the Conservation Areas, beyond its design and appearance in respect to the built form or physical features, is its intensity of use to which buildings and land are put. Conservation Areas can be particularly sensitive to change of use proposals, particularly if such proposals were to bring greater traffic generation or an increase in the number of commercial vehicles.

The proposal as presented would completely change the street scene as viewed from Long Lane from one of individual large houses in large spacious plots to a large terraced commercial structure higher, wider, and deeper than the existing properties, and as referred to above will increase traffic generation, and introduce commercial vehicle movements.

With the exception of the Douay Martyrs school building along the northern edge, the remainder of the site is surrounded by substantial detached and semi-detached houses, which currently enjoy the benefits of an open, green environment, consistent with a Conservation Area. This will be replaced with extensive buildings at the end of their gardens (Court Road & Swakeleys Drive) covering the majority of the plot, resulting in a considerable loss of amenity and character.

The proposal can in no way claim to "preserve or enhance the Conservation Area" and the loss of existing houses would, by way of the positive contribution they currently make to the Conservation Area, be detrimental to it.

We therefore feel this application contravenes the following policies of the UDP Saved Policies.
Pt 1.10; BE4, BE5, BE13, BE 19, BE21, BE24, and OE1.

2) Flooding.

The area in question already suffers from a high water table with frequent instances of local surface water drainage problems. Occasionally this build up has been known to put such pressure on the local sewerage network as to have instances of sewerage overspill as well.

The introduction of such a large area being placed under concrete (1.2 Hectares), together with the subsequent loss of natural drainage, coupled with the introduction of some 89 (min) accommodation units will, in our view, add considerably to the risk of further instances of flooding.

As indicated there will be a substantial increase in the percentage of the site covered in hard surfacing and whilst we acknowledge there has been some attempt to balance soft and hard landscaping proposals, the applicant has failed to offer any SUDs input which would sufficiently demonstrate that the site in its proposed use would not flood leading to the flooding of neighbouring sites due to the high water table.

We therefore feel this application contravenes the following policies of the UDP Saved Policies.

3) Change of Use.

In relation to Policy R15 of the UDP we have already commented (in our preamble) that this area is, in our opinion, fairly well covered for the provision of care facilities, so no such NEED exists. Further the development is NOT in sympathy with either the style OR character of the existing street scene.

This particular site however has NO transport facilities passing the door and shops are a lengthy and arduous walk away. Medical facilities (GP's) are already overstretched in the area.

We therefore feel that this application does NOT comply with policy R15 and H10.

4) Traffic/Safety

Whilst conceding that this proposal 'MAY' not generate too much traffic, we feel it has been understated.

It sits on a very contentious piece of road with regular heavy congestion, on a difficult bend, with a traffic Island opposite/adjacent to the proposed vehicular entrance, opposite access to Turnstone Close and not too far distant from a heavily used School Crossing. The residents and neighbours in the vicinity of the houses planned to be demolished comment that the 'difficult bend' referred to above has caused a number of vehicle accidents, particularly speeding cars late at night.

The assumption that traffic impact at a location that can accommodate up to 85 residents, with between 80 and 90 members of staff can be minimised through the introduction of a site travel plan is in our view simplistic. We believe that the staff alone will generate more than the 7 – 10 two way trips detailed within the Travel Plan.

We also have a concern that the survey undertaken on the 18th June 2014 was not carried out at the correct a.m. and p.m. peak times; 0730 - 0830 and 1545 -1645, as opposed to 0745 - 0845 and 1645-1745 as used by the recent surveys provided by Tesco and Morrisons for the Hillingdon Circus applications.

The number of vehicles returned from the survey were also lower by over 100 in each direction than the volumes reported in both the Tesco and Morrisons Transport Assessments and by LBH for the proposed extension to Glebe School.

In addition, the travel plan is silent on any committed development in the area such as the Glebe School extension and the recently approved Tesco store on the former Master Brewer site.

It should be understood that any additional traffic in the Ickenham area will have an impact on the journey time and queue lengths currently experienced by the users of this already congested route

We are concerned that adequate consideration/provision may not have been provided for 'Loading Arrangements' within the curtilage of the site. An accommodation site of this size and nature will require many 'service vehicle' movements to service the needs of such an institution, e.g. food supplies, medical supplies, recycling, waste disposal, clinical waste disposal, transport for residents. (See General Notes on the use of parking standards (LBH UPD Saved Policies Sept 2007 page 322)).

We therefore contest this application's robustness against Policies AM2 and AM7.

5) Environmental Impacts

We are concerned that, as the site will be operating around the clock, site deliveries and collections will take place outside normal working hours, leading to a noise impact on adjacent properties.

We are also concerned that kitchen waste will attract vermin if not stored and disposed of correctly.

We feel the plans are misleading, suggesting a green and pleasant setting, whereas we know that a number of substantial trees will have to be felled and that some of the green setting on the plans will comprise bin storage and other similar facilities.

6) Summary

In summary we would suggest that the introduction of a purely commercial site and operation within the confines of a Conservation Area, so designated as being 'of large residential properties set in spacious grounds' is wholly inappropriate.

For all of the above reasons, and the contravention of many of your planning policies, as indicated, we strongly oppose this application and ask that you refuse planning permission.

Yours Sincerely



Mrs June Reyner
General Secretary

On behalf of Ickenham Residents' Association

Cc J Palmer
R Puddifoot
D Simmonds
J Hensley