

<u>MEETING</u> PLANNING COMMITTEE
<u>DATE AND TIME</u> WEDNESDAY 25TH OCTOBER, 2017 AT 7.00 PM
<u>VENUE</u> HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BG

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	ADDENDUM (IF APPLICABLE)	3 - 20

Kirstin Lambert kirstin.lambert@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 2177

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

25 OCTOBER 2017

AGENDA ITEM 5

ADDENDUM TO THE OFFICER'S REPORT

17/2248/FUL

Plot 299, 128 Colindale Avenue, London, NW9 4AX

Pages 11-34

Amendment to reason for refusal 2:

Addition of part iii of Policy DM12 to the reason for refusal.

The amended reason for refusal will read as follows:

The proposal has failed to provide evidence of effective marketing of an A1 use or any of the other uses previously approved under application H/05856/13 for this unit or any of the other units within the 128 Colindale Avenue parade contrary to parts iii and iv of policy DM12 of Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Following publication of the October Committee reports, 4 new letters were submitted to the Local Planning Authority. One of these is from Smith Jenkins, who is acting on behalf of the Colindale Village Residents Association. Other letters submitted after the September Planning Committee are included in the committee report.

23rd October 2017

Harriet Beattie
Principal Planner – Major Developments Team
London Borough of Barnet
Barnet House
1255 High Road
Whetstone
London N20 0EJ

Dear Ms Beattie,

Planning application 17/2248/FUL

Change of use of 97sqm of Plot 299 of 128 Colindale Avenue from flexible A1/A2/A3 use to a betting shop (Sui Generis use) at Plot 299 128 Colindale Avenue NW9 4AX

We write on behalf of our clients Colindale Village Residents Association (CVRA), further to our previous letter dated 25th September concerning the above application and following consideration of the application at the Planning Committee on 28th September.

At the meeting Members were minded to refuse the application but the decision was deferred to the next meeting to allow a report to be prepared with proposed reasons for refusal. Members voted unanimously in favour of this motion.

The CVRA would like to highlight the further letters of objection which have been submitted since the application was considered by the Planning Committee, and respond to the committee report which has been prepared for the next meeting on 25th October including the proposed reasons for refusal.

Further objections to the proposal

Since the application was considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 18th September, there have been further objection letters submitted to the Council from the following:

- Barnet, Enfield and Haringey (BEH) Mental Health Trust Recovery Houses
- Managing Director of Very Good Entertainment (Restaurant)
- New Hendon Village Residents Association
- Colindale Village Residents Association (letter to Chief Executive of Barnet Council)

The number and breadth of objections from local residents, residents associations, the Police, local businesses, education and health institutions as well as Local Councillors demonstrates the strength and volume of local opposition to this proposal. The changes made to the Use Classes Order in April 2015, removing betting shops from the A2 use class, was introduced in order for the consideration of any local issues arising from betting shop uses to be assessed through a planning application. These proposals have been subject to

public consultation through the planning application process and this has overwhelmingly demonstrated that there is no support for the proposals from any part of the local community.

All of the objection letters (excluding letters from local residents) have been collated and are attached as **Appendix 1**.

Response to committee report and proposed reasons for refusal

The CVRA are disappointed that no reasons for refusal had been drafted by officers in advance of the Planning Committee on 28th September, knowing the strength of opposition towards the proposal including objections from all three Local Councillors. This has delayed the determination of the application unnecessarily.

The proposed reasons for refusal set out in the report to committee for 25th October have been assessed and the CVRA comment as follows:

Reason 1: The proposed sui generis use would fail to comply with the previously approved flexible A1/A2/A3 use, contrary to DM12 of Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012)

The CVRA accept that this is not a strong reason for refusal due to the original planning permission allowing A2 uses which would have included betting shops at that time. The permission was granted in December 2014 before the changes to the Use Classes Order were made in April 2015, and betting shops were not excluded from the approved uses set out in the decision notice for H/05856/13.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed betting shop would not have required planning permission if the use had commenced prior to April 2015, the application was submitted in April 2017 and therefore must be considered according to current legislation. The current Use Classes Order does not permit change of use from any use class to sui generis use and therefore planning permission is required.

Reason 2: The proposal has failed to provide evidence of effective marketing of an A1 use or any of the other uses previously approved under application H/05856/13 for this unit or any of the other units within the 128 Colindale Avenue parade contrary to part iv of the policy DM12 of Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012)

The CVRA consider that the unit should have been marketed prior to the submission of the application and fully endorse this reason for refusal. The officer report states that a marketing strategy is not required. However consideration should be given to fact the unit is new and has never been occupied, and its permitted use includes A1 use and therefore marketing is required according to policy DM12 of the Development Management Policies DPD. Furthermore there is protection to the permitted uses of the unit provided by condition 9 of the original planning permission, which states:

Upon their first occupation, the commercial units on the ground floor of the buildings hereby approved shall be occupied for uses falling within Class A1, A2, A3 or D1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and for no other purpose.

The imposition of condition 10 also requires planning permission for any subsequent change of use after first occupation and commencement of a use. This demonstrates the Council's intention at that time to retain appropriate uses in this location in order to safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties, forming an integral part of the creation of a neighbourhood centre on Colindale Avenue in accordance with the Colindale Area Action Plan.

The application site is not in an existing centre or parade but is an isolated unit with A1 (shop) consent (amongst the other permitted uses) and therefore should be subject to the four policy tests in DM12 of Development Management Policies DPD. It is accepted that the proposal would comply with the first two tests as, due to the small size of the unit, it cannot be demonstrated that the proposal would lead to a significant reduction in shopping facilities, and alternative shopping facilities exist in the area. However with regard to criteria iii, the proposal does not meet an identified local need and this is evidenced through the high number of objections from local residents, businesses, Local Councillors, from local education establishments, the local Mental Health Trust and the Metropolitan Police. There is no policy basis in either Local Plan policies or the Colindale Area Action Plan which identifies a sui generis betting shop use as meeting a local need. Furthermore, with regard to criteria iv, the permitted use of the unit includes A1 use and the application is not supported by any evidence of marketing. Therefore it is unknown what demand there is for the A1 use, although it is likely demand would exist due to the unit being new, vacant and in a densely populated vibrant area.

The application therefore fails to comply with policy DM12 as whole (not just criteria iv stated in the reason for refusal), as the wording of the policy requires all four criteria to be satisfied. The reason for refusal should be amended accordingly.

The CVRA are also aware of instances where local residents have contacted the landowners Fairview New Homes Ltd to enquire about the availability of the commercial units at this development, but have been advised all units are sold, or their enquiries remain unanswered. Evidence can be provided if required.

Reason 3: The proposed change of use will result in noise and disturbance to nearby residential amenities, in particular residential units of 128 Colindale Avenue, contrary to policy 7.15B (parts a and b) of the London Plan (2016) and part d of policy DM04 of Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Reason 4: The proposed betting shop would result in anti-social behaviour which would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of local residential occupiers, contrary to policy 7.3B of the London Plan policy (2016), part d of policy DM01 of Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012)

The CVRA are concerned regarding the impact of the development on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties and fully support a reason for refusal on this basis. It is important to consider the specific circumstances of this site as it is different to the

majority of betting shops, as the site forms part of the ground floor of a densely populated high-rise development with a large number of residential properties in close proximity and therefore the proposals will impact on a greater number of people. It is for this reason that the Council imposed planning conditions 9 and 10 on the original planning permission, in order to control the potential use of the units to safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties.

The CVRA request that reasons 3 and 4 are amalgamated into one reason based on an inappropriate mix of uses and failure to minimise the fear of crime, resulting in a significant negative impact on the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential properties. A betting shop is an unneighbourly use due to the proposed opening hours and associations with crime and anti-social behaviour which are confirmed by the objections raised by the Metropolitan Police. A betting shop would be inappropriate in this location within this newly established densely populated residential area, including a high proportion of students, and in proximity to several education establishments and a mental health rehabilitation facility, which results in an inappropriate mix of uses and a fear of crime. The proposals are contrary to policy DM01 and DM04 of Development Management Policies DPD and policies 7.15 and 7.3 of the London Plan in this regard.

Reason 5: The proposed betting shop would not be usable to all members of the local community and would therefore fail to comply with policy CS6 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012)

The CVRA consider that a betting shop use has a very limited focus, and fully endorse a reason for refusal based on the use not being accessible to the whole community in the same way as a café or shop. The officer report states that there are other A1/A2/A3 uses which do not serve all members of the community such as an estate agent, however the CVRA do not agree that this is a relevant comparison. The unit has permission for A1/A2 and A3 uses and the majority of these uses would be accessible to the whole community. It is important to secure the provision of a genuine facility accessible to the whole community in this location as the area is now densely populated from major new residential developments as well as the existing residential properties that already existed prior to the development. Again, this is why the Council imposed conditions on the original planning permission for the development so that the future uses of the units could be controlled, in the interests of residential amenity.

The drafted reason for refusal relates the harm to policy CS6 of the Local Plan Core Strategy. Policy CS6 relates to promoting Barnet's Town Centres and is therefore not relevant and assumed to be an error. It is suggested that the policy basis for this reason for refusal is amended to policy CS5 'Protecting and Enhancing Barnet's Character to create High Quality Places' and policy CS10 'Enabling Inclusive and Integrated Community Facilities and Uses'.

We trust that these comments will be taken into consideration in the determination of the application and that the application will be refused at the Planning Committee on 25th October.

Yours faithfully

Jennie Harris
Senior Planner

Enc: Appendix 1: Collated objection letters (excluding objections from local residents)

Cc: Members of the Planning Committee

Chairperson New Hendon Village Residents Association

9th October 2017

For the attention of Harriet Beattie, Barnet Council

Dear M/s Beattie,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Beaufort Park Residents Association concerning the proposed granting of a lease to Paddy Power to open a betting shop adjacent to the Colindale tube station entrance.

Whilst we as a group do not have a specific issue with regard to betting or gambling as such, we do feel that the positioning of a betting shop at the tube station location would be inappropriate and not in keeping with the local development environment.

The Colindale area is increasingly becoming a mixed environment for families, students, young people and older residents all of whom could be adversely affected by the granting of a lease for a betting shop.

As far as we as a group are concerned, we consider that it is vital to maintain the quality of life in the Colindale area as more and more people and families, choose this part of north London to settle and set up home. With the increasing concern being expressed about the impact that gambling is having on young people, we do feel that the granting of a lease to Paddy Power would be retrograde step for the local community.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Wakley
Secretary, BPRA

Objection to planning application 17/2248/FUL
Paddy Power betting shop Plot 299 of 128 Colindale Avenue NW9 4AX
9th of October 2017

I am writing to you on behalf of the Colindale Village Residents' Association (CVRA) to object to the above planning application for a Paddy Power betting shop in Colindale.

We object on the following grounds:

The proposed betting shop use would have a negative economic impact on the area compared to the permitted uses which would have a higher footfall, contrary to the aims of the Colindale Area Action Plan DPD and the Core Strategy.

The proposed use has a very limited focus and does not serve the whole community compared to the permitted uses, contrary to policies CS5 and CS10 of the Local Plan.

A variety of betting shops already exist in close proximity to the site and there is no need for an additional facility.

The betting shop would be inappropriately located in a densely populated residential area with a high student population and in proximity to education establishments, resulting in an inappropriate mix of uses and a fear of crime.

The proposed betting shop will increase traffic to an already congested area which has an impact on local air quality, safety of pedestrians, particularly local school children, who use Colindale Avenue. The lack of designated parking space will also mean that customers will be looking to park in the surrounding area which is already suffering from lack of parking spaces for residents. Although Colindale tube station is opposite the proposed site this has not contributed to reducing traffic over the years.

The proposed plot is part of the Edition residential development with access to the shop being part of the main residential building. This creates safety concerns noise, disturbances and lack of privacy for residents using their building and respective homes.

Joey Skye
CVRA CHAIR
15 Osler Court, 9 Charcot Road,
Colindale NW9 5XW

Dear Harriet,

I am writing to you regarding the planning application by Paddy Power to operate a new being shop on the Edi-on housing development on Colindale Avenue.

As a local business I am fully aware that there is a great deal of opposition to the idea of yet another being shop in this locality, there already being one nearby on the Edgware Road, as well as one in Burnt Oak merely 5 minutes away by bus or tube.

Many people are concerned about the increase in traffic and lack of parking in an already congested area. They also feel that a being shop is not the most important facility for the area, which is lacking in Doctor and GP surgeries, and/or local corner shops servicing the community.

Our clients have voiced their concerns that a being shop sets a bad example to the community especially the younger genera-on as being the only visible form of recreation/entertainment in the area. Surely our community deserve something better than an encouragement to gambling.

Yours Sincerely

Lock 8 Estates

Pages 38-39 – S106 Head of Terms to be amended as follows:

(a) Travel Plan

Car-based travel proportions for secondary pupils shall be no more than the percentages specified in Tables 8.2 of the amended draft Travel Plan (received 23/10/2017) over the lifetime of the STP. For clarification, the baseline figure for year 1 shall be 23.3%. These targets shall be subject to annual review.

The reference to pick up/drop off facility to be deleted.

Pages 39-40 – S106 Head of Term to be amended as follows:

Introduction of flexibility to allow for highway improvement works to be delivered under a Section 278 Agreement

Page 40 – S106 Head of Term to be deleted

Item (h) - Pick up/Drop off facility

Page 40 – S106 Head of Term to be added

(h) Provision of New Bus Stops

The applicant is to provide 2 new bus stops for 326 route on Mays Lane in agreement with the LPA and TfL.

Page 91 – Paragraph 8.19 to be deleted

Page 99 – Paragraph 8.39 to be amended as follows:

Car-based travel proportions for secondary pupils shall be no more than the percentages specified in Tables 8.2 of the amended draft Travel Plan (received 23/10/2017) over the lifetime of the STP. For clarification, the baseline figure for year 1 shall be 23.3%. These targets shall be subject to annual review.

Page 101 – The following comments from the GLA to be noted alongside paragraphs 9.8-9.10:

The applicant has confirmed that there is a single centralised plantroom at the most northern part of the building. An incoming services room on the upper ground floor accommodates the break tank as well as the incoming services and the main plant is located in the plantroom on the upper first floor directly above the incoming services/tank room. A drawing has been provided and there are therefore no further issues.

Page 106 – Paragraph 15.4 to refer to Travel Plan targets as updated in this addendum note

Pages 107-108 - Paragraphs 15.7-15.9 to be amended as follows:

Introduction of flexibility to allow for highway improvement works to be delivered under a Section 278 Agreement.

Miscellaneous:

An informative to be added to any permission advising the applicant that the development would be required to comply with all relevant Building Regulations including those relating to fire safety.

17/2963/RMA

Brent Cross Cricklewood Regeneration Area
London
NW4

Pages 123-289

P159, 6.2 Public Consultation and Views Expressed

The following concerns were raised by a further local resident of Brent Park Road in relation to the proposal.

- The residential development of 52 units at Plot 113 with vehicular access to Brent Park Road will result in additional car parking on this residential road and on adjoining Layfield Place. Additional vehicular movements associated with this site would also add to pollution in the area.
- The Seating and Landscaping area at Layfield Place will be available to the general public day and night raising issues of security and safety concerns.

Officer Response:

Consideration has been given to the level of parking proposed at Plot 113 which includes 40 car parking spaces providing a ratio of 0.75 spaces per unit. This has been found to comply with the parking controls which require a maximum of 1 space per unit.

Layfield Place and Brent Park Road fall within an area under consideration for the introduction of new Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) or extensions to existing ones as a part of the Regeneration scheme. The new residents of plot 113 will not be able to apply for CPZ permits and so parking in these roads will be controlled.

The impact of additional pollution from these vehicles has not been considered to have a significantly detrimental impact to warrant further controls.

Security of the new shopping centre and its external spaces will be managed by the applicant. An Estate Management Framework for Sub Phase 1B (North) is currently under consideration by the Local Planning Authority which includes security measures including CCTV.

p217 - Condition 1

The Following Documents to be added to the list of approved plans

- Drawing Notes Q1
- Material Schedule 25 August 2017

The following two plans require updating as the incorrect revision has been shown:

- 08069-CTA-EN-B10-DR-A-20101 **revision P6**
- 08069-CTA-EC-XXX-DR-A-22701 **revision P5**

P217 – Condition 2

Additional wording in **Bold** to be added as follows to stipulate accordance with the s.73 Permission:

The development approved by this Reserved Matters Application shall not exceed 82,325sqm (**GEA which excludes the areas identified in the notes to the Zonal Floorspace Schedule of the Planning Permission F/04687/13**) of Class A1 – A5 floorspace (which includes tenant allocated seating but excludes general public seating and ancillary seating not allocated to individual tenant) and 14,534sqm (**GEA which excludes the areas identified in the notes to the Zonal Floorspace Schedule of the Planning Permission F/04687/13**) of Class D2 floorspace.

P221 – Condition 15 Phase-wide –Materials to be amended as follows:

To be amended as follows:

Prior to the installation of any external material on any plot/building, and in accordance with the ~~Illustrative~~ Materials Schedule:

P223 - Phase-wide – Accessible Stairway

Second Paragraph to read

All such **external** stairways shall ~~be designed to~~ include cycle channels.

P226 – Condition 32 HOTEL PLOT 109 – Accessible rooms/floor Plans

To be amended as follows:

Prior to commencement of development on Plot 109 detailed floor plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate **10% of hotel bedrooms are accessible and in compliance with London Plan Policy 4.5 and any relevant updated policy** and Part M4(2) and Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations 2016. Reason: To ensure compliance with Policy 4.5 of the London Plan **and Grant Thornton Accessible Hotels in London GLA, 2010 as referenced in Policy 4.5** in providing sufficient accessible Hotel Rooms.

p127 Part 3.3 paragraph 3 – Wording to be deleted and replaced with the following paragraph

The NMA and associated changes to the RDSF also broadened the definition of existing demolished, decommissioned or lost A1 Comparison Retail Floorspace which would be re-provided as A1 Retail floorspace with no net increase to the overall floorspace area. The principal of there being no net change as a result of such lost floorspace had previously been restricted to floorspace from the existing John Lewis Store. Amendments saw this widened to incorporate any existing A1 Comparison Retail Floorspace and increased from 6,545m² to 7,460m². Such information has been presented within plans submitted and found to be acceptable within this Reserved Matters Application in keeping with the amended condition 36.8.

P114 - Plot 112 (Existing Centre Refurbishment) 2nd Paragraph – The Following sentence to be deleted:

“The new floorspace to be constructed post demolition requires planning consent and has been approved under planning permission 17/2528/NMA.” (p.144)

P142 – Plot 110/111 (Western Car Park and John Lewis Store) – Last sentence to be deleted as follows:

“Since the proposed demolition requires planning permission, the area of JLP store to be demolished falls within the proposals of Plot 110/111 and the wider 1BN RMA.”(p142).

7.3.8 Plot 110/111 (Western Car Park) p180, 3rd Paragraph Bullet List:

The following additional minor amendments to Phase 1A (North) should be noted:

- A new vehicular entrance into Plot 109;
- Amendment of pedestrian crossing;
- Amendment to pedestrian entrance to Plot 113;
- New entrance/exit to proposed eastern car park along the southern frontage of Plot 105. The configuration of the northern entrance to the car park has been amended;
- Additional vehicular entrance to Plot 109 has been provided along the footpath at Tempelhof Avenue.

P137 Plot 106 (Retail and Cinema) 5th and 6th Paragraphs.

For clarity:

- It should be noted that the seating referred to in paragraph 5 is ‘General Seating’. And as per the following paragraph seating serving “...*the kiosks and stalls of the Market area ... is provided as ancillary seating to the main A3 – A5 use class.*”
- Paragraph 6 states that the Market area floorspace will be fixed at 1,684m². This figure is indicative only. The amount floorspace will be flexible but subject to the overall A1 – A5 use class floorspace permitted under the s.73 Permission.

Clarification – M&S Plot 102

Within the report it should be noted that M&S are the *potential* future occupants of plot 102. Their occupancy, whilst expected in this location, has yet to be finalised with the applicant.

Appendix 2 - Planning History

It should be noted that the following applications were approved or have been approved since publication of the committee agenda:

- 16/7666/CON
- 16/7574/NMA
- 16/7489/CON
- 16/2596/BXE
- 16/2597/BXE
- 16/2598/BXE
- 17/3088/CON
- 17/3089/CON
- 17/3197/CON
- 17/2528/NMA
- 17/2460/CON
- 17/4207/NMA

The following application listed in Appendix 2 has been withdrawn: 16/7564/CON

Appendix 4 - Cover Letter from Planning Agent outlining updated documents submitted to the LPA for Phase 1B (North)

The following letter dated 13th October 2017 should replace that published of 2nd October 2017:

our ref: TG/Q70204
your ref: 17/2963/RMA
email: tony.gallagher@quod.com
date: 13 October 2017



Mr Peter Alsop
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
London Borough of Barnet
Barnet House
1255 High Road
Whetstone
London
N20 0EJ

Dear Mr Alsop

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)
RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR PHASE 1B (NORTH) REF. NO. 17/2963/RMA OF THE BRENT CROSS CRICKLEWOOD REGENERATION SCHEME RELATING TO LAYOUT, SCALE, APPEARANCE, ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO CONDITIONS 1.2.2.A AND 2.1 AND FOR THE PART DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 13.1 ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION REF NO. F/04687/13 FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE MIXED-USE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE BRENT CROSS CRICKLEWOOD REGENERATION AREA. THE PROPOSAL COMPRISES RETAIL-LED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT WHICH INCLUDES A REPLACEMENT BRENT CROSS BUS STATION, 52 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, NEW HOTEL, NEW ENERGY CENTRE, EASTERN AND WESTERN BRENT RIVERSIDE PARK (INCLUDING A NATURE PARK) AND IMPROVEMENTS TO STURGESS PARK. APPLICATION IS ACCOMPANIED BY AN ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT FURTHER INFORMATION REPORT.

I write on behalf of our client, the BXC Development Partners, following the submission of a Reserved Matters Application ("RMA") Ref No 17/2963/RMA in respect of Phase 1B (North) pursuant to Conditions 1.2.2A and 2.1 and part discharge of Condition 13.1 attached to Planning Permission Ref. No. F/04687/13 for the comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the Brent Cross Cricklewood Regeneration Area.

Following the submission of the Phase 1B (North) RMA Ref No 17/2963/RMA the Applicant has continued to engage with the London Borough of Barnet ("LBB") and a number of documents and drawings submitted in support of the Phase 1B (North) RMA have been updated to reflect these discussions and limited amendments to the design proposed by the Applicant. The table below lists the drawings and supporting documents which have been updated and provides a description of the amendments.

Document/Drawing	Amendments
Volume 3 Environmental Statement of Further Information Report ("ES FIR")	
Appendices for Chapter 17 of the ES FIR with regards to the internal sunlight and daylight assessment relating to Plot 113 (Also submitted as part of Volume 5)	Omitted from original submission and provided to LBB.



Quod | Ingeni Building 17 Broadwick Street London W1F 0AX | 020 3597 1000 | www.quod.com

Quod Limited. Registered in England at above address No. 7170188.

Document/Drawing	Amendments
ES FIR Statement of Compliance	Statement of Compliance submitted relating to proposed limited amendments made to the Phase 1B (North) RMA design such as the narrowing of High Street North and amended layout of Plot 102 basement.
Volume 4 Drawings	
For Approval Drawings and List	<p>Drawings amended to identify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Narrowing of High Street North and The Park; - Design of roof amended, increase in widths of voids along High Street North and mall bridge removed along The Park; - Amendments to design and layout of basement in Plot 102; - Amendments to the frontage of Plots 107/108 and 109; - Amendments to the multi storey car park drawings to identify dimensions, provide additional click and collect disabled parking space (Plot 110/111) and correct circulation widths where necessary; - Amendments to General Arrangement Plans including making the red line showing RMA area and existing shopping centre clearer; - Demolish/Decommission/Lost Floorspace drawings provided; - Setting back of a fire door at Plots 107/108; - Amendment to the design of the Western Riverside Park northern boundary and to the surface material of the walkway in both the Western and Eastern Riverside Park;

Document/Drawing	Amendments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to the design of threshold spaces and the entrances (i.e. additional cycle stands and planting); and - Amendments to the design of Sturgess Park
Not for Approval Drawings and List	<p>Drawings amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated tracking drawings for Plots 102, 103/104, 105 and 110/111; - Tracking drawings for Plots 109 and 113 provided; - Visibility Splay drawing provided
Drawing Notes Q1	Updated Drawing Notes Q1 submitted.
Volume 5	
Landscape and Ecology Management Plans ("LEMPs") relating to the Adjacent Phase 1B (North) Landscape and Threshold Spaces	Updated to include the revised planting plans to show Virginia Creeper (Parthenocissus) replaced by Ivy (Hedera) and also changes associated with the additional planting along the northern boundary of the Western Riverside Park.
Reserved Matters Transport Report	Updated to reflect ongoing discussions regarding transport matters such as car parking, servicing and delivery, amendments to the design etc.
Material Schedule	This document sets out the intent for materials to be used in Phase 1B (North).
Updated Phase 1B (North) Car Parking Standards and Strategy Statement of compliance	Updated to provide a number of amendments including the proposed type of tariffs and their timings.
Addendum to the Revised Energy Strategy Statement	Updated to include the presentation given to Energy Panel (22/09/2017) and further description of fact that commercial occupiers must meet identified reduction against Part L of the Building Regulations.



Page 4

We hope the above is clear and if you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Tony Gallagher
Associate