

**HOUNSLOW JOINT LOCAL PLAN AND
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY EXAMINATION
ACTION POINTS**

**Session 14 – CIL Retail and B SkyB + Gillette Site Allocations
19 March 2015**

No:	Issue:	Timescale:
1	<p>Agenda Item No.Qn1a-1e Definition of retail development</p> <p>Notwithstanding the qualified description of types of retail development on the draft charging schedule, the definitions would in practice mean that the retail charge would apply to all retail development of more than 280sqm and in any part of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council would therefore propose a simplification of the schedule and the accompanying footnote such that it would simply apply to development with a 'gross retailing space' of more than 280sqm. It would no longer seek to define whether a retail development was eg a retail warehouse or a supermarket, and whether or not it catered mainly for car-borne customers.</p>	14/4/15
2	<p>To avoid confusion about the interpretation of the term 'gross retailing space' in the schedule the Council would propose a footnote to clarify that this term refers to the gross internal floor area including all ancillary floorspace (i.e. as defined on the Planning Portal), except that ancillary parking within buildings for retail development would be defined as an 'all other use' and thus subject to the nominal rate of £20 per sq m.</p>	14/4/15
3	<p>The term 'creating net additional space of over 280 sq m' is ambiguous and would create interpretation difficulties in the measurement of developments which either extend or replace existing retail space.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Council proposes to remove this wording such that the charge only applies where the gross retailing floorspace after the development is 280 sq m or more. This could include a development where for example a 250 sqm store is extended to 300 sqm. Any part of the retail development which already existed would be exempt from the charge. Thus the charge would be levied on (300sqm-280sqm =) 20sqm</p> <p>Whether the retail development is a new building or an extended building the regulations would typically provide for a credit against any floorspace that had been demolished to</p>	14/4/15

	implement the development.	
4	<p>There was a discussion at the hearing about developments of 2 or more units which are each individually less than 280 sqm but which would in combination exceed that figure (eg 2 units that are each of 150sqm). On reflection the Inspector does not consider that the schedule or any footnote could provide that the charge would apply to such developments. This is because the draft charging schedule footnote specifically referred either to supermarkets as 'shopping destination in their own right' or to retail warehouses as 'large stores'. In these circumstances to interpret the schedule as applying to multiple units of small stores which individually fit neither description could be interpreted as extending the scope of the charging schedule. That would not be possible at this stage without reissuing and reconsulting on the schedule.</p>	-
5	<p>Agenda Item No. Qn3a-3d Ancillary parking</p> <p>As ancillary parking within a building is normally included in the gross floor area it would normally be charged at the same rate as the principal use, whether that is residential, retail, and exempted use or a use subject to the nominal rate. In the case of retail development the potentially large amounts of parking this could distort competition between shops with surface parking (usually out of centre) or indoor parking (usually within town centres). It has not been supported by evidence of greater value or viability of stores with covered parking.</p> <p>The Council therefore intends that ancillary parking for retail development would be reduced to the nominal £20 rate. This would be explained by a footnote.</p>	14/4/15
6	<p>Other Matters – Site allocations 06 (BSkyB) and 07 (Gillette)</p> <p>The Inspector drew attention to the apparent contradictions between: a briefing note which indicated that 75% of B1a office supply in the Borough would come from these 2 sites; the sites' apparent continued status as Industrial Business Parks where the London Plan seeks to preclude such large scale office development but may allow for 'new emerging industries'; and the London Plan's SOLDC status of the area which supports digital media.</p> <p>The Council would review both allocations and seek to resolve these issue. This may require one or more of the following approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Considering whether the IBP status needs to be carried forward to the Local Plan (which itself would require a modification to Policy ED2) ii) If IBP is carried forward, adding text 	14/4/15

	<p>to ED2 and/or the site allocations that refers to the area's SOLDC status and defines digital media as a 'new emerging industry' which can be acceptable in an IBP.</p> <p>iii) Adding text which interprets that the identified need for office space can be met by similar uses such as digital media that are not B1a.</p> <p>iv) Acknowledging that the identified need for office space will not be fully met by the Local Plan and (subject to the intended employment review update) would need to be addressed by allocations in the GW Corridor Plan and the West of Borough Plan.</p>	
--	--	--