

DELEGATED DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control**

Address: GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Retrospective permission for the installation of six pole mounted lights sited 6 metres above ground level

LBH Ref Nos: 14607/APP/2023/1912

Drawing Nos: HS1117_101A Site Location Plan
 HS1117_102A Lighting Column Plan
 S-FR2506T01-01 General Arrangement of Forest Column
 Brackenheath Rex Slim Datasheet
 Cover Letter, 30th June 2023, PowerHaus
 Outdoor Lighting Report, Ref: BEI20230629, Dated: 30 June 2023, Lighting Reality
 Technical Data Sheet, CU Phosco Lighting Ltd

Date Plans received: 30-06-23 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 30-06-23

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks retrospective permission for the installation of six pole mounted lights sited 6 metres above ground level. The development represents inappropriate development in the green belt and would be harmful to the character and visual amenity of the area and harmful to neighbouring residential amenity. The application is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Green belt

The development represents inappropriate development in the green belt to which no very exceptional circumstances exist. The development therefore conflicts with Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraphs 152 and 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

2. NON2 Character and appearance

The proposed six lighting columns due to their excessive height in this location results in significant visual intrusion and a highly conspicuous form of development that results in significant harm to the character and visual amenity of the area. The development therefore conflicts with Policy D3 of the

London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

3. NON2 Amenity

The lighting would result in a significant level of harm to the amenities and quality of life of surrounding residents by reason of light pollution, light spillage and glare. The development therefore conflicts with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 191 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

INFORMATIVES

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a 0.7 hectare parcel of land to the west of West End Road, to the north of the Grade II* listed Polish Air Force Memorial and Park, to the east of scrubland and to the south of residential properties. The site falls within a large expanse of Green Belt, which separates Northolt in the east from Hillingdon to the west, partly above and partly below the A40. The Eastern Arm of Yeading Brook is approximately 20 metres to the south of the site (but the site is not at risk of surface water flooding and is in Flood Zone 1).

The wider area to the north of the application site is characterised by low-scale residential housing, whilst to the south and east are large areas of undeveloped grassland, used for various sports and recreational activities. RAF Northolt, a military-operated airfield is to the west.

Within the site, there are a collection of small-scale structures and buildings, some appearing temporary whilst others are more established, such as the locally listed Glebe Farm cottage. The site has evolved over time and benefits from a lawful B8 use extending over most of the site, relating mostly to the storage of various building materials. The site has two vehicle access points approximately 10 metres apart facing onto West End Road, the northernmost of which is adjacent to a bus stop.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks retrospective permission for the installation of six pole mounted lights sited 6 metres above ground level. From the application form, the development was completed on 15/02/2023.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

14607/APP/2020/3619 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

RE-CONSULTATION ON AMENDED PLANS: Demolition of existing industrial buildings, removal of all external industrial storage and redevelopment of site to provide 31 dwellings (7 x 1-bed and

12 x 2- bed, 9 x 3-bed houses and 3 x 4-bed houses) and the restoration and conversion of locally listed building to create two office suites, provision of open space, associated parking and landscaping, including creation of footpath to adjacent war memorial and gardens.

Decision: 29-04-2022 Withdrawn (P)

14607/ADV/2019/29 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

Erect a large uPVC banner 2.5m x 1.5m (removable at any time) attached to our main gate

Decision: 25-07-2019 Withdrawn (P)

14607/PRC/2019/96 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

Replacement of the existing storage (formally agricultural) buildings with a bespoke residential development of 30 dwellings

Decision: 30-08-2019 Objection

14607/APP/2005/2696 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURAL TO USE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS FOR STORAGE AND ANCILLARY PURPOSES (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR AN EXISTING USE OR OPERATION OR ACTIVITY IN BREACH OF A PLANNING CONDITION)

Decision: 22-11-2005 Refusal **Appeal:** 07-07-06 Allowed

14607/APP/2005/2645 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

ERECTION OF STEEL PALISSADE FENCING TO WEST END ROAD SITE BOUNDARY (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR AN EXISTING USE OR OPERATION OR ACTIVITY IN BREACH OF A PLANNING CONDITION)

Decision: 15-11-2005 Refusal **Appeal:** 07-07-06 Allowed

14607/APP/2005/2371 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

CHANGE OF USE OF THE LAND TO AN OPEN STORAGE USE FOR CONTAINER AND SKIPS AND THE SITING OF A PORTACABIN FOR USE AS AN OFFICE (APPEAL AGAINST ENFORCEMENT NOTICE; APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN MADE PURSUANT TO SECTION 174 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990)

Decision: 07-07-2006 Refusal **Appeal:** 07-07-06 Dismissed

14607/APP/2005/2372 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

ERECTION OF STEEL RAILINGS ALONG THE FRONT BOUNDARY WITH WEST END ROAD (APPEAL AGAINST ENFORCEMENT NOTICE; APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN MADE PURSUANT TO SECTION 174 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990)

Decision: 07-07-2006 Approval **Appeal:** 07-07-06 Allowed

14607/APP/2002/2130 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

CHANGE OF USE OF FROM FORMER AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS TO CLASS B1 OFFICES,

INVOLVING RETENTION OF FORMER GLEBE FARMHOUSE, DEMOLITION OF ALL
REMAINING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF TWO PART SINGLE STOREY, PART TWO
STOREY BUILDINGS AND NEW ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING

Decision: 25-04-2003 Withdrawn (P)

14607/G

14607/F

14607/E

14607/D/94/0787 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

Erection of meeting hall with associated parking and erection of single garage for existing
farmhouse (involving demolition of existing farm buildings)(outline application)

Decision: 14-10-1994 Refusal

14607/C

14607/B/93/0533 GLEBE FARM WEST END ROAD RUISLIP

Residential development at a density of 80 habitable rooms per acre (outline application)

Decision: 04-08-1993 Refusal

14607/A

14607/XX/11586

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

79 neighbours were consulted by letter dated 11-07-23. A newspaper advertisement and a site notice were posted on 19-07-23. 6 letters of objection were received citing concerns regarding parking and the impact on residential amenity.

Officer comments:

Parking is not considered to be a material planning matter relevant to this application which is just for the external lighting. The impact on neighbouring residential amenity is discussed in the 'Impact on Neighbours' section.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.E1	(2012) Managing the Supply of Employment Land
PT1.EM11	(2012) Sustainable Waste Management
PT1.EM2	(2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains
PT1.EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
PT1.EM7	(2012) Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PT1.EM8	(2012) Land, Water, Air and Noise

Part 2 Policies:

DMAV 1	Safe Operation of Airports
DMAV 3	RAF Northolt
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DME 1	Employment Uses in Designated Sites
DME 2	Employment Uses Outside of Designated Sites
DMEI 1	Living Walls and Roofs and Onsite Vegetation
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 12	Development of Land Affected by Contamination
DMEI 14	Air Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 3	Decentralised Energy
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMHB 9	War Memorials
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D13	(2021) Agent of change
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP E4	(2021) Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function
LPP E7	(2021) Industrial intensification, co-location and substitution
LPP G2	(2021) London's Green Belt
LPP G5	(2021) Urban greening
LPP G6	(2021) Biodiversity and access to nature
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG5	(2021) Growing a good economy
LPP SI1	(2021) Improving air quality
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
LPP SI3	(2021) Energy infrastructure
LPP SI7	(2021) Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
LPP SI8	(2021) Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency
LPP T1	(2021) Strategic approach to transport
LPP T2	(2021) Healthy Streets
LPP T3	(2021) Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.2	(2021) Office parking
LPP T6.5	(2021) Non-residential disabled persons parking
LPP T7	(2021) Deliveries, servicing and construction

In addition: Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
The London Plan (2021)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023), Planning Practice Guidance, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance are all material consideration in planning decisions.

The proposed development has been assessed against development plan policies and relevant material considerations, discussed below.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

Paragraph 191 of the NPPF (2023) states - Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states Part D7) that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. The supporting text for this policy states that the Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

The case officer has noted the objections made by nearby residents and sought to clarify the hours of use of the lighting with the agent. In response the agent has indicated that the site would be operated 24 hours a day. They have also mentioned occurrences of fly-tipping and new security and lighting would have dealt with the issue.

It is noted from the planning history, that certificate of lawfulness application ref: 14607/APP/2005/2696 which was allowed on appeal (PINS ref: APP/R5510/X/06/2011331) established the use of the site as open storage and ancillary purposes. No conditions were attached

that the certificate approval with regards to site's hours of operation, however the material considerations dictate that the hours of use of the lighting is relevant to this application given the close proximity to neighbouring residential dwellings and the site's location within the Green belt.

The outdoor lighting report demonstrates that the lighting would be positioned in a southerly direction towards the site. The light spillage diagrams on pages 3 and 5 within the outdoor lighting report illustrate there would be light spillage outside of the site over the northern boundary which abuts part of Glebe Farm and the amenity area serving Wordsworth Court which is located 10metres away. It is noted that this flatted development has side windows facing towards the site. It is however noted that the diagrams refer to horizontal illuminance however no information is provided with regards to vertical illuminance, which would measure the impact on the windows of the flatted development.

When in use throughout the night, the lighting would be seen and disruptive to the residential amenity of nearby occupiers, and in a location where such lighting of this scale did not previously exist. The boundary treatment to the north of application site is noted to comprise a closed boarded fence which would not provide any screening to block out light. Taking into consideration the height of the lighting columns and the power output of the new lighting and the fact that the new lighting is proposed to be used without any restriction of use into late night hours, the lighting would significantly affect the visual amenity and residential amenity of the area.

It is considered that unrestricted lighting that could be used 24 hours a day in this location would be detrimental to the amenity of the area by reason of light pollution, light spill and glare. The proposal would therefore harm neighbouring residential amenity and conflict with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 191 of the NPPF (2023).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA :

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that: Development proposals should: D1) enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including: i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding: · scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; · building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; · building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment. ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes; iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities; iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets,

designated and un-designated, and their settings; and v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

It is noted that the pre-existing lighting was of a much smaller scale comprising seven small roof mounted floodlights that would have been between 2.5-3.5metres above ground level. Being what appears to be an ad-hoc lighting installation and no longer in existence, no information is provided with regards to the power output of the pre-existing floodlights. The submission suggests the pre-existing lighting was installed over 20 years ago, which is not verified. Further, it is noted that there is no record in the planning history of the previously existing floodlights.

The lack of information on the pre-existing lighting makes a comparison between the old and new lighting systems difficult. Despite a reduction of lighting units with a net decrease of one lighting unit, the new lighting columns would be 6metres in height and fitted with 100W Led lights and it is considered a fair assumption that lighting levels would be significantly increased as a result of the development.

The height of the columns has been questioned, as in officers view, having six 6metre high lighting columns seems a bit excessive for the scale of the site which is used for open storage. The agent has suggested that the height of the columns needs to be this height to provide clearance for delivery vehicles. This is not considered to provide adequate justification. The new columns are located in a series alongside the north boundary and it is considered that columns of a lower height would be more suitable and just as effective in serving the needs of the site and would not impede delivery vehicles.

The visual amenity of the site would be negatively affected by increased activity across the visible areas of the site. Views of the lighting would be obtainable from the surrounding street scene, and the lighting being unrestricted in hours of use would provide a constant source of light which would be harmful to the amenity of the area. The lighting poles would be of an excessive height in this location resulting in a highly conspicuous and prominent form development that would lead to significant visual intrusion causing harm to the character and visual amenity of the area.

For the above reasons, the development is considered to be harmful to the character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

IMPACT ON THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT:

Paragraph 152 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states - Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states - When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states -. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021) states - A) The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development: 1) development proposals that would harm the Green Belt should be refused except where very special circumstances exist, 2) subject to national planning policy tests, the enhancement of the Green Belt to provide appropriate multi-functional beneficial uses for Londoners should be supported.

Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states - A) Inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances.

In the application submission, it is suggested by the agent that the principle of the development for replacement external lighting would fall under the exceptions criteria under Paragraph 154g) which lists - limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would: - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

The wording of Paragraph 154g) is clear and refers specifically to the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land and not to the partial or complete redevelopment of land that is partly previously developed. Annex 2 of the Framework specifically excludes land that is or was last occupied by agricultural buildings from the definition of previously developed land.

The site is currently noted to be in storage use, however from the planning history, the site was in agricultural use in the past i.e. was last occupied by agricultural buildings. The site would therefore not fall into the exceptions list of Paragraph 154g) of the Framework. The test of Paragraph 154g) is not engaged.

Consequently in light of the above, it is therefore considered that the development represents inappropriate development in the green belt to which no very exceptional circumstances exist. The development therefore conflicts with Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraphs 152 and 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Not applicable.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Not applicable.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Not applicable.

7.6 Other Issues

No other issues are identified.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)

London Plan (2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

Contact Officer:	Christos Chrysanthou	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------