



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By: Swakeleys Ltd

Proposal: Change of use of rear first floor from Sui Generis and construction of second floor extension to provide residential dwellings, alongside associated works. Retention of ground floor use with minor internal alterations.

Appeal Site:

11 Swakeleys Road, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8DF

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



1. Introduction

- 1.1 This appeal statement is submitted by the London Borough of Hillingdon, as the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in respect of the appeal against its refusal to grant planning permission for the Change of use of rear first floor from Sui Generis and construction of second floor extension to provide residential dwellings, alongside associated works. Retention of ground floor use with minor internal alterations.
- 1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 10-01-2025 for the following reasons (as stated on the decision notice):
1. *The development, by reason of its height, bulk, and proximity, would unduly harm the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at 13-15 Swakeleys Road due to loss of daylight/sunlight. The development, therefore, conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021)*
 2. *The development, by reason of its height, depth, size, bulk, design, massing, and balconies, would unduly harm the character and appearance of the area and the visual amenities of the street scene. The development, therefore, conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135(b) and (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).*
 3. *The development, by reason of its failure to provide an appropriate provision of a good quality outlook, private outdoor amenity areas, and daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms, would be unduly harmful to the living conditions of future occupants. The development, therefore, conflicts with Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 16, and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021).*
 4. *The cycle parking, by reason of the first-floor location, would be poorly accessible, potentially restricting or preventing the use of the parking by some future occupants and being detrimental to the overall uptake of cycling by*



HILLINGDON

LONDON

future occupiers, contrary to Policy DMT 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021)

5. *The proposed refuse layout, by reason of its inaccessible location and long carry distances, raises safety and accessibility concerns for future residents and is contrary to Policies SI7 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).*
 6. *In the absence of water usage and design information, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would achieve sufficient water efficiency contrary to Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).*
 7. *The proposal has not demonstrated the existing public house use would not be adversely affected by the development in accordance with the Agent of Change principle by reason that the remediation of the significant loss of existing public house floorspace has not been detailed and insufficient noise information has been provided to confirm the proposed residential flats would not restrict the ongoing noise generation and use of the public house. The development is, therefore, contrary to Policies HC7 and D13 of the London Plan (2021).*
 8. *In the absence of satisfactory acoustic information, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed residential flats would not be exposed to excessive internal noise levels from the ground floor public house use that could result in ongoing harm to onsite residential amenity, contrary to Policies D13 and D14 of the London Plan (2021).*
- 1.3 The LPA's case is set out in the Planning Officer's delegated report, which should be read in conjunction with this statement. A copy of the delegated report has already been provided within the original information. Copies of relevant planning policies have also been included.
- 1.4 This statement will not repeat the delegated report and will focus on addressing matters raised in the Appellant's Appeal statement.

2. LPA Comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

Reason 1 (Amenity of neighbours)

- 2.1 The reason for refusal was focussed specifically on the loss of daylight/sunlight to the flat at No 13-15 Swakeleys Road. It is the expectation of the Local

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Planning Authority (LPA) that any proposed development should minimise its impact on the daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

- 2.2 The Appellant's Statement acknowledges that the impact on the windows of the flat at 13–15 Swakeleys Road would exceed the 20% reduction threshold set out in the BRE Daylight and Sunlight Guidelines. The justification put forward is that the site lies within a Local Centre where housing growth is encouraged. However, while the LPA supports the principle of residential intensification in such areas, this should not come at the cost of significantly diminishing the amenity of existing residents.
- 2.3 The argument presented by the Appellant is not accepted. The additional daylight/sunlight information submitted in the appeal addendum does not provide sufficient justification to alter the LPA's position. It remains the view of the LPA that the proposal would cause undue harm to the amenity of this neighbouring property. The LPA would argue that the quality of the neighbours amenity would be eroded to an unacceptable level due to the bulk and height of the development which would be in close proximity to the neighbour. The provision of daylight to a kitchen window is important and given the modest nature of this neighbouring flat, by reducing the amount of daylight below the standards to 2 of the 4 windows serving the habitable rooms, it would materially impact the overall amenity standards to an unacceptable level.
- 2.4 The argument presented by the Appellant is not accepted. The additional daylight/sunlight information submitted in the appeal addendum does not provide sufficient justification to alter the LPA's position. It remains the view of the LPA that the proposal would cause undue harm to the amenity of this neighbouring property.
- 2.5 It is important to note that the neighbouring flat is already situated on a constrained site with limited access to daylight. Any further reduction in daylight or sunlight levels as a result of this proposal would exacerbate an already poor situation, leading to an unacceptable standard of living for current occupiers

Reason 2 (Character and Appearance and visual amenities of the street)

- 2.6 The LPA considers that the proposed development, due to its combined height, bulk, massing, and overall design, fails to comply with relevant Local Plan policies. While the Appellant's Statement focuses on five selected viewpoints, these are taken from specific locations and do not adequately demonstrate the full extent of the development when viewed in the context of the existing building, its immediate setting, or the wider character of the area.
- 2.7 A particular concern is the significant increase in built form toward the rear of the property. As highlighted in the western elevation, the current building

Our Ref: 6626/APP/2024/3040
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

benefits from a tiered form, with a larger roof element at the front transitioning down to a more modest scale at the rear. This natural step-down helps maintain an appropriate relationship with the rear setting and neighbouring plots. It provides an openness that is normally expected within a semi commercial residential area.

- 2.8 The proposal to increase the overall height and introduce substantial bulk to the rear results in a discordant form of development that fails to respect the established pattern and character of the area. Whilst there are some returns visible in the area, there are no examples of similar rear returns of such scale, and the additional massing introduces an unrelieved visual presence from front to back.
- 2.9 The Appellant's view in paragraph 5.30 of the Appellant's Statement that the proposal represents a high-quality, architecturally led scheme would be disputed. While some elements of the extended roof may not be fully visible from the street frontage and the development to the front may include some elements acceptable, the overall length and scale of the rear projection offer limited visual relief and erode the established architectural rhythm. It increases the overall massing of the building substantially to the rear. This would be at odds with the established prevailing character with returns more modest in scale. A defining characteristic of the current roofscape is the transition from front to rear — removing this gradual shift and replacing it with a bulky, monolithic form undermines the architectural integrity of the building.
- 2.10 The Appellant references several roof forms within the wider area as justification; however, none of these cited examples demonstrate a comparable scale or massing to the proposal. It is important to emphasise that character is not defined solely by the front façade or street scene. The rear elevations and the relationship of built form across plots contribute significantly to the townscape character. Where increased scale and massing adversely affect this relationship, the LPA has a responsibility to preserve local character
- 2.11 In this case, the proposal appears overly dominant and incongruous due to its massing toward the rear, resulting in clear harm to the visual character and identity of the area. The assertion in paragraph 5.38 of the Appellant's Statement regarding public benefits is noted and is addressed in the planning balance section of this statement.

Reason 3 (Living Conditions for future occupants)

- 2.12 The LPA maintains that the scheme in its current form fails to provide a satisfactory living environment for future occupiers due to poor internal layouts, limited outlook, and inadequate daylight/sunlight provision. These concerns go

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

to the heart of sustainable and liveable residential design, which requires that new homes meet basic standards of habitability and residential amenity.

- 2.13 Of particular concern is the quality of accommodation proposed for Flat 2, where the primary living space faces onto a narrow service road, with only limited separation (approx. 4.2 metres) between the building and the flank wall of the neighbouring property at No. 15A. The room is served by two undersized windows, one of which is shown as obscure glazed to address privacy concerns. This glazing treatment further compromises both daylight and outlook. As a result, the living space would effectively rely on a single small window facing a blank wall at close proximity — a configuration that falls significantly below acceptable amenity standards.
- 2.14 Flat 3 presents similar issues, with flank windows again facing onto a service road, providing direct outlook towards No. 9 Swakeleys Road. The reliance on flank windows for principal habitable rooms is unacceptable, particularly given the potential for neighbouring redevelopment, which could further constrain light and outlook in the future. Moreover, the living area of Flat 3 has a further window which faces onto a small, enclosed terrace, which itself would require screening to protect the privacy of Flat 1. This results in a highly constrained arrangement with minimal external outlook, further reinforcing the LPA's view that the flat would not provide a high-quality living environment.
- 2.15 Similar concerns extend to Flats 5 and 6 on the second floor, where again, the use of flank-facing windows to serve habitable rooms undermines the quality of accommodation. This reliance on side windows compromises both privacy and daylight/sunlight access, particularly in an urban context where surrounding development may change. Although the LPA note that flats 5 and 6 also have a secondary window opening facing onto the front section of the building, the close proximity of this window to this front section comprises this outlook.
- 2.16 The Appellant argues in paragraphs 5.57 to 5.78 that the site's brownfield status justifies these reduced standards. The LPA strongly disagrees. Good design should respond positively to site constraints. Designing around constraints is fundamental to achieving high-quality, sustainable development. A poor outlook, even on constrained or previously developed land, is not acceptable under adopted policy
- 2.17 Furthermore, the suggestion in paragraph 5.59 that occupants of Local Centres may tolerate a poorer residential environment due to convenience or proximity to services is not a valid planning justification. The requirement to provide acceptable living conditions applies to all residential development, regardless of location.



HILLINGDON

LONDON

- 2.18 In paragraphs 5.76 to 5.80 of the Appellant's Statement, reference is made to new daylight and sunlight information and revised fenestration details. However, these documents were not included in the original application and have not been subject to formal consultation or assessment. The LPA considers this to be new material that should not be accepted as part of the appeal. In any event, the minor changes proposed would not materially improve the overall quality of the living environment or address the underlying concerns set out in the reason for refusal.
- 2.19 The LPA also notes that several of the proposed units do not benefit from any private outdoor amenity space. Policy DMHB 18 is explicit in requiring high-quality private outdoor space for future residents. While the Appellant refers to nearby public amenity areas, these cannot substitute for private outdoor provision. The lack of amenity space, when considered alongside the constrained internal layouts and poor outlook, reinforces the conclusion that the scheme is overdeveloped and fails to meet minimum residential standards.
- 2.20 Where private amenity space is proposed, such as the terraces serving flats 1 and 3, these are of limited quality and usability. Their subdivision between flats results in small, enclosed spaces, with excessive screening required to protect neighbouring privacy. This creates an oppressive environment and significantly reduces the amenity value of the terraces themselves.
- 2.21 Taken as a whole, the scheme would deliver a series of residential units that fall materially below acceptable standards for daylight, outlook, and outdoor amenity. The cumulative impact of the constrained layouts, compromised privacy, and poor external environments results in a development that fails to provide future residents with the standard of accommodation required by adopted policy. The LPA maintains its position that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable living environment.

Reason 4 (Cycle Parking)

- 2.22 The LPA acknowledge that sufficient cycle storage was provided however the key concern is the location of this storage at first floor level without level access or access to a lift.
- 2.23 Whilst it is acknowledged that constraints exist to creating cycle storage on developments that are not completely new builds, this overall design solution would not be appropriate as it would involve carrying bikes up a level. It discourages sustainable transport as occupants are likely to be put off this mode of transports given the impracticalities of the storage area.
- 2.24 This is fundamental to the scheme given that the flats proposed would be a car free development. By not providing suitably positioned cycle storage, it has the

Our Ref: 6626/APP/2024/3040
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

potential to deter occupants from using cycling as a mode of transport. The appellant statement accepts that the cycle storage is not fully compliant due to the constraints of the site. Whilst limitations to cycle storage is sometimes accepted for converted properties, under the current appeal scheme, the overall scale and number of flats being provided would require a suitable more appropriate design solution.

- 2.25 For these reasons, the LPA would stand by their reason for refusal. It points to the constraints and limitations of the site and how this further reduces the overall quality of the accommodation that is being provided to the detriment of occupants.

Reason 5 (Refuse)

- 2.26 In terms of the refuse location, this was considered both inconvenient and poorly accessible for potential future occupants.
- 2.27 Given the level of flats proposed, it would be imperative to have a refuse storage within easy distance to the flats to ensure that the quality and servicing of the building meets acceptable standards. Having bin storage units which involves exiting the building and walking a significant distance to the storage space is likely to deter future occupants of the units.
- 2.28 As pointed out, there are also safety concerns given the lack of surveillance along this route to the bin storage. This could then have a knock-on effect of rubbish being dispersed onto the streets with would have environmental implications. For these reasons, the LPA would stand by the original reason for refusal.

Reason 6 (Water efficiency)

- 2.29 As part of the Appellant statement and further information, a Water Efficiency Statement has been submitted and demonstrated that the water usage for each property can meet the criteria of 105 litres/person/day. As such, this reason for refusal is no longer contested and were the appeal to be allowed, the LPA would suggest a condition on water usage. This has been included in the suggest conditions in Appendix 1 of the statement below.

Reason 7 (Agent of Change for the Public House)

- 2.30 The planning refusal rightfully raised a principle objection to the loss of ancillary floorspace which contributed to the Public House operation and viability. No supporting evidence has come forward either through the original details or within the appeal statement to justify this loss of space.

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

- 2.31 The response of the appellant is to reconfigure the layout of both the public house and as well as relocating the plant equipment to the roof. This would be introducing materially different evidence which does not form apart of the description of the development (relocation of plant equipment) and should therefore not form part of the appeal assessment. The idea of relocating the plant to the roof could have repercussions on the adjoining neighbours as well as future occupants of the units. The Council's Acoustic Officer has not been able to scrutinise this positioning during the application process and the LPA would respectfully ask the Inspectorate to not consider this amendment under the current appeal process. It is also worth noting that the neighbouring properties would not have been consulted on this significant change given it did not form apart of the original details or description of development.
- 2.32 Notwithstanding this point, the LPA still consider insufficient justification has been provided that the first floor of the Public House is no longer viable to the running of this important local community facility. Para 7.78 of the London Plan (2021) is quite clear in its understanding of the importance of ancillary space on more than one floor to an existing Public House.
- 2.33 It states that *"the change to residential use of these area can limit the operational flexibility of the pub, make it less attractive to customers and prevent ancillary spaces being used by the local community. It also threaten the viability of a pub through increased complaints about noise and other issues from new residents. Boroughs should resist proposal for redevelopment of associated accxomodation, facilities or development within the curtilage of the public house that would compromise the operation or viability of a public house."*
- 2.34 The information presented within the application to date does not support the long time future of this Public House. No supporting information has been provided that clarifies why the current ancillary space is no longer needed for the functioning of the Public House. It has not been demonstrated that it is unviable presently. Furthermore, the proximity of the Public House to the flats above threaten the remaining ground floor of the Pub. This is largely due to the amount of residential units, the overall layouts and the private amenity spaces are more than likely to lead to noise issues from residents due to the positioning and fenestration openings. For these reasons, the LPA would consider that the first floor space remains important to the functionality of the Public House.

Reason 8 (Noise)

- 2.35 The LPA maintains that the proposed development fails to fully address the requirements of London Plan Policy D13 and the Agent of Change principle. Policy D13 is explicit that noise-sensitive development must be designed to ensure that existing noise-generating uses can continue to operate without unreasonable restriction, with the onus placed firmly on the new development to

Our Ref: 6626/APP/2024/3040
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

incorporate effective mitigation. The supporting text at paragraphs 3.112 and 3.113 makes clear that this requires robust, site-specific assessment and design measures from the outset—not assumptions or post-occupation adjustments.

- 2.36 The LPA would argue that the applicant has introduced further acoustic details within the appeal process that have not been properly scrutinised. Notwithstanding the additional measurements taken, crucially do not appear to have been taken from the exact location of the proposed flats, meaning the results cannot provide a reliable assessment of internal noise levels. Despite this, the appellant concludes that noise from the Public House is “unlikely to be perceptible” to future occupiers. This is speculative and unsupported by adequate evidence.
- 2.37 Without conclusive data and properly designed mitigation measures, there remains a clear risk that residents of the proposed flats would be exposed to unacceptable noise levels, leading either to diminished residential amenity or pressure to curtail the operations of the Public House. Either outcome represents a failure to satisfy both Policy D13 and Policy D14, which together require that new development mitigates noise impacts effectively while safeguarding the viability of existing uses. On this basis, the appellant’s unsupported acoustic claims should be afforded little or no weight in the decision-making process.

3. Planning Balance

- 3.1 The proposal would result in the creation of six additional residential units above an existing public house, which carries some limited benefit in contributing to the borough’s housing supply. However, this modest gain is potentially at the expense of the Public Houses long term viability. The overall massing of the development would add significant bulk to the rear of the property which would be out of character to the area. The overall standards of accommodation together with the impact on the adjoining residents would also weigh against the scheme. Furthermore, noise mitigation measures, waste and cycle storage facilities remain inadequate
- 3.2 Paragraphs 130 and 134 of the NPPF, along with relevant Local Plan policies, place great weight on securing high-quality design and ensuring developments create a high standard of amenity for all users. The proposal fails to meet this bar.
- 3.3 In the planning balance, the harm from the scheme as a whole to both occupants, adjoining residents, the Public House outweighs the limited benefit of the additional residential units. As such, the proposal is contrary to the development plan when read as a whole, and no material considerations have been advanced that would justify a departure from policy.

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report and this statement, the appeal proposal would be unacceptable in principle; harmful to amenity of the adjoining and nearby residents and would provide a poor-quality living standard for future occupants.
- 4.2 To conclude, the Appeal scheme conflicts with national, regional and local planning policies and guidance.
- 4.3 The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.
- 4.4 In the event that the Inspector considers the appeal should be allowed, and without prejudice to the Council's case, a list of recommended planning conditions is included at Appendix 1.

Appendix 1 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions

For the reasons set out in this appeal statement, the decision notice and the case officers' delegated report, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal. In the event that the Inspector is minded to allow the appeal, the Council ask that the following conditions be considered for inclusion on any planning permission:

1) Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON

To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) Accordance with the approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, drawing numbers.

753/000 Rev B Location Plan

753/001 Rev C Site Analysis

753/010 Rev G Ground & First Floor Plan – Demolition

Our Ref: 6626/APP/2024/3040
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

753/015 Rev F North & East Elevation – Demolition

753/016 Rev G North & East Elevation – Proposed

753/017 Rev H West & South Elevations – Demolition

753/019 Rev G Sections BB&CC – Demolition

753/020 Rev B Plans & Sections Proposed

753/021 Rev B Sections & Elevations Proposed

and shall thereafter be retained/maintained for as long as the development remains in existence.

REASON

To ensure the development complies with the provisions Hillingdon Local Plan Parts 1 (November 2012) and 2 (January 2020) and the London Plan (2021).

3) Details of Materials

No development shall take place until details of all materials and external surfaces, including details of fenestration have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such.

Details should include information relating to make, product/type, colour and photographs/images.

REASON

To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

4) Details of Landscaping

No development shall take place until a landscape scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include: -

1. Details of Soft Landscaping

1.a Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100),

1.b Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken,

1.c Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate.

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



2. Details of Hard Landscaping

2.a Refuse Storage

2.b Cycle Storage (2 secure and accessible space per dwelling)

3. Details of Landscape Maintenance

3.a Landscape Maintenance Schedule for a minimum period of 5 years.

3.b Proposals for the replacement of any tree, shrub, or area of surfacing/seeding within the landscaping scheme which dies or in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased.

4. Schedule for Implementation

Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.

REASON

To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and provide adequate facilities in compliance with Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14, DMEI 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and Policy G5 of the London Plan (2021).

5. Details of Roof Terrace Screening Measures

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed privacy screening to be located between the roof terrace including side sections shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screens shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any of the development retain as such in perpetuity.

REASON To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies

6) Sustainable Water Management

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (excluding demolition, ground works and substructure works), a scheme for the provision of sustainable water management and water efficiency shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall:

- i. Provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii. Include a timetable for its implementation; and

Our Ref: 6626/APP/2024/3040
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

iii. Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The scheme shall also demonstrate the use of methods to minimise the use of potable water through water collection, reuse and recycling and will:

iv. Provide details of water collection facilities to capture excess rainwater;

v. Provide details of how rain and grey water will be recycled and reused in the development;

vi. Provide details of how the dwelling will achieve a water efficiency standard of no more than 110 litres per person per day maximum water consumption (to include a fixed factor of water for outdoor use of 5 litres per person per day in accordance with the optional requirement defined within Approved Document G of the Building Regulations).

Thereafter the development shall be implemented and retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.

REASON: To ensure the development does not increase the risk of flooding in accordance with Policies DMEI 9 and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and Policies SI2 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021).

7) Compliance with M4(2)

The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until certification of compliance with the technical specifications for an M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. All such provisions must remain in place for the life of the building.

REASON

To not only allow the Building Control body to require the development to comply with the optional Building Regulations standards, but to also ensure the appropriate quantity and standard of accessible and adaptable housing is constructed and maintained in accordance with Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

8) Details Construction Management Plan

Prior to development commencing, the applicant shall submit a demolition and construction management plan to the Local Planning Authority for its approval. The plan shall detail:

(i) The phasing of development works.

(ii) The hours during which development works will occur (please refer to informative 2 for maximum permitted working hours).

(iii) Measures to prevent mud and dirt tracking onto footways and adjoining roads (including wheel washing facilities).

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

(iv) Traffic management and access arrangements (vehicular and pedestrian) and parking provisions for contractors during the development process (including measures to reduce the numbers of construction vehicles accessing the site during peak hours).

(v) a dust risk assessment, including means to monitor and control dust, noise and vibrations, following the published guidance by The Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) on how to assess impacts of emissions of dust from demolition and construction sites. This must demonstrate compliance (drawn up accordance with) the GLA Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition SPG (or any successor document).

(vi) The storage of demolition/construction materials on site.

The approved details shall be implemented and maintained throughout the duration of the demolition and construction process.

REASON

To safeguard the amenity of surrounding areas in accordance with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

9. Noise Levels

For the lifetime of the development hereby permitted the noise level shall not exceed 35 dB LAeq 16 hrs between 0700 and 2300 and 30 dB LAeq 8 hrs, between 2300 and 0700, measured inside any room of any permitted dwelling whilst achieving acceptable internal living conditions with respect to ventilation and temperature.'

REASON

To ensure that occupants of the permitted development would not be exposed to noise that would be likely to cause an adverse effect on their health and quality of life. This has regard to the guidance set out in 'Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings' British Standard Institution BS8233: 2014.

INFORMATIVES

1) Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), this development is liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This will be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012. Before commencement of works the development parties must notify the London Borough of Hillingdon of the commencement date for the construction works (by submitting a Commencement Notice) and assume liability to pay CIL (by submitting an Assumption of Liability Notice) to the Council at planning@hillington.gov.uk. The Council will then issue a

Our Ref: 6626/APP/2024/3040
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Demand Notice setting out the date and the amount of CIL that is payable. Failure to submit a valid Assumption of Liability Notice and Commencement Notice prior to commencement of the development may result in surcharges being imposed. The above forms can be found on the planning portal at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

Pre-Commencement Conditions: These conditions are important from a CIL liability perspective as a scheme will not become CIL liable until all of the pre-commencement conditions have been discharged/complied with.

2) Nuisance from demolition and construction works is subject to control under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other related legislation. In particular, you should ensure that the following are complied with:-

A. Demolition and construction works which are audible at the site boundary shall only be carried out between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

B. All noise generated during such works shall be controlled in compliance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228:2009.

C. Dust emissions shall be controlled in compliance with the Mayor of London's Best Practice Guidance' The Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.

D. No bonfires that create dark smoke or nuisance to local residents.

You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Protection Unit (www.hillingdon.gov.uk/noise Tel. 01895 250155) or to seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the normal working hours set out in (A) above, and by means that would minimise disturbance to adjoining premises.

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

6626/APP/2024/3040
APP/R5510/W/25/3368336