

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 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 Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval ☐
25. WORKS TO TREES ☐
26. OTHER (please specify) ☐

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives 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 DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address 63-65 STATION ROAD HAYES

Development: First floor rear extension and conversion of storage area to a studio flat

LBH Ref Nos: **18175/APP/2020/2157**

Drawing Nos: 01C
 03B
 06C
 Location Plan (1:1250)

Date Plans received : 03/08/2020

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 03/08/2020

1. **SUMMARY**

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor rear extension and conversion of storage area to a studio flat. It is considered that the proposal fails to address the concerns in terms of the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of the occupants of the flat at Number 67A Station Road.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its overall siting, size, scale and bulk would result in an overdominant and visually obtrusive form of development in relation to the existing adjoining occupiers of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road and as such would constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

In the absence of a legal agreement or obligation, the applicant has failed to agree to the restrictions of parking permits which is required in order to facilitate sustainable development. The developments therefore fails to provide adequate off street parking provision or demonstrate that the proposal would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP 3.3	(2016) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2016) Housing Choice
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character
NPPF- 2	NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF- 5	NPPF-5 2018 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF- 11	NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

3 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2016). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

4

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service. This is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme, where the Inspectors Report identified issues to be addressed, which were reflected in the reasons for refusal, allowing the opportunity to address those issues within this submission.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a retail unit with storage above located within the

secondary shopping frontage in Hayes Town Centre as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012). Residential Properties in Crown Close are located to the south east of the application site.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first floor rear extension and conversion of storage area to a studio flat.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

18175/APP/1999/2322 63-65 Station Road Hayes
CHANGE OF USE TO AMUSEMENT CENTRE

Decision: 01-03-2000 Refused

18175/APP/2008/2310 63-65 Station Road Hayes

Two storey rear extension comprising 2 retail units at ground floor, 2 two-bedroom flats at first floor level and 1 one-bedroom flat at second floor level involving the installation of 7 rooflights in side elevations and demolition of single storey rear projection

Decision: 29-10-2008 Refused

18175/APP/2013/2507 63-65 Station Road Hayes

Three storey rear extension to include retail (Use Class A1) on ground floor and 2 x 1 bed and 2 x studio flats on first and second floors, involving demolition of single storey extension.

Decision: 31-10-2013 Refused

18175/APP/2014/232 63-65 Station Road Hayes

Three storey rear extension to include 2 x retail (Use Class A1) units and parking garage on ground floor and 2 x 2 bed self contained flats on first and second floors, involving demolition of single storey extension (Resubmission)

Decision: 19-03-2014 Refused

18175/APP/2016/715 63-65 Station Road Hayes

First floor rear extension

Decision: 26-04-2016 Approved

18175/APP/2017/2180 63-65 Station Road Hayes

Single storey rear extension

Decision: 25-09-2017 Approved

18175/APP/2020/544 63-65 Station Road Hayes

First floor rear extension and creation of 1 x 1-bed self contained flat

Decision: 10-06-2020 Refused

18175/B/80/1295 63-65 Station Road Hayes

Change of use

Decision: 07-10-1980 Refused

18175/D/81/0522 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Change of use from retail shop to estate agents

Decision: 01-05-1981 Approved

18175/E/81/1249 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Change of use to Retail use 84 sq.m

Decision: 16-10-1981 Refused

18175/G/81/9101 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Installation of internally illuminated fascia signs

Decision: 12-10-1981 Approved

18175/H/83/0275 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Change of use from shop with residential above to shop with offices above (Nos.63 and 65)

Decision: 10-05-1983 Refused

18175/K/84/0167 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Change of use of first floor from residential to office (Nos.63 and 65)

Decision: 22-06-1984 Approved

18175/PRC/2014/61 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Demolition of rear section retail unit. Construction of retail unit and 2 flats above

Decision: 07-08-2015 OBJ

18175/PRC/2015/169 63-65 Station Road Hayes
Proposed ground and first floor extension. New storage to existing retail

Decision: 15-01-2016 OBJ

57520/APP/2015/855 63 Station Road Hayes
Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and enlargement of roof space to create 2 x 2 bed self contained flats with amenity space and new retail area to rear

Decision: 11-05-2015 Refused **Appeal:** 29-09-2015 Dismissed

Comment on Planning History

Planning application reference 18175/APP/2020/544 for the erection of a first floor rear extension and creation of 1 x 1-bed self contained flat was recently refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its overall siting, size, scale and bulk would result in an overdominant and visually obtrusive form of development in relation to the existing adjoining occupiers of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road and as such would constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

2. In the absence of a legal agreement or obligation, the applicant has failed to agree to the restrictions of parking permits which is required in order to facilitate sustainable

development. The developments therefore fails to provide adequate off street parking provision or demonstrate that the proposal would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

57520/APP/2019/3607 - First floor rear extension and conversion of existing retail storage space to create 1 x 2 bed self contained flat with amenity space was recently refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its excessive size, scale, bulk and design would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, the visual amenities of the street scene and would harm the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

2. The proposed development by reason of its overall siting, size, and position of the roof terrace would result in an overdominant and visually obtrusive form of development in relation to the existing adjoining occupiers of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road and as such would constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies OE1, BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3. The proposed development fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety and contrary to policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policy DMT6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

There has been a long history of refusals for flats at first floor level. The most notable was application reference 57520/APP/2015/855 for the Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and enlargement of roof space to create 2 x 2 bed self contained flats with amenity space and new retail area to rear which was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its excessive size, scale, bulk, site coverage and inappropriate details of design, would result in an incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, the visual amenities of the street scene and would harm the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposed development by reason of its overall siting, size, and position of windows, doors and roof terraces would result in an overdominant and visually obtrusive form of

development in relation to the existing adjoining occupiers of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road and as such would constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies OE1, BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3. The proposed development would result in the loss of 3 existing on site parking spaces and fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision which meets the Council's approved parking standards to service the proposed and existing dwellings and retail units. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety and is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the Council's adopted car parking standards and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4. The proposal fails to make adequate provision for servicing within the site resulting in servicing of the development taking place along the adjacent highway, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

An appeal was subsequently dismissed which is discussed below

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

Access Officer:

This development application has been assessed against the requirements of London Plan policy 3.8 (c) which should not be applied to the proposed extension of this existing development. No accessibility objection is raised. Conclusion: acceptable.

Landscape Officer:

This site is occupied by the side / rear elevation and yard of a retail outlet which fronts onto Station Road. The side elevation faces Crown Close which forms part of the urban area being refurbished under the Hayes town centre improvement programme. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site and no existing vegetation.

COMMENT: No trees will be removed to facilitate the development. The rear of this site is currently quite scruffy with car parking and bin storage areas which are indicated as part of the proposal. If the application is approved, this area should be improved and the rubbish bins secured discretely behind a fence. Planting may be feasible against the car park walls

RECOMMENDATION: No objection subject to condition COM9 (parts 1, 2, 4 and 5).

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.H1 (2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 2 Housing Mix

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 5 Pedestrians and Cyclists

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.3 (2016) Increasing housing supply

LPP 3.4 (2015) Optimising housing potential

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 3.8 (2016) Housing Choice

LPP 7.4 (2016) Local character

NPPF- 2 NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development

NPPF- 5 NPPF-5 2018 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

NPPF- 11 NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land

NPPF- 12 NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

In relation to the previous appeal the Inspector advised:

"From the evidence that is before me and from my site visit it is clear that the occupants of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road are most likely to be affected by the proposed extension in terms of overlooking, noise and disturbance and outlook. I saw that this first floor flat has habitable windows in its rear elevation. Whilst I accept that the reduced bulk of the proposed extension would not result in any technical loss of light to the occupants of this property it seems to me that windows to be inserted in the side elevation (south flank) of the proposed flats would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road through overlooking.

Furthermore, there would be a significant potential for increased levels of noise and

disturbance and potentially loss of privacy arising from the access and use of the terrace areas close to this property. Moreover, I consider the extension would result in an over-dominant and visually obtrusive form of development in relation to the occupants of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road thereby causing a material loss of outlook for these adjoining occupiers. Overall I find that the proposed extension would be in conflict with Policies BE19, BE21, BE24 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). On the second issue I conclude that the appeal must fail."

The current proposal does not include a terrace and the dormer extension has been removed. Whilst this does remove two concerns raised by the Inspector, it does not fully address the concern that the proposal would result in an over-dominant and visually obtrusive form of development in relation to the occupants of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road thereby causing a material loss of outlook for these adjoining occupiers. The overall bulk of the extension in terms of its footprint and roof is similar to that considered recently under refused scheme application reference 18175/APP/2020/544. The extension has been reduced in width, but the projection remains the same. It is considered that the increased projection of the first floor would remain unacceptably dominating on the outlook of the first floor flat at Number 67 Station Road.

The proposed development therefore, by reason of its overall siting, size, and bulk would result in an overdominant and visually obtrusive form of development in relation to the existing adjoining occupiers of the first floor flat at 67 Station Road and as such would constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

The NPPF (2012) notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

Policy 7.1 of the London Plan states that "design of new buildings and the spaces they create should help reinforce or enhance the character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of the neighbourhood."

Policy 7.4 of the London Plan states, "Development should have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. It should improve an area's visual or physical connection with natural features. In areas of poor or ill-defined character, development should build on the positive elements that can contribute to establishing an enhanced character for the future function of the area."

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) requires that all new development achieves a 'high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions'.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - 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

The application site occupies a prominent corner location with the rear and side elevations appearing prominent within the streetscene. This current proposal removes the unacceptable crown roof element and dormer extensions of the previous proposal which was dismissed at appeal and reduced the width of the extension that was recently refused. The extension is designed to be subordinate in height to the existing main building and, whilst it elongates the plan form, it is considered that the proposed extension would respect the architectural integrity of the host building and would not detract from the visual amenities of the street scene.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

See below

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Policy DMT 2: Highways Impacts states:

Development proposals must ensure that:

- i) safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards;
- ii) they do not contribute to the deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety of all road users and residents;
- iii) safe, secure and convenient access and facilities for cyclists and pedestrian are satisfactorily accommodated in the design of highway and traffic management schemes;
- iv) impacts on local amenity and congestion are minimised by routing through traffic by the most direct means to the strategic road network, avoiding local distributor and access roads; and
- v) there are suitable mitigation measures to address any traffic impacts in terms of capacity and functions of existing and committed roads, including along roads or through junctions which are at capacity.

Policy DMT 6: Vehicle Parking states:

A) Development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity.

The Council may agree to vary these requirements when:

- i) the variance would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity; and/or
- ii) a transport appraisal and travel plan has been approved and parking provision is in accordance with its recommendations.

B) All car parks provided for new development will be required to contain conveniently located reserved spaces for wheelchair users and those with restricted mobility in accordance with the Council's Accessible Hillingdon SPD.

The application site is situated in the middle of Hayes town centre with excellent access to shops, services, facilities and transport links. The site has a PTAL ranking of 5 indicating access to public transport is good compared to London as a whole suggesting that there are opportunities for some trips to be made to and from the site by modes other than the private car. For a development of this type the maximum number of parking spaces permitted is 1. However, the Highways Officer has previously confirmed that taking into account the applications sites town centre location a car free development is acceptable subject to the provision of one covered and secure bicycle parking space and that the applicant enters into a S106 legal agreement to ensure the future residents do not have access to parking permits within the adjacent parking management scheme, no objection is raised on parking grounds. The applicant has agreed to enter into such a S106 agreement. However, no agreement or obligation currently exists and in the absence of this, the applicant has failed to agree to the restrictions of parking permits which is required in order to facilitate sustainable development. The developments therefore fails to provide adequate off street parking provision or demonstrate that the proposal would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Policy DMHB 16: Housing Standards states:

All housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment. To achieve this all residential development or conversions should:

meet or exceed the most up to date internal space standards, as set out in Table 5.1. A one person studio flat is required to provide 37 square metres which the proposal exceeds. Furthermore the habitable rooms would enjoy a satisfactory outlook in accordance with the requirements of Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

7.6 Other Issues

CIL

The Council adopted its own Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on August 1st 2014 and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per sq metre.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)
The London Plan (2016)
The Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016)
Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016)
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon
National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230