

APPLICATION FOR: 12853/APP/2023/1492

HAYES PARK CENTRAL AND SOUTH, HAYES PARK HAYES END ROAD
HAYES

COMMITTEE: Major Apps PC

DATE: 14th February 2024

I confirm:-

- All consultations have been completed
- All consultations are reflected in the report.
- The report is free from spelling, typing and grammatical errors.

Final formatting:

Signed:- _____
Case Officer

Signed:- _____
Team Manager

Signed:- _____
Senior Manager

I agree this report can go on the agenda for the above Committee.

Signed:- _____
DC Tech Admin

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

Address: HAYES PARK CENTRAL AND SOUTH, HAYES PARK HAYES END ROAD
HAYES

Development: Change of use of the existing buildings to provide new homes (Use Class C3), together with internal and external works to the buildings, landscaping, car and cycle parking, and other associated works.

LBH Ref Nos: 12853/APP/2023/1492

Drawing Nos: 0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001005 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001006 Rev. P2
Planning Responses (Dated 21st November 2023)
Daylight and Sunlight Report (Dated May 2023)
Design and Access Statement (Dated May 2023)
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001001 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001002 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001003 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001004 Rev. P2
Planning, LSH, HE, & GLA Responses Rev. 1 (Dated 22nd September 2023)
157-60 Glazing Investigation (Dated January 2023)
Response to Consultation Feedback (Dated 29th September 2023)
PP2012/HP/AQA/202309-EC Air Quality Assessment (Dated September 2023)
P450887-WW-XX-XX-RP-C-0002 Rev. P5 Drainage Assessment and Strategy Report (Dated 15th November 2023)
0419-SEW-HC-00-DR-A-001111 Rev. P3
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-001112 Rev. P3
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253215 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253216 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-HC-02-DR-A-001113 Rev. P3
0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-001116 Rev. P3
0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-253225 Rev. P2
0419-SEW-HS-01-DR-A-001117 Rev. P3
0419-SEW-HS-02-DR-A-001118 Rev. P3
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001000 Rev. P2
Without Prejudice Affordable Housing Offer (10% Shared Ownership) Letter (Dated 24th January 2024)
Qualitative Design Review (Dated 5th September 2023)

P450887-WW-XX-RF-DR-C-1001 Rev. P4 Proposed Drainage Layout
P450887-WW-XX-RF-DR-C-1003 Rev. P1 Exceedance Plan
P450887-WW-XX-XX-RP-C-0001 Rev. P4 Flood Risk Assessment (Dated
September 2023)
PP2012/HP/AQDMP/202309-EC Air Quality and Dust Management Plan
(Dated September 2023)
P450887-WW-XX-FN-C-0002 Rev. P1 Response to LLFA planning Objections
(Dated 27th September 2023)
P450887-WW-XX-FN-C-0003 Rev. P1 Response to GLA planning Objections
(Dated 29th September 2023)
Pre-Refurbishment Audit (Dated March 2023)
WIE19060.112.R.1.1.3.TN Transport Note - Response to GLA and Highway
Authority (Dated September 2023)
1854-KC-XX-YTREE-TCP01 Rev. 0 Tree Constraints Plan
P308SK001 Preliminary External Lighting Overview
Sustainability Statement (Dated May 2023)
Whole Life Carbon Assessment (Dated 2023)
Statement Of Community Engagement (Dated May 2023)
Area Schedule Rev. P1 (Dated 12th May 2023)
0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-000001 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-00-DR-A-000011 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-01-DR-A-000012 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-02-DR-A-000013 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-03-DR-A-000014 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-B1-DR-A-000010 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-ZZ-DR-A-000020 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-ZZ-DR-A-000021 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-ZZ-DR-A-000030 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-ZZ-DR-A-000031 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-ZZ-DR-A-000032 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPC-ZZ-DR-A-000033 Rev. P1
0419-SEW- HPS-00-DR-A-000016 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-01-DR-A-000017 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-02-DR-A-000018 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-03-DR-A-000019 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-B1-DR-A-000015 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-ZZ-DR-A-000022 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-ZZ-DR-A-000023 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-ZZ-DR-A-000034 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-ZZ-DR-A-000035 Rev. P1

0419-SEW-HPS-ZZ-DR-A-000036 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HPS-ZZ-DR-A-000037 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-001100 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001308 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001307 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001306 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001305 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001207 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001206 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001205 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001204 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-RF-DR-A-001119 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001304 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001303 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001302 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001301 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001203 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001202 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001201 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001200 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-RF-DR-A-001114 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-B1-DR-A-001110 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-00-DR-A-253200 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-00-DR-A-253205 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253210 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253217 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-253220 Rev. P1
0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-253230 Rev. P1
Utilities Statement (Dated May 2023)
Cover Letter (Dated 16th May 2023)
Circular Economy Statement (Dated May 2023)
0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-000003 Rev. P2
Planning Statement (Dated May 2023)
Framework Travel Plan (Dated May 2023)
Transport Assessment (Dated May 2023)
Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment (Dated May 2023)
Financial Viability Assessment (Dated May 2023)
Bat Survey Report (Dated May 2023)
Biodiversity Impact Assessment (Dated May 2023)

1854-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01 Rev. 0 Tree Protection Plan
 Arboriculture Impact Assessment (Dated May 2023)
 Outline Construction Logistics Plan (Dated May 2023)
 Delivery and Servicing Plan (Dated May 2023)
 P0308EXT001 Rev. B
 Fire Statement (Dated May 2023)
 Air Quality Assessment (Dated May 2023)
 Noise Assessment (Dated May 2023)
 Vibration Assessment (Dated May 2023)
 Strategic Economic Case Report (Dated May 2023)
 Housing Mix Report (Dated May 2023)
 Overheating Assessment (Dated May 2023)
 Phase 1 Environmental Report (Dated May 2023)
 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Dated May 2023)
 Refuse and Recycling Strategy (Dated May 2023)
 Energy Strategy - Refurbished Residential (Dated May 2023)
 Energy Strategy - Operational Energy Analysis (Dated May 2023)
 Site Waste Management Plan (Dated May 2023)

Date Plans received:	17-05-2023	Date(s) of Amendment(s):	04-12-2023
			22-05-2023
Date Application valid	20-06-2023		29-09-2023

1. SUMMARY

This Full Planning application seeks planning permission for a proposed change of use of the Grade II* Listed Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South office buildings (Use Class E) to 124 residential flats (Use Class C3). The development is proposed with 10% shared ownership affordable housing provision, and would have access to 124 car parking spaces and 207 cycle stands. Internal and external works to the buildings are proposed, alongside landscaping works to create a communal square, play space and amenity space.

Offices:

Hayes Park Central has been vacant since September 2020 and Hayes Park South has been vacant since the Summer of 2017. Both buildings have been marketed since 2018 and have been unsuccessful in finding occupants for the buildings as offices. With respect to the loss of the existing offices, it is noted that the site is not located within a designated or allocated preferred location for such development or a designated town centre. Hillingdon Council have also chosen not to support the retention of offices in this area through the recent confirmation of Article 4 Directions across the borough which remove permitted development rights for changes of use from offices to other uses. Accordingly, the loss of the offices and employment floorspace is considered to be acceptable in this circumstance.

Residential Use:

The proposed re-use of brownfield land for residential dwellings accords with the local, regional and national planning policies. The proposed residential use is supported in general terms, subject to compliance with other policies in the development plan.

Unit Mix:

The proposal for only 15% family housing is less than would be expected for such a scheme. In this regard it is recognised that there are some clear site constraints for the proposal, which includes the Grade II* listed status of the buildings. In this circumstance, any request for an increase to the number of family units, which would therein result in an overall reduction of units, would compromise viability and potentially jeopardise the delivery of the scheme. On balance, the unit mix as proposed is accepted but the lack of family housing does not weigh in applications favour.

Affordable Housing:

The scheme has been subject to viability testing by the Council's third party consultants and the Greater London Authority. Following such assessment, it has been concluded that the scheme generates a deficit but is within the range of deliverability when accounting for growth within the market. Despite this, the developer has made a 'without prejudice' 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer. This offer increases the deficit generated by the scheme and reduces its viability and deliverability. It is therefore concluded that this offer would represent the maximum viable affordable housing provision deliverable. The affordable housing offer would accord with paragraph 66 of the NPPF (2023) which requires that at least 10% of homes proposed should be delivered as affordable homes. In the event of an approval, it is recommended that the 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer is secured by legal agreement and includes Early and Late Stage Viability Review mechanism as defined by Policy H5 of the London Plan (2021). All reasonable endeavours should be made to secure a Registered Provider to take on the affordable units. Should all reasonable endeavours fail, the obligation shall secure the payment of a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing.

Heritage:

The proposed change of use to C3 residential use would result in a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site, this being something that is considered unlikely to be possible for alternative uses of the Hayes Park Central and South buildings. The proposed residential use is considered to be the optimum viable use. As confirmed by the Council's Conservation Officer, the harm identified in this case is considered to be 'less than substantial harm'. Under paragraph 208 of the NPPF (2023), the application needs to demonstrate public benefit to outweigh the harm to the heritage assets.

Having taken all aspects of the proposal into consideration, it is considered that the less than substantial harm is justified and that public benefits that would result from the delivery of the proposed scheme. Specifically, the re-use of the Grade II* Listed buildings and securement of their long-term future, alongside the identified heritage gains, are considered to be the primary public benefits. Notably, the scheme is supported in principle by Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer. When weighing the harm against the benefits, the public benefits are considered to cumulatively surmount the less than substantial harm posed to the heritage asset. For this reason, and subject to the necessary planning conditions and obligations, the development is considered to accord with relevant conservation planning policy requirements.

Planning Obligations:

Planning obligations are proposed to secure affordable housing provisions, a HUDU health contribution, public open space contribution, carbon offset contribution, air quality mitigation contribution, a full travel plan, active travel zone improvement works, parking permit restriction, employment strategy and construction training.

Recommendation:

Subject to the planning conditions and obligations recommended, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle and with respect to density, heritage significance, airport safeguarding, green belt, character and appearance, neighbour amenity, living conditions, traffic, highway safety, urban design, access, security, affordable housing, trees, landscaping, ecology, waste, energy, sustainability, flooding and drainage, noise, air quality, digital connectivity, contaminated land, fire safety, health, and infrastructure.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the reasons outlined above and within the main body of the report, this application is considered to comply with the Development Plan and is recommended for approval, subject to securing the necessary planning conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That delegated powers be given to the Director of Planning, Regeneration and Environment to grant planning permission subject to the following:

A) That the application be referred to the Mayor under Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

B) That the Council enter into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) or any other legislation to secure the following:

i) Affordable Housing: Planning obligation for on-site provision of 12 no. Shared Ownership units (equal to 10% of all units by habitable room), comprising 2 x 3 bed units, 4 x 2 bed units and 6 x 1 bed units. This shall include an Early and Late Stage Viability Review mechanism as defined by Policy H5 of the London Plan (2021). All reasonable endeavours should be made to secure a Registered Provider to take on the affordable units. Should all reasonable endeavours fail, the obligation shall secure the payment of a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing.

ii) HUDU Health Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £7,409 shall be paid to the Council for the enhancement of health infrastructure provision.

ii) Public Open Space: A financial contribution amounting to £165,500 shall be paid to the Council for the enhancement of existing public open space in the borough.

iii) Carbon Offset Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £137,527 shall be paid to the Council's carbon offset fund. Any additional shortfall identified through the ongoing reporting

required shall form a cash in lieu contribution to the Council in accordance with Policy SI2 of the London Plan (2021) at a rate of £95/tCO2 annualised for not more than 30 years beginning on the commencement of development.

iv) Air Quality Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £363,583 shall be paid to address the air quality impacts of the proposed development.

v) Travel Plan: A full Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan will include such matters as: targets for sustainable travel arrangements; effective measures for the ongoing monitoring of the Travel Plan; and a commitment to delivering the Travel Plan objectives.

vi) Active Travel Zone Improvement Works Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £247,040 shall be paid to the Council for the implementation of active travel zone improvement works.

vii) Parking Permit Restriction: The residents of this development will not to be eligible for parking permits within the Parking Management Areas and Council car parks in the vicinity of the site, apart from Blue Badge holders and a charge made against the site to ensure the future buyers are aware of the parking restrictions.

viii) Employment Strategy and Construction Training: Details shall be in accordance with the Council Planning Obligations SPD with the preference being for an in-kind scheme to be delivered. Securing an Employment/Training Strategy Agreement is the Council's priority. A financial contribution will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances.

ix) Project Management & Monitoring Fee: A financial contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions secured from the scheme to enable the management and monitoring of the resultant agreement.

B) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

C) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement and conditions of approval and agree any changes requested by the GLA.

D) That, if the Legal Agreement has not been finalised within 6 months (or such other time frame as may be agreed by the Director of Planning, Regeneration and Environment), delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Regeneration and Environment to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to mitigate the impacts posed by the proposed development (in respect of Affordable Housing, Health, Public Open Space, Carbon Offsetting, Air Quality, Travel Planning, Active Travel, Employment, and Project Management and Monitoring). The scheme therefore conflicts with Policies DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020); the adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (2014); Policy DF1 of the London Plan (2021); and paragraphs 55-57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).'

E) That if the application is approved, the following conditions be imposed:

1. COM3 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. COM4 Accordance with Approved Plans

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

Location Plan:

0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-000003 Rev. P2

Floor Plans and Roof Plans:

0419-SEW-HC-B1-DR-A-001110 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-00-DR-A-001111 Rev. P3;
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-001112 Rev. P3;
0419-SEW-HC-02-DR-A-001113 Rev. P3;
0419-SEW-HC-RF-DR-A-001114 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-001116 Rev. P3;
0419-SEW-HS-01-DR-A-001117 Rev. P3;
0419-SEW-HS-02-DR-A-001118 Rev. P3;
0419-SEW-HS-RF-DR-A-001119 Rev. P1;

Elevations:

0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001200 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001201 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001202 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001203 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001204 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001205 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001207 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001301 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001302 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001303 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-ZZ-DR-A-001304 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001305 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001306 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001307 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-ZZ-DR-A-001308 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-00-DR-A-253200 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-00-DR-A-253205 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253210 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253215 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253216 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-HC-01-DR-A-253217 Rev. P1;

0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-253220 Rev. P1;
0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-253225 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-253230 Rev. P1;

Landscape Plans:

0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001000 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001001 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001002 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001003 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001004 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001005 Rev. P2;
0419-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001006 Rev. P2; and
0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-001100 Rev. P1.

Thereafter the development hereby permitted shall 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. COM5 General compliance with supporting documentation

The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the specified supporting plans and/or documents:

157-60 Glazing Investigation (Dated January 2023);
Pre-Refurbishment Audit (Dated March 2023);
Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment (Dated May 2023);
PP2012/HP/AQA/202309-EC Air Quality Assessment (Dated September 2023);
PP2012/HP/AQDMP/202309-EC Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (Dated September 2023);
Sustainability Statement (Dated May 2023);
P308SK001 Preliminary External Lighting Overview;
Whole Life Carbon Assessment (Dated 2023);
Utilities Statement (Dated May 2023);
Circular Economy Statement (Dated May 2023);
P450887-WW-XX-XX-RP-C-0002 Rev. P5 Drainage Assessment and Strategy Report (Dated 15th November 2023);
P450887-WW-XX-RF-DR-C-1001 Rev. P4 Proposed Drainage Layout;
P450887-WW-XX-RF-DR-C-1003 Rev. P1 Exceedance Plan;
P450887-WW-XX-XX-RP-C-0001 Rev. P4 Flood Risk Assessment (Dated September 2023);
Daylight and Sunlight Report (Dated May 2023);
Design and Access Statement (Dated May 2023);
Transport Assessment (Dated May 2023);
Bat Survey Report (Dated May 2023);
Biodiversity Impact Assessment (Dated May 2023);
1854-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01 Rev. 0 Tree Protection Plan;
Arboriculture Impact Assessment (Dated May 2023);
Fire Statement (Dated May 2023);
Noise Assessment (Dated May 2023);

Vibration Assessment (Dated May 2023);
Phase 1 Environmental Report (Dated May 2023);
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Dated May 2023);
Energy Strategy - Refurbished Residential (Dated May 2023);
Energy Strategy - Operational Energy Analysis (Dated May 2023);
Site Waste Management Plan (Dated May 2023); and
Refuse and Recycling Strategy (Dated May 2023).

Thereafter the development shall be retained/maintained in accordance with these details 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).

4. NONSC M4(2) and M4(3) Accessible Units

(i) The dwellings hereby approved shall ensure that 108 units (87.1%) are constructed to meet the standards for a Category 2 M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, and all such provisions shall remain in place for the life of the building.

(ii) The dwellings hereby approved shall ensure that 16 units (12.9%) are constructed to meet the standards for a Category 2 M4(3) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, and all such provisions shall remain in place for the life of the building.

REASON

To ensure that sufficient housing stock is provided, in accordance with Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan (2021).

5. NONSC Noise

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. This has regard to the guidance set out in 'Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings' British Standard Institution BS8233: 2014.'

REASON

To ensure a satisfactory living environment is achieved, in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021).

6. NONSC Connection to Future District Heating Network

The development hereby approved shall connect to a district heating network should one become available in future and should it be viable to do so.

REASON

To ensure compliance with Policy SI 3 of the London Plan (2021).

7. NONSC Digital Connectivity Infrastructure

The development hereby approved shall ensure that sufficient ducting space for full fibre connectivity infrastructure is provided.

REASON

To ensure compliance with Policy SI 6 of the London Plan (2021).

8. NONSC Non-Road Mobile Machinery

All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) of net power of 37kW and up to and including 560kW used during the course of the demolition, site preparation and construction phases shall comply with the emission standards set out in chapter 7 of the GLA's supplementary planning guidance "Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition" dated July 2014 (SPG), or subsequent guidance. Unless it complies with the standards set out in the SPG, no NRMM shall be on site, at any time, whether in use or not, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority. The developer shall keep an up to date list of all NRMM used during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of the development on the online register at <https://nrmm.london/>."

REASON

To comply with the London's Low Emission Zone for non-road mobile machinery as per requirements of the London Environment Strategy, in accordance with Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policy DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy SI 1 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraphs 180(e) and 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

9. NONSC Use of Water

The development hereby approved shall incorporate measures to minimise the use of mains water in line with the Optional Requirement of the Building Regulations, achieving mains water consumption of 105 litres or less per head per day (excluding allowance of up to five litres for external water consumption). Measures shall include smart metering, water saving and recycling measures, including retrofitting, to help to achieve lower water consumption rates and to maximise future-proofing.

REASON

In order to minimise the use of mains water, water supplies and resources should be protected and conserved in a sustainable manner, in compliance with Policy SI 5 of the London Plan (2021).

10. NONSC Construction Management and Logistics Plan

Prior to the commencement of works on site, a Construction Management and Logistics Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Ministry of Defence). This plan shall detail:

- i. The phasing of the works;
- ii. The hours of work;
- iii. On-site plant and equipment;
- iv. Measures to mitigate noise and vibration;
- v. Measures to mitigate impact on air quality;
- vi. Waste management;
- vii. Site transportation and traffic management, including:

- (a) HGV Routing enforcement;
- (b) Signage;
- (c) Vehicle types and sizes;
- (d) Hours of arrivals and departures of staff and deliveries (avoiding peaks);
- (e) Frequency of visits;
- (f) Parking of site operative vehicles;
- (g) On-site loading/unloading and wheel washing arrangements
 - (h) Use of an onsite banksman (if applicable)
 - (i) Use of consolidation centres to reduce HGV movements.
 - (j) Achieve FORS Gold standard and 5* Direct Vision Standard.
 - (k) Encourage use of active travel.
- viii. The arrangement for monitoring and responding to complaints relating to demolition and construction;
- ix. Details of cranes and other tall construction equipment (including the details of obstacle lighting);
- x. Measures to avoid and mitigate impacts to the Hayes Shrub Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

This plan should accord with Transport for London's Construction Logistic Planning Guidance and the GLA's 'The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition' Supplementary Planning Guidance (July 2014) (or any successor document). It shall cover the entirety of the application site and any adjoining land which will be used during the construction period. It shall include the details of cranes and any other tall construction equipment (including the details of obstacle lighting).

The construction works shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved plan.

REASON

To safeguard the amenity of surrounding areas and to ensure that the construction works include appropriate efficiency and sustainability measures so as not to compromise the safe and efficient operation of the local highway network and local air quality, in accordance with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policies D14, SI 1, T4 and T7 of the London Plan (2021). Also, to ensure that construction work and construction equipment on the site and adjoining land does not obstruct air traffic movements or otherwise impede the effective operation of air traffic navigation transmitter/receiver systems, in accordance with Policy DMAV 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

11. NONSC Contaminated Land

(i) The development hereby permitted (excluding demolition, site clearance and supplementary ground investigation works e.g. beneath demolished buildings) shall not commence until a scheme to address unacceptable contamination, in accordance with the Environment Agency's guidance "Land contamination risk management" (LCRM), has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). All works which form part of an approved remediation scheme shall be completed before any part of the development is occupied or brought into use unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirement specifically and in writing. The scheme shall include the following measures unless the LPA dispenses with any such requirement specifically and in writing:

- a) A detailed remediation strategy, to also include how completion of the remedial works will be

verified, along with the details of a watching brief to address undiscovered contamination, shall be agreed in writing with the LPA. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without the express agreement of the LPA prior to its implementation.

(ii) If, during remedial or development works, contamination not addressed in the submitted remediation strategy is identified an addendum to the remediation scheme shall be agreed with the LPA prior to implementation; and

(iii) Upon completion of the approved remedial works, this condition will not be discharged until a comprehensive verification report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The verification report shall include the details of the final remediation works and demonstrate that they have been conducted in full and in accordance with the approved methodology.

(iv) No contaminated soils or other materials shall be imported to the site. All imported soils for landscaping and/or engineering purposes shall be clean and free of contamination. Before any part of the development is occupied, all imported soils shall be independently tested for chemical contamination, and the factual results and interpretive reports of this laboratory testing including details of placement of the suitable materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON

To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems and the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (January 2020) Policies - DMEI 11: Protection of Ground Water Resources and DMEI 12: Development of Land Affected by Contamination.

12. NONSC Materials

Prior to commencement of the development, details and samples of materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Historic England. This shall include:

- (i) Details and samples of all new external materials (including the reflecting pool, floor finishes, floor slabs, drainage goods, roof finishes, roof lights, vents, lift overruns, access hatches, capping etc);
- (ii) Detailed drawings of fenestration and doors, including profiles of all new windows, external doors, together with information on materials, glazing (including obscure glazing) and finishes;
- (iii) Detailed drawing including new doors together with materials and finish;
- (iv) Details of new joinery, including internal doors, architraves, skirting and staircase details to communal areas;
- (v) Details of fire and sound proofing works/upgrading;
- (vi) Comprehensive colour scheme for all built details; and
- (vii) Full-scale mock up of the external curtain wall glazing and balconies (including balustrades).

Thereafter the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such.

REASON

To safeguard the special architectural and/or historic interest of the listed building, in accordance to

Policy HE1 of Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

13. COM9 Landscape Scheme

Prior to commencement of works above ground level, a landscape scheme shall be 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) with at least 25 no. new trees to be planted, including pollution absorbing species

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

2. Details of Hard Landscaping

2.a Refuse Storage

2.b Cycle Storage (showing provision for 203 no. long-stay secure and covered spaces and 4 no. short-stay spaces, including access provisions, in accordance with London Cycling Design Standards)

2.c Full details of the means of enclosure and boundary treatments, including product details with materials and finish

2.d Car Parking Layouts:

- 124 no. car parking spaces total, including:

- 25 no. car parking spaces are served by active charging infrastructure and 99 no. car parking spaces served by passive electric vehicle charging infrastructure;

- 15 no. car parking spaces will be designated disabled persons parking bays.

2.e Hard Surfacing Materials (including the external areas and amenity areas which would be accessible to older and disabled people, including wheelchair users)

2.f External Lighting

2.g Other structures (including the access gate(s), play space and the exercise & trim trail space, alongside accessible and inclusive equipment provisions (i.e. sensory impairment and complex multiple disabilities)).

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 surfing/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

5. Other

5.a Existing and proposed functional services above and below ground

5.b Proposed finishing levels or contours

6. Confirmation of the final Urban Greening Factor score

The works shall be completed prior to occupation of any buildings.

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, DMT 2, DMT 6 and DMEI 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policies G1, G5, T5, T6, T6.2 and T7 of the London Plan (2021).

14. NONSC Ecological Management and Enhancement Plan

Prior to commencement of works above ground level, a scheme for the management and enhancement of ecology shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall set out how the development will contribute positively to ecological value through the use of features and measures within the landscaping (i.e. nectar rich and diverse planting including living walls and/or roofs) and the fabric of the new built form (i.e. bat and bird boxes). The scheme shall include a plan with the features annotated and the development must be built and operated in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON

To ensure the development contributes positively to the ecological value of the area in accordance with Policy EM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Parts 2 (2020) and Policies G6 and G7 of the London Plan (2021).

15. NONSC Bird Hazard Management Plan

Prior to commencement of development above ground level, a Bird Hazard Management Plan (BHMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Ministry of Defence (MOD). The Bird Hazard Management Plan should contain, but not be limited to:

- a. An assessment of the various bird species found in the vicinity of the site, to include species data and numbers:
- b. Details of layout of the solar panels, and roof proofing measures designed to prevent access to, and successful breeding by, large gulls, Feral Pigeons and any other identified problematic species on the roof spaces and on, under or around the PV panels; and
- c. Schedule for inspection of the roof spaces by a suitably qualified individual (to include details of roof access), details of the methods used to disturb/disperse birds, and a method statement for recording the results of the disturbance/dispersal activity.

The development shall be carried out and managed strictly in accordance with the details agreed and there shall be no variation without the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with MOD.

REASON

To limit the potential of the site to attract and support populations of those bird species that may cause detriment to aviation safety, in accordance with Policy DMAV 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

16. NONSC Overheating

Prior to commencement of development, the final Overheating Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall demonstrate how the development will reduce the potential for internal overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems in accordance with the following cooling hierarchy:

- 1) reduce the amount of heat entering a building through orientation, shading, high albedo materials, fenestration, insulation and the provision of green infrastructure;
- 2) minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design;
- 3) manage the heat within the building through exposed internal thermal mass and high ceilings;
- 4) provide passive ventilation;
- 5) provide mechanical ventilation; and
- 6) provide active cooling systems.

The approved details shall thereafter be implemented and retained for the lifetime of the development.

REASON

To demonstrate that the final strategy will reduce the potential for internal overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems in accordance with the cooling hierarchy and Policy SI 4 of the London Plan (2021).

17. NONSC Sustainable Drainage Scheme Details

Prior to commencement of groundworks (excluding site investigations and demolition), a final detailed drainage design shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include drawings and supporting calculations, in accordance with document reference "P450887-WW-XX-XX-RP-C-0002 Rev. P5 Drainage Assessment and Strategy Report (Dated 15th November 2023)" and associated drawings. A detailed management plan confirming routine maintenance tasks for all drainage components must also be submitted to demonstrate how the drainage system is to be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

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

REASON

To ensure that surface water run off is controlled and to ensure the development does not increase flood risk, in compliance with Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policy DMEI 9 and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021), the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), and Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change March 2014).

18. NONSC Sustainable Drainage Scheme Verification

Prior to the first occupation of the development, evidence (photographs and installation contracts) shall be submitted to demonstrate that the sustainable drainage scheme for the site has been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan for all of the proposed drainage components.

REASON

To ensure that surface water run off is controlled and to ensure the development does not increase flood risk, in compliance with Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policy DMEI 9

and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021), the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), and Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change March 2014).

19. NONSC Energy Monitoring, Recording and Reporting

Prior to first occupation of the development, a detailed energy monitoring, recording and reporting plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall accord with the requirements of the London Plan (policy SI2) and the GLA Energy Assessment Guidance (April 2020 or as amended) and demonstrate that the development will secure the 85.8% saving in CO2 emissions from the regulated energy load in accordance with the approved energy strategy.

The development must proceed in accordance with the approved reporting structure and where there is a failure to achieve the carbon savings as set out in the energy strategy, the quantum (tCO2) shall be treated as part of the shortfall and shall result in a cash in lieu contribution in accordance with the formula set out in the S106.

REASON

To ensure the development's onsite carbon savings from regulated energy demand is achieved in perpetuity (i.e. annually over 30years) in accordance with the Policy SI2 of the London Plan (2021).

20. NONSC Parking Design and Management Plan

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a Parking Design and Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall detail car parking provision, indicating how the car parking will be designed and managed, with reference to Transport for London guidance on parking management and parking design. This should ensure that parking spaces are allocated appropriately, are leased, are not sold and that the multi storey parking spaces (outside of the site boundary) are not accessible or used by future occupiers.

The Parking Management Plan shall be implemented as approved and shall remain in force for the life of the development.

REASON

To allow sufficient space for all vehicles to access the application site and neighbouring sites, and to safeguard the safety of highway users, in accordance with Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policies T4 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

21. NONSC Control of Balconies

Prior to first occupation of residential units, a scheme to ensure that the approved balconies are not used as storage for clutter shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be occupied in accordance with the approved details.

REASON

To safeguard the special architectural and/or historic interest of the Grade II* Listed Buildings, in accordance with Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

22. NONSC Privacy Screen Details

Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, full details of the privacy screening required to safeguard the amenity of residential properties located around the central courtyards of Hayes Park Central and South, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such.

REASON

To safeguard the amenity of future occupiers, in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

23. NONSC Delivery, Servicing and Waste Management Plan

Prior to the first occupation of the development, details of a final Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should accord with Transport for London's Delivery and Servicing Plan Guidance.

Thereafter the development shall be operated in full accordance with the approved details.

REASON

To ensure appropriate servicing of the site, to safeguard highway safety and to safeguard the free flow of traffic, in accordance with Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policy T7 of the London Plan (2021).

24. NONSC Fire Strategy

Prior to the first occupation of the development, the final comprehensive Fire Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should be accompanied by the Building Control Decision Notice or equivalent.

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

REASON

To ensure the safety of all building users in accordance with Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021).

25. NONSC Secured by Design

The building(s) shall achieve 'Secured by Design' accreditation awarded by the Hillingdon Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Adviser (CPDA) on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). No building shall be occupied until accreditation has been achieved.

REASON

In pursuance of the Council's duty under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to consider crime and disorder implications in excising its planning functions; to promote the well being of the area in pursuance of the Council's powers under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 to ensure the development provides a safe and secure environment in accordance with Policy DMHB 15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policy D11 of the London Plan (2021).

26. NONSC Low Emission Strategy

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a Low Emission Strategy (LES) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LES shall detail but be not restricted to:

1) a clear and effective strategy to encourage users of development to:-

- a) use public transport;
- b) cycle / walk to work where practicable;
- c) enter car share schemes;
- d) purchase and drive to work zero emission vehicles.

2) Install EV fast charging points to promote the use of zero emission vehicles to serve the residential area.

The measures in the agreed scheme shall be maintained throughout the life of the development.

REASON

As the application site is within an Air Quality Management Area and within close proximity to the Uxbridge Road Air Quality Focus Area, and to reduce the impact on air quality in accordance with Policy EM8 of the Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policy DME1 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policies SI 1 and T4 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraphs 180(e) and 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

27. NONSC Circular Economy Monitoring Report

Prior to first occupation of the development, a post-construction monitoring report should be completed in line with the Greater London Authority's (GLA) Circular Economy Statement Guidance.

The post-construction monitoring report shall be submitted to the GLA, currently via email at: circulareconomystatements@london.gov.uk, along with any supporting evidence as per the guidance.

Confirmation of submission to the GLA shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, prior to first occupation of the development.

REASON

In the interests of sustainable waste management and in order to maximise the re-use of materials, in accordance with Policy SI 7 of the London Plan (2021).

28. NONSC Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment

Prior to the first occupation of the development the post-construction tab of the Greater London Authority's (GLA) Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment template should be completed in line with the GLA's Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment Guidance.

The post-construction assessment should be submitted to the GLA at: ZeroCarbonPlanning@london.gov.uk, along with any supporting evidence as per the guidance.

Confirmation of submission to the GLA shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, prior to first occupation of the development.

REASON

In the interests of sustainable development and to maximise on-site carbon dioxide savings, in accordance with Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021).

29. COM10 Tree to be retained

Trees, hedges and shrubs shown to be retained on the approved plans shall not be damaged, uprooted, felled, lopped or topped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. If any retained tree, hedge or shrub is removed or severely damaged during construction, or is found to be seriously diseased or dying another tree, hedge or shrub shall be planted at the same place or, if planting in the same place would leave the new tree, hedge or shrub susceptible to disease, then the planting should be in a position to be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and shall be of a size and species to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be planted in the first planting season following the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the earlier. Where damage is less severe, a schedule of remedial works necessary to ameliorate the effect of damage by tree surgery, feeding or groundwork shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. New planting should comply with BS 3936 (1992) 'Nursery Stock, Part 1, Specification for Trees and Shrubs' Remedial work should be carried out to BS BS 3998:2010 'Tree work - Recommendations' and BS 4428 (1989) 'Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (Excluding Hard Surfaces)'. The agreed work shall be completed in the first planting season following the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the earlier.

REASON

To ensure that the trees and other vegetation continue to make a valuable contribution to the amenity of the area in accordance with Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and to comply with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

30. NONSC Thames Water Condition

The development shall not be occupied until confirmation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that either: -

1. All surface water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or-
2. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

REASON

To ensure that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is provided in compliance with Policy SI 5 of the London Plan (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1. I52 **Compulsory Informative (1)**

The decision to GRANT 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. 170 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Granting)

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 Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.

3. 172 Section 106 Agreement

You are advised that this permission has been granted subject to a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4. 173 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Granting Consent)

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@hillingdon.gov.uk. The Council will then issue a 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.

5.

The Equality Act 2010 seeks to protect people accessing goods, facilities and services from discrimination on the basis of a 'protected characteristic', which includes those with a disability. As part of the Act, service providers are obliged to improve access to and within the structure of their building, particularly in situations where reasonable adjustment can be incorporated with relative ease. The Act states that service providers should think ahead to take steps to address barriers

that impede disabled people.

6. I15 Control of Environmental Nuisance from Construction Work

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.

I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to GRANT 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 (2021) and national guidance.

DMAV 1	Safe Operation of Airports
DMCI 3	Public Open Space Provision
DMCI 4	Open Spaces in New Development
DMCI 5	Childrens Play Area
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DME 2	Employment Uses Outside of Designated Sites
DME 3	Office Development
DMEI 1	Living Walls and Roofs and Onsite Vegetation
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 11	Protection of Ground Water Resources
DMEI 12	Development of Land Affected by Contamination
DMEI 14	Air Quality

DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMH 3	Office Conversions
DMH 7	Provision of Affordable Housing
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 15	Planning for Safer Places
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHB 19	Play Space
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 7	Archaeological Priority Areas and archaeological Priority Zones
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D1	(2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth
LPP D11	(2021) Safety, security and resilience to emergency
LPP D12	(2021) Fire safety
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 D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP DF1	(2021) Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations
LPP E1	(2021) Offices
LPP G1	(2021) Green infrastructure
LPP G2	(2021) London's Green Belt
LPP G4	(2021) Open space
LPP G5	(2021) Urban greening
LPP G6	(2021) Biodiversity and access to nature

LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP GG1	(2021) Building strong and inclusive communities
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP H4	(2021) Delivering affordable housing
LPP H5	(2021) Threshold approach to applications
LPP H6	(2021) Affordable housing tenure
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP M1	(2021) Monitoring
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 SI4	(2021) Managing heat risk
LPP SI5	(2021) Water infrastructure
LPP SI6	(2021) Digital connectivity infrastructure
LPP SI7	(2021) Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
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 T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP T7	(2021) Deliveries, servicing and construction
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF13	NPPF 2021 - Protecting Green Belt Land
NPPF14	NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding
NPPF15	NPPF 2021 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF4	NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF8	NPPF 2021 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The site forms part of the Hayes Park business park, a landscaped parkland setting, measuring approximately 5.22 hectares in size. The site comprises three office buildings including Hayes Park North, Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South. Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South form the focus of this application and are both Grade II* Listed buildings, purpose built back in 1965 as corporate and research laboratories for HJ Heinz UK by American Architect Gordon Bunshaft. Hayes Park Central has been unoccupied since September 2020 and Hayes Park South has been unoccupied since Summer 2017.

Each building is three storeys in height (including a basement and two storeys) and is served by external car parking and a sunken 2 level car park. The site has access to a total of 576 car parking spaces, 23 disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking.

The site lies within designated Green Belt and the Hillingdon Air Quality Management Area. The wider site forms part of the Hayes Shrub Site of Borough Grade II or Local Importance. The Uxbridge Road Air Quality Focus Area is also located circa 350m to the South. Based on TfL's WebCAT planning tool, the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 0 (zero) to 1b (poor).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This Full Planning application seeks planning permission for a proposed change of use of the Grade II* Listed Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South office buildings (Use Class E) to 124 residential flats (Use Class C3). The development is proposed with 10% shared ownership affordable housing provision, and would have access to 124 car parking spaces and 207 cycle stands. Internal and external works to the buildings are proposed, alongside landscaping works to create a communal square, play space and amenity space.

This application has been submitted alongside planning application reference 12853/APP/2023/1493 which seeks Listed Building Consent for internal and external works to Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park Central required in order to facilitate the proposed change of use from offices to residential.

The 124 residential flats proposed are proposed in the following unit mix:

- 25 no. studio units (20%)
- 40 no. 1-bed units (32%)
- 41 no. 2-bed unit (33%)
- 17 no. 3-bed unit (14%)
- 1 no. 4-bed unit (1%)

Following discussions with the Applicant Team regarding the viability of the scheme, a 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer has been made as part of the proposals. This would be equal to

32 habitable rooms.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

12853/APP/2020/2980 Hayes Park Hayes End Road Hayes

Internal office refurbishment of Hayes Park Central and South including removal of the non-original partitions, re-instatement of the South Building's reflecting pool and refurbished entrances. External elevation and roof refurbishment of both buildings including cleaning and repair works, replacement of non-original glazed double doors and other works to the South building's glazed curtain wall system (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Decision: 04-02-2021 Approved

12853/APP/2020/2981 Hayes Park Hayes End Road Hayes

Erection and installation of external cycle storage, trim trail and outdoor seating

Decision: 03-12-2020 Approved

12853/APP/2021/2202 Hayes Park North, Hayes Park Hayes End Road Hayes

Change of use of offices (Use Class E(g)) to residential use (Use Class C3) to include 64 residential units comprising 6 x studio units, 33 x one-bedroom units, 19 x two-bedroom units and 6 x three-bedroom units (Application for Prior Approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015).

Decision: 26-07-2021 Refused **Appeal:** 23-06-2022 Allowed

Comment on Relevant Planning History

HAYES PARK CENTRAL AND SOUTH

Application reference 12853/APP/2020/2980 granted Listed Building Consent for internal office refurbishment of Hayes Park Central and South including removal of the non-original partitions, re-instatement of the South Building's reflecting pool and refurbished entrances. External elevation and roof refurbishment of both buildings including cleaning and repair works, replacement of non-original glazed double doors and other works to the South building's glazed curtain wall system. It is understood that these works were not implemented.

HAYES PARK NORTH

Planning application reference 12853/APP/2021/2202 sought Prior Approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 for the change of use of Hayes Park North, an office building (Use Class E(g)) to residential use (Use Class C3) to include 64 residential units comprising 6 x studio units, 33 x one-bedroom units, 19 x two-bedroom units and 6 x three-bedroom units. The application was refused on 26th July 2021 for the following reasons:

1) The proposed development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O.1(f) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) because the Hayes Park North building is within the curtilage of a listed building, namely Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South.

2) The applicant has failed to secure financial and non financial contributions required to mitigate the highways impacts created by the proposed development. The scheme therefore conflicts with Policies DMCI 7, DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020), the adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (July 2014), Policy DF1 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 55-58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Prior approval is refused under Condition AA.2.-(1)(a).

The application was subsequently appealed on 30th July 2021 and allowed on 23rd June 2022. The implementation of this permission establishes a lawful residential element to the Hayes Park site and is a material planning consideration for the current application.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

Development Plan

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 West London Waste Plan (2015)
- The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

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.HE1 (2012) Heritage

PT1.H2	(2012) Affordable Housing
PT1.E7	(2012) Raising Skills
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
PT1.H1	(2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMH 7	Provision of Affordable Housing
DMAV 1	Safe Operation of Airports
DMCI 3	Public Open Space Provision
DMCI 4	Open Spaces in New Development
DMCI 5	Childrens Play Area
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DME 2	Employment Uses Outside of Designated Sites
DME 3	Office Development
DMEI 1	Living Walls and Roofs and Onsite Vegetation
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 11	Protection of Ground Water Resources
DMEI 12	Development of Land Affected by Contamination

DMEI 14	Air Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMH 3	Office Conversions
DMHB 15	Planning for Safer Places
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHB 19	Play Space
DMHB 7	Archaeological Priority Areas and archaeological Priority Zones
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D1	(2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth
LPP D11	(2021) Safety, security and resilience to emergency
LPP D12	(2021) Fire safety
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 D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm

LPP DF1	(2021) Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations
LPP E1	(2021) Offices
LPP G1	(2021) Green infrastructure
LPP G2	(2021) London's Green Belt
LPP G4	(2021) Open space
LPP G5	(2021) Urban greening
LPP G6	(2021) Biodiversity and access to nature
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP GG1	(2021) Building strong and inclusive communities
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP M1	(2021) Monitoring
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 SI4	(2021) Managing heat risk
LPP SI5	(2021) Water infrastructure
LPP SI6	(2021) Digital connectivity infrastructure
LPP SI7	(2021) Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
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 T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP T7	(2021) Deliveries, servicing and construction
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF14	NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding
NPPF15	NPPF 2021 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF8	NPPF 2021 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport
LPP H4	(2021) Delivering affordable housing
LPP H5	(2021) Threshold approach to applications
LPP H6	(2021) Affordable housing tenure
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF4	NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF13	NPPF 2021 - Protecting Green Belt Land
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: **26th July 2023**

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: **26th July 2023**

6. Consultations

External Consultees

A total of 267 no. letters were sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice was displayed to the front of the site and an advert was posted in the local paper. All forms of consultation expired on 26th July 2023.

A total of 8 comments have been received from neighbouring residential properties, including 6

objections and 2 comments. All comments are summarised below:

- Increase local traffic, including traffic at the junction between Hayes End Road and Uxbridge Road.
- The proposal has insufficient car parking, which will lead to overspill of parking onto local streets.
- The historic building should not be repurposed.
- There is no need for anymore residential development.
- The proposal will impact on local services.
- The proposal will destroy the landscape.
- Too many properties are proposed.
- The development will increase air quality and noise pollution.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

All material planning considerations are addressed within the main body of the report. Specifically, the principle of residential development is considered in Section 07.01, heritage impacts are considered in Section 07.03, traffic impacts are considered in Section 07.10, the impact on landscaping is considered in Section 07.14 and the impact on noise and air quality is considered in Section 07.18.

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY:

Plan policies on Green Belt, Office, Heritage, Urban Design and Housing are relevant to this application. Whilst the proposal is supported in principle, the application does not fully comply with these policies, as summarised below:

- Land use principles: The redevelopment of these Grade II* listed buildings within the Green Belt to provide 124 new homes is supported in principle subject to the resolution of the other issues raised in this report.
- Housing: The applicant is currently proposing 0% affordable housing. GLA officers are currently scrutinising the submitted viability assessment with a view to increasing the provision of affordable housing.
- Heritage: Although less than substantial harm at a low level is caused to the two listed buildings, this is considered to be clearly capable of being outweighed by the public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use of the buildings.
- Urban Design: The general design of the proposed development is supported but further work is required to ensure connectivity between the proposed development and existing communities off-site.
- Sustainable development and the environment: additional information and clarification is required regarding air quality, flood risk before compliance with the London plan can be confirmed.
- Other issues on Transport also require resolution prior to the Mayor's decision making stage.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENTS:

The Greater London Authority's comments are noted and all material planning considerations are addressed within the main body of the report.

Specifically, the design of the proposals are considered within the main body of the report. The connectivity of the site to neighbouring residential estates is considered to be sufficient and acceptable in

the context of the development proposals, this being two Grade II* Listed Buildings within the Green Belt.

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY VIABILITY COMMENTS:

The fact that the applicant is proposing no affordable housing contribution will need to be considered in the overall planning balance and the weight given to viability is a matter for the LPA to decide (PPG para 8).

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

Following negotiation with the Applicant Team, a 'without prejudice' offer of 10% shared ownership is proposed to be secured as part of the development. This is discussed within the main body of the report.

TRANSPORT FOR LONDON:

Site Description

The development site is located within the Metropolitan Greenbelt adjacent to an area designated as a Nature Conservation Site of Borough Grade II or Local Importance. It is mostly surrounded by residential neighbourhoods as well as 30 acres of parkland setting. The closest section of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is the A312 The Parkway, approximately 2.3km to the southeast.

There is no rail station within reasonable walking distance of the site, with the closest station (Hayes and Harlington Underground Station) being approximately 3.8km to the south of the site. The closest bus stop (Uxbridge Road 3121) is located approximately 570m to the south of the site and is served by the route 278, 427, 607, 697, 698, H98, N207 Buses. As such, the site records a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 0/1b, on a scale which ranges between 0 and 6b, where 6b is highest. There is a footway provided from Mead House Lane into the subject site on one side of the road.

Access

The access arrangements indicated on plan entails the retention of the existing vehicular access points. This does not raise any specific concerns; the swept path analysis provided demonstrates that the existing vehicular access points are suitable for the largest vehicles that will access and leave the site in forward gear. Separate pedestrian access from the car parking areas to the buildings are provided without the need to cross the carriageway.

Healthy Streets

A Healthy Streets Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment has been included within the submitted Transport Assessment (TA). A map that details the assessed routes should be provided for clarity. The ATZ has identified areas for improvements to the Healthy Street indicators on all routes, including localized footway widening and resurfacing. A contribution towards delivering such improvements would be supported.

Whilst it is appreciated that the site is within a greenbelt location and public transport access is limited, in order to decrease vehicle mode share the development should capitalise on the opportunity to improve cycle connections to Hayes and Harlington station and Hayes Park. Appropriate contributions towards delivering improvements, informed by the ATZ assessment, to the access to public transport should be secured from this development, in line with Policy T2 and T4.

Access routes between all disabled parking and main entrances should be revised to be continuous and direct, and it should be ensured that all pedestrian routes within the site will be safe and attractive to use at all times.

Trip Generation and Highway Impact

A multi-modal trip generation has been provided within the Transport Assessment. The trip generation assessment has set out the existing office trip generation to provide net trips. Information was provided to set out where the car parking spaces have been retained/re-provided. It predicts a reduction in 613 daily car trips; however, the adjusted car trips are predicted to make up 53.1% of the mode share which sits significantly above the strategic mode share target of 25% vehicle trips set out in Policy T1 for outer London boroughs. The sites selected look broadly acceptable except for the Edge of Town Centre site which should be justified.

Detailed travel plan measures and enhancements to the active travel environment will be required to encourage modal shift and support a reduction in the number of vehicle trips to this site. These should be identified in the Travel Plan.

Based on the assessment provided to date, it has been identified that the proposed development will generate an overall increase in new trips (gross) as the existing office space has been vacant since 2017, the 613 less vehicle trips is based on previous use. However, given the proposed impacts no contribution/mitigation is currently requested.

Cycle Parking

The provision of 203 long-stay and 4 short stay is in line with the minimum quantum standards identified within Policy T5 of the London Plan. High quality cycle parking provision should be provided and designed with regard to London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS), which is referred to within Policy T5. Whilst there is some compliance with LCDS, such as the provision of 5% of spaces to accommodate larger cycles, other areas need further thought. It is unclear if the internal doorways are wide enough to afford access to accommodate larger cycles, this should be clarified. TfL supports membership to the Hillingdon Santander cycle hire scheme.

Car Parking

In line with Policy T6, car-lite development should be the starting point for all outer London developments. The proposed development seeks to retain 124 parking spaces. Whilst this quantum is in line with minimum standards, in light of Policy T6 and given the predicted high car-use mode share for the site which would not support achieving a strategic modal shift as outlined in Policy T1, a reduction in the quantum of car parking should occur. Given the low PTAL we note that access to car club spaces with electric charging and free/discounted membership could be appropriate to reduce the need for private car ownership. It is also noted that adjacent to the site, yet outside the site boundary there is a 506 space multi storey car park. It is imperative that future residents do not have access to this facility with detail on how this will be implemented required.

The quantum of disabled person parking provision at this site should be clarified, as different numbers within the submitted documentation has been provided (i.e. 13 spaces vs. 15 spaces). In line with London Plan Policy, at least three per cent of dwellings should be provided with access to a disabled person parking space from the outset, with a Parking Design and Management Plan detailing how a further 7 per cent of dwellings could be provided with access to a disabled person parking space should demand arise. TfL requests that any car parking spaces should be leased and not sold, and this should

be secured via a permit free agreement.

Travel planning

A Framework Travel Plan has been provided in support of the application. The Travel Plan targets should support achieving a strategic modal shift in line with Policy T1. It is considered that the targets contained within the Plan do not go far enough towards supporting a strategic modal shift and need to be revised. Additional measures to support these revised targets will need to be identified in an updated Travel Plan. The full Travel Plan should be secured, monitored, enforced, reviewed, and funded via planning obligation.

Deliveries, Servicing and Construction

Delivery and servicing will take place onsite in accordance with Policy T7. Some measures to consolidate deliveries have been identified, however further measures to provide opportunities to decarbonize freight should be identified. A management procedure for cycle deliveries should be identified. A full DSP should be secured by condition in accordance with Policy T7.

Some measures to improve safety and reduce unnecessary trip movements have been provided to reduce impacts such as FORS Gold membership and CLOCS. In line with Policy T7, details of the proposed construction period should be provided and conditioned within a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) prepared in accordance with TfL guidance.

MCIL

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy 2(MCIL2) is payable at a rate of £60 per square metre for the London Borough of Hillingdon in accordance with the MCIL2 Charging Schedule (January 2019).

Conclusion

To summarise:

- A contribution towards Healthy Streets enhancements should be secured from this development.
- Clarification on the car parking building access should be provided;
- Clarification on disabled parking provision should be provided;
- Revisions to the cycle parking provision at this site is required. These amendments should be carried out prior to the determination of this application; and
- A CMP, Parking Design and Management Plan, Travel Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan should be secured through the appropriate mechanism.

I trust that the above provides an overview of TfL's comments on the proposed development. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss the above further.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENTS:

The issues raised by Transport for London are addressed within the main body of the report. Planning conditions and obligations are proposed to resolve the matters raised.

HISTORIC ENGLAND:

Summary

Historic England has no in-principle issues with the proposed conversion of these important modernist office buildings to residential use and welcomes the well-researched design approach which seeks opportunities to enhance significance. However, the introduction of external balustrades and changes to the glazing have the potential to disrupt the sleek modern aesthetic of the buildings and their sculptural form. We understand from the submitted information that your Council has inspected some samples of materials relating to these elements of the scheme. However, we would also welcome the opportunity to inspect mock-up samples of both the new glazing and balustrade, or at least review evidence of your Council's inspections, to ensure that a high-quality and visually sensitive solution would be delivered. This inspection could be subject to condition should you be minded to approve these applications.

Historic England Advice

Significance

The development site is located within Hayes Park which forms a large area of Green Belt land. The site contains two rectangular commercial office buildings designed by the American architect Gordon Bunshaft and built between 1962 and 1965. Bunshaft, a partner at Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (SOM), was America's leading proponent of mid-20th century office architecture, and designed many highly regarded modernist commercial buildings. The Hayes Park offices are rare examples of Bunshaft's work outside America - one of only two schemes by him in Western Europe, and his only project in England.

The two office buildings - Hayes Park Central (former research laboratories) and Hayes Park South (administrative headquarters) were built for Heinz UK, the American food processing company, within the grounds of a demolished Victorian house on the outskirts of London. The greenfield location for Heinz UK's headquarters reflects the changing attitudes in the post-war era for large companies to relocate their headquarters away from cities where land was cheaper, sites could be easily accessed due to increased car ownership, and all business activities could be integrated within a single complex. Spurred on by the 'Garden factory' movement in American and Britain, and the principles of modernism, the mature parkland setting for the offices was also intended to promote the physical and mental wellbeing of the workforce. As noted in the list entry, the Heinz site is the most important early example in Britain of this type of headquarters complex on a greenfield site.

Both buildings are low-rise, in part due to their sunken positioning within the landscape with curved retaining walls. The list description explains that this was due to Metropolitan Green Belt policies which were introduced in London after WWII. Nonetheless, the overall effect adds to the drama and sculptural qualities of the office complex, set within a mature landscape setting.

Architecturally, both buildings are highly significant for their sophisticated sculptural form, comprising an elegant three-storey grid frame constructed in pre-cast concrete with a granite aggregate finish. Set behind the frame is full-height aluminium-framed glazing with blue opaque glass. The recessed glazing and its reflective qualities allow the concrete framework of floor slabs and columns to appear almost as an entirely independent structure, and this effect is particularly dramatic at the building corners where clear sky can be seen through the frame.

Hayes Park South has a more interesting plan form due to its central courtyard which provided natural light into the canteen at ground floor level. The original plans for the South Building indicate that cellular offices were fitted around the entire outer perimeter of the upper floors, meaning that the open office plan above depended on natural light from the courtyard. The courtyard originally featured a 'reflecting pool' at its centre with an island containing a magnolia tree. Although these structures survive, the pool has been filled with pebbles, and the courtyard surfacing has been replaced. Despite these changes, the courtyard with its perimeter colonnade remains a striking feature which can still be appreciated in long views from

within the office space.

Heinz sold the site in the 1990s, and various changes to the landscaping and listed buildings were subsequently undertaken. This involved cut outs to the retaining earth wall, and the introduction of vehicle routes including an unsightly roundabout providing access to a new office building immediately to the north of the development site. The interiors were also extensively altered, and beyond the structural columns (many of which have been boxed in), the fixtures and finishes are not of special interest, and this is specifically mentioned in the list entry. However, as discovered during our pre-application site visit, depictions of the Heinz brand which appear to be original survive beneath the modern floor coverings in ground floor of Hayes Park South. This is an interesting surviving visual reference to the globally recognised brand for which the listed complex was constructed.

In summary, the Hayes Park buildings are of special architectural and historic interest for their distinctive and unique character and greenfield setting, designed by a leading proponent of modernist office architecture for a world-famous American-owned multinational. For these reasons, the building complex is highly listed at Grade II*.

The proposals and their impact

These proposals seek to convert both buildings to residential use with associated changes to the landscaping. The work would involve significant reconfiguration of the interior to accommodate multiple residential units. Within Hayes Park Central, it is proposed to introduce a central atrium roughly within the footprint of the service core to improve communal circulation and resolve challenges facing residential conversion caused by the deep floor plate. Whilst a significant intervention, the atrium would have limited impact on the significance of the listed building due to the non-original plan form and lack of internal features of interest.

Due to the existing central courtyard at Hayes Park South, the conversion of that building would be contained within the existing envelope and staircases would be reintroduced broadly within their original locations. No additional floors of accommodation are proposed for either building, which we understand to be related to limitations of development within the Green Belt. Therefore, beyond the introduction of an atrium to Hayes Park Central, no substantial structural interventions would be proposed to the listed complex.

Although large dual-aspect flats are proposed to the upper floors of both buildings, the extensive subdivision into multiple units would result in almost total loss of the open plan interior. The existing layout currently provides dramatic internal views of the large floorspace, structural columns and curtain wall system at the upper levels of both buildings. However, we recognise that the current open plan arrangement is not historic, and cellular offices were originally arranged around the entire perimeter of the upper two floors of Hayes Park South. Hayes Park Central was also heavily subdivided originally. Nonetheless, this loss of appreciation of the structural anatomy of the buildings and the open-plan configuration, which still clearly reads as offices, would cause a low level of harm to the significance of listed buildings.

The proposals for the ground floor of Hayes Park South are more successful in retaining a sense of openness. Here, an east-west link through the centre of the floorplan would be introduced which would provide physical and visual access through the central courtyard as originally conceived. We note that the size of this floorspace has increased in response to our pre-application comments. The restoration of the courtyard pool and island as proposed offers enhancement to architectural interest of the listed building in this former communal part of the complex. Further enhancement is proposed through the revealing of the boxed-in structural columns in these non-residential parts of the building (and within the

residential areas where this is practicable).

As part of the residential conversion, it is proposed to create private balcony space within the external floor slabs of each building. This would involve the introduction of balustrades which would be constructed of metal uprights and light-weight tensile wiring. The balustrades would run the perimeter of both buildings at first and second floor level, but would exclude the corners to lessen their visual impact in important views of the concrete frame. The same balustrade treatment would be required for the inner courtyard of Hayes Park South.

The scheme also proposes to replace the existing glazing to improve the performance of the buildings and to incorporate access to the balconies. As previously set out, the glazing is a key design component of the office complex, and the list description specifically mentions their slender glazed frames and opaque blue glass. Since our pre-application involvement, further investigations into the existing glazing have been undertaken by the Applicant Team including a condition survey prepared by Hutton+Rostron. The investigations have concluded that "the glass has historically been replaced" (Heritage Impact Assessment, Icení, para 5.3.7), and that the window units generally demonstrate a "lack of compliance" with building regulations for residential use (Design and Access Statement, p34).

The visualisations in Section 11 of the submitted Design and Access Statement (Studio Egret West, May 2023) suggest that the new glazing would be very similar in appearance to the existing, and that the balustrading would be visually discrete. While this is encouraging, in the absence of samples, there remain risks that the balustrading could be visually distracting, and that the replacement glazing could similarly be unsympathetic to the historic curtain wall system. There is also a risk that the balcony areas could become cluttered with chairs and other domestic paraphernalia, which would add to the visual distraction.

Whilst we note that various samples of materials were presented on site to your Council's Heritage Officer (Design and Access Statement, p51), it does not appear that these were 'mocked-up' for external inspection. Therefore, there remain risks that some harm to the significance of both buildings could result from the new balustrading and replacement glazing.

The proposals also include proposals for the landscaping. Within the immediate setting of the buildings, some of the earth bank is to be cut out to improve the daylight and amenity to the ground floor residential units. It is also proposed to provide additional hardstanding for building spill out. These changes risk causing a small degree of harm to the appreciation of the offices sunken within their greenfield setting. A notable enhancement to the landscaping would be the removal of the unsightly roundabout to the north of Hayes Park Central, and the creation of a new square. We understand that parking would continue to be provided to the west of the buildings behind a boundary wall.

Policy

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes a statutory duty for local planning authorities to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings including any contribution made by their setting. We draw your attention to the following heritage policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which support the legislation above:

- Paragraph 200, which states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification;
- Paragraph 202 which states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Public benefits can include heritage

benefits as set out under Paragraph 020 of the Historic Environment section of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG, updated 24 June 2021) which supports the NPPF.

- Paragraph 206 which states that local planning authorities should look for opportunity for new developments within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance.

Position

As set out above, the Central and South buildings at Hayes Park are important and rare examples of Bunshaft's work as a leading proponent of mid-century commercial office architecture. However, we have no in-principle issue with the proposed conversion from office to residential use in order to provide the site with a sustainable long-term use, providing the key elements of significance are preserved.

The submitted documents indicate that virtually no internal features of interest survive beyond the structural columns which would be retained. The proposed atrium to Hayes Park Central and other service cores required for residential conversion would not, in our view, undermine the integrity of the listed structures. Given the precedent for cellular partitioning as set out in the original plans, we do not wish to raise any significant concerns about the subdivision into multiple units.

We are pleased that the proposed plans would retain a sense of openness within the entrance lobby to the South building, which we note has been increased in size in response to our pre-application comments (although we note that the lobby floorspace would still be smaller than the original canteen). We are also pleased that it is intended to incorporate the (likely) original remnants of the Heinz branding in the floor treatments (Design and Access Statement p51) in response to our pre-application comments, which would enhance our understanding of the connection between these buildings and this global brand.

The most sensitive aspects of these proposals are the changes that are perceived externally, particularly the replacement glazing and conversion of the outer floor slab areas to private balconies. It is clear that much thought has already gone into design solutions for the glazing and balustrades to minimise their impact on Bunshaft's highly significant concrete frame and inset curtain wall. This is evident in the slender form of the balustrade, the omission of balustrading around the corners of the buildings, and the retention of the glazing module for the proposed windows. However, it is inevitable that these interventions, and domestic clutter associated with residential conversion, would lead to some visual intrusion in important views of the listed buildings.

These changes and additions would diminish the orderly modernist character and carefully considered proportions of the listed building complex and its harmonious greenfield surroundings, therefore causing some harm. It is likely that the proposed cutaways to the earth banks around Hayes Park Central and introduction of amenity space for the ground floor units would similarly diminish the appreciation of the building within its important greenfield setting, causing a small degree of harm.

The NPPF states that any harm should be clearly and convincingly justified (Para 200) and weighed against the public benefits of a proposal by decision makers (Para 202). The PPG explains that public benefits can include heritage benefits. We consider that these can include:

- the restoration of the original courtyard design to Hayes Park South, including the revealing of the reflecting pool and island;
- the removal of unsympathetic accretions to the interior, and the revealing of the distinctive structural columns throughout;
- the enhancements to the external landscaping particularly the replacement of the unsightly roundabout

with a new public square;

- the repair and cleaning of the concrete frame, the details of which should be provided by condition.

Ultimately, it will be for the Council to consider the harm identified within the context of these, and other public benefits of the scheme in coming to a decision on the applications. Although some samples of materials have been provided to your Council, we recommend that conditions are also imposed regarding the provision of mock ups of the balustrading and glazing systems for on-site inspection. We would be pleased to be involved in a future inspection should your Council be minded to approve the applications.

Recommendation

Historic England has no objection to the applications on heritage grounds, but raises some concerns due to the harm as set out.

In determining these applications you should bear in mind the statutory duty of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Your Authority should take these representations in account and determine the application in accordance with national and local planning policy and in consultation with your specialist conservation advice. We have drafted the necessary letter of authorisation for your Authority to determine the application as you see fit and have referred this to the National Planning Casework Unit (NPCU). You will be able to issue a formal decision once the NPCU have returned the letter of authorisation to you, unless the Secretary of State directs the application to be referred to them.

This response relates to designated heritage assets only. If the proposals meet the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service's published consultation criteria we recommend that you seek their view as specialist archaeological adviser to the local planning authority.

NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES:

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

HEATHROW AIRPORT SAFEGUARDING:

We have now assessed the above application against safeguarding criteria and can confirm that we have no safeguarding objections to the proposed development.

However, we would like to draw your attention to the following:

Cranes

Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would, therefore, draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4, 'Cranes and Other Construction Issues' (available at <http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations->

safety/

All crane applications should be sent to Heathrow's Works Approval Team via the following address:

Airside_Works_Approvals@heathrow.com

Wind Turbines

Wind Turbines can impact on the safe operation of aircraft through interference with aviation radar and/or due to their height. Any proposal that incorporates wind turbines must be assessed in more detail to determine the potential impacts on aviation interests. This is explained further in Advice Note 5, 'Renewable Energy & Impact on Aviation' (available at <http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/>)

GREATER LONDON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ADVISORY SERVICE:

The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) gives advice on archaeology and planning. Our advice follows the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the GLAAS Charter.

NPPF section 16 and the London Plan (2021 Policy HC1) make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration.

Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, I conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.

The planning application is not in an Archaeological Priority Area.

The application affects a grade II* listed building and its associated historic designed landscape recorded on the GLHER. Hayes Park is the former landscaped park of a 19th Century mansion. From 1849-98 it was a private lunatic asylum, and from 1898 house and grounds were sold for a psychiatric nursing home. In 1959 H.J. Heinz & Co purchased the estate and 2 adjacent parcels of land, demolishing the mansion in 1962., which was replaced by offices and a research centre. Although not of archaeological interest, the GLHER does identify historical interest relevant to the setting of the listed building.

No further archaeological assessment or conditions are therefore necessary.

THAMES WATER:

Waste Comments

Following initial investigations, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing SURFACE WATER network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. Thames Water has contacted the developer in an attempt to agree a position for foul water networks but has been unable to do so in the time available and as such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission:

"The development shall not be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:

- 1. All surface water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or

- 2. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Authority in consultation with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and

infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan." Reason - Network reinforcement works are likely to be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid sewage flooding and/or potential pollution incidents. The developer can request information to support the discharge of this condition by visiting the Thames Water website at thameswater.co.uk/preplanning. Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Planning Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the planning application approval.

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to FOUL WATER sewerage network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

Water Comments

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

Supplementary Comments

With regard to Surface Water, we would expect the developer to demonstrate that they have exhausted the roof and landscape opportunities, regarding maximising SuDS to reduce surface water flows from the site and help future proof the development. If possible, prioritise green SuDS such as tree pits and green roofs that are more effective in low-return period storms, as opposed to attenuation tanks.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS:

Referring to the consultation on a planning application dated 22 June 2023 referenced above, in the vicinity of the M4 and M40 that form part of the Strategic Road Network, notice is hereby given that National Highways' formal recommendation is that we:

Offer No Objection - Reasons

We note that residential (Use Class C3) use of this site as compared to its current designation of office buildings (Use Class E) along with proposals to seek sustainable modes of travel will generate less trips on the SRN and due to the distance of this proposal from our network, we are satisfied that the development will not materially affect the safety, reliability and/or operation of the strategic road network (the tests set out in DfT Circular 01/2022, and MHCLG NPPF 2021 paragraphs 110-113) in this location and its vicinity.

Standing advice to the local planning authority

The Climate Change Committee's 2022 Report to Parliament notes that for the UK to achieve net zero carbon status by 2050, action is needed to support a modal shift away from car travel. The NPPF supports this position, with paragraphs 73 and 105 prescribing that significant development should offer a genuine choice of transport modes, while paragraphs 104 and 110 advise that appropriate opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport should be taken up.

Moreover, the build clever and build efficiently criteria as set out in clause 6.1.4 of PAS2080 promote the use of low carbon materials and products, innovative design solutions and construction methods to minimise resource consumption.

These considerations should be weighed alongside any relevant Local Plan policies to ensure that planning decisions are in line with the necessary transition to net zero carbon.

METROPOLITAN POLICE:

Upon review of the proposal the I have the following comments:

- The site will be assessed against the 2023 SBD Homes guide, however we reserve the right to assess against the latest guidance if appropriate and proportionate. The additional points are unique to the site or I wished to raise to bring to your attention.
- The building is Grade II listed and this proposal sees the site changing from an vacant office block into a residential block. If the site is to progress any issues arising from the listing that impact upon security will need to be discussed and approved by a DOCO.
- The building is situated within green belt land with surrounding green space that is not planned to be built upon, as such leaving the site somewhat isolated and cut off from the rest of the community. There are two entrance points, which during the buildings time as an office were staffed by security personnel. Owing to the isolated nature of the site it must be secured, as it will not have the security personnel that it used to have. In order to do this both entrance need to be gated (LPS 1175/Issue 7 SR1 or LPS 1175/Issue 8 A1 gate) and the perimeter needs to be a minimum of 2.1m high, appropriately robust with no climbing aids. However if planting can be used (e.g dense established bramble bushes etc) then this will be accepted, providing it is fit for the purpose of security and appropriately mature at the time of site completion. The gate will need to work with an access control system, and allow for visitors to be permitted access from the homes of the residents.
- Security rated doors (one of PAS 24/2022, LPS 1175/Issue 7 SR2, LPS 2081 SRB, LPS 1175/Issue 8 B3 or STS 202 BR2 standards required for:
 - Communal entrance doors
 - Secondary doors that provide the secure lobby off of the main entrance.
 - All accessible private doors and openable windows (usually ground and first)
 - All private residents front doors
 - Bike stores
 - Bin stores
 - Of note owing to the unusual arrangement on main entrance to one block with the original (listed) feature of a rotating door being retained and curved doors either side of it being designed in, the proposed doors that are RC2 standard will be accepted, provided that no doors of the above standards are available that meet the unusual criteria that would comply with the requirements of the listing. Please note that the acceptance of RC standards is not usually allowed, but only will be considered in this owing to the unusual design.

- The usually mandatory requirement of security compartmentation of blocks serving over 25 units cannot be achieved on either of these blocks in a logical or practical way, owing to the design which is created by the listed buildings. As such in lieu of this the required for the site is for CCTV coverage covering the entrance areas (including post areas) with a system that can be suitably zoomed in image of the entrance door that an image is obtained that is suitable for identification purposes. Furthermore in the communal areas further up the building 13 amp fuse spur points need to be installed in locations that would allow for CCTV coverage in these areas if issues were to arise.

- Any communal gardens with private windows or doors off of them require a minimum of 1.5m defensible space that is clearly demarked as private to them.

- The lighting strategy for the site - the SBD guide states the following for parking areas, for this site it will not be complied with for parking and footpath areas;

- Lighting must be at the levels recommended by BS 5489-1:2020. The DOCO shall be provided with a declaration of conformity to BS 5489-1:2020 by a 'competent' designer. Competency shall be demonstrated by achievement to at least ILP competency level 3 or 4, i.e. the designer will be a member of the ILP (MILP) and either IEng or CEng qualified to be deemed competent to be able to design under Construction Design and Maintenance (CDM) Regulations. Further information is available at: www.securedbydesign.com

I met with the applicants on 21st July and reviewed the proposal, and I do not wish to object to the proposal. I have provided them with a report of requirements that the site would need to achieve for Secured By Design accreditation.

However I wish to bring to your attention the requirement for the site to have a secure perimeter - due to the isolated nature of the buildings it is essential that the site is secure with a 2.1 high perimeter fence with access control gates that only provide access to residents (of course security can be achieved with planting/brambles etc that would negate the need for a fence) if this were not to be included I would have serious concerns for the security of this site.

Every other security matter can be addressed directly by the Secured By Design scheme, as such I recommend a condition is attached to the site if permission is granted that Secured By Design accreditation is achieved (usual agreed wording that is used in the borough). This will ensure that the site has the minimum levels of security installed that are appropriate for what this site will face in this area.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE:

The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the Ministry of Defence (MOD) as a consultee in UK planning and energy consenting systems to ensure that development does not compromise or degrade the operation of defence sites such as aerodromes, explosives storage sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites or training resources such as the Military Low Flying System.

This full planning application is a proposal for the redevelopment of 2no existing office buildings (Hayes Park Central is four-storeys, Hayes Park South is three-storeys) to create 124no residential dwellings across the two buildings. The development does not propose any change to the height of the existing buildings (approximately 14.5m for Hayes Park Central and 13m for Hayes Park South) but the development will add PV solar panels to the flat roofs of each building.

The application site occupies the statutory safeguarding zones surrounding RAF Northolt. In particular, the height and birdstrike safeguarding zones surrounding the aerodrome, and it is approximately 2.08km

from the aerodrome boundary.

Aerodrome Height

The proposed development site occupies the statutory height safeguarding zone that ensures air traffic approaches, and the line of sight of navigational aids and transmitters/receivers are not impeded.

The MOD have reviewed the documents and has no aerodrome height safeguarding objections to the proposals.

However, the MOD recognises that cranes may be used during the construction of tall buildings at this site. These may affect the performance of the Precision Approach Radar (PAR) and air traffic safety. If the proposal at this site does progress, it will be necessary for the developer to liaise with the MOD at RAF Leeming prior to the erection of cranes or temporary tall structures.

The MOD would request that a condition be included in any planning permission granted to ensure that the MOD is notified of when and where cranes will be erected.

A suggested condition wording is provided below:

Submission of a Construction Management Strategy

Development shall not commence until a construction management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority covering the application site and any adjoining land which will be used during the construction period. Such a strategy shall include the details of cranes and other tall construction equipment (including the details of obstacle lighting). The approved strategy (or any variation approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be implemented for the duration of the construction period.

Reason:

To ensure that construction work and construction equipment on the site and adjoining land does not obstruct air traffic movements or otherwise impede the effective operation of air traffic navigation transmitter/receiver systems.

Birdstrike

Within this zone, the principal concern of the MOD is the creation of new habitats may attract and support populations of large and/or flocking birds close to an aerodrome.

After reviewing the plans and documentation provided in the application, given the location of the development relative to RAF Northolt, it is identified that the addition of PV panels on the roofs has the potential to form an attractant environment to those large and/or flocking bird species that may be hazardous to aviation safety.

The proposed external works include the addition of PV panels on the flat roof of each existing building. Addition of PV panels to the existing flat roofs will potentially increase the attraction for hazardous birds due to the increased shelter provided, allowing Feral Pigeons to nest in the support structure underneath the panels and large gulls to nest in the sheltered spaces between the panels. To address this issue MOD, require that a condition is applied to any consent issued requiring the submission, approval and implementation of a suitably detailed Bird Hazard Management Plan (BHMP) with zero tolerance of nesting large gulls and Feral Pigeons.

The BHMP should provide details of proposed roof proofing designed to exclude large and/or flocking birds such as Gull species, Feral Pigeons, Corvid species and starlings, along with inspection timescales (and logging procedures) to identify the presence of large and/or flocking birds, and provisions for access to the site for monitoring and/or dispersal of birds if and when required.

A suggested condition wording is provided below:

Bird Hazard Management Plan

No development shall take place until a Bird Hazard Management Plan (BHMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Ministry of Defence (MOD). The Bird Hazard Management Plan should contain, but not be limited to:

- a. An assessment of the various bird species found in the vicinity of the site, to include species data and numbers:
- b. Details of layout of the solar panels, and roof proofing measures designed to prevent access to, and successful breeding by, large gulls, Feral Pigeons and any other identified problematic species on the roof spaces and on, under or around the PV panels; and
- c. Schedule for inspection of the roof spaces by a suitably qualified individual (to include details of roof access), details of the methods used to disturb/disperse birds, and a method statement for recording the results of the disturbance/dispersal activity.

The development shall be carried out and managed strictly in accordance with the details agreed and there shall be no variation without the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with MOD.

Reason:

To limit the potential of the site to attract and support populations of those bird species that may cause detriment to aviation safety.

LONDON FIRE BRIGADE:

The London Fire Commissioner (the Commissioner) is the fire and rescue authority for London. The Commissioner is responsible for enforcing the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (The Order) in London.

The London Fire Brigade (LFB) has been consulted with regard to the above-mentioned premises and have the following observations to. It should be ensured that if any material amendments to this consultation is proposed, a further consultation will be required.

The Applicant is advised to ensure the plans conform to Part B of Approved Document of the Building Regulations and that the application is submitted to Building Control/Approved Inspector who in some circumstances may be obliged to consult the Fire Authority.

I also enclose Guidance note 29 on Fire Brigade Access similar to that in B5 of the Building Regulations, Particular attention should be made to paragraph 16, Water Mains and Hydrants, by the applicant.

If there are any deviations from the guidance in ADB) vol 1 and 2: B5 Access and facilities for the fire service in relation to water provisions, then this information needs to be provided to the Water Office (water@london-fire.gov.uk) to discuss the proposed provision.

If there are any deviations to Brigade access and facilities then this information needs to be provided to Fire Safety Regulation (FSR-AdminSupport@london-fire.gov.uk) to review the proposed provision. Once we have received this information then the LFB can provide a response on the consultation and advice in regards to hydrants upon receipt of an appropriate site plan showing premises layout, access to it, and water supply infrastructure if available.

Any queries regarding this letter should be addressed to FSR-AdminSupport@london-fire.gov.uk if you are dissatisfied in any way with the response given, please ask to speak to the Team Leader quoting our reference.

TWENTIETH CENTURY SOCIETY:

No comments were received.

HILLINGDON FRIENDS OF THE EARTH:

Hillingdon Friends of the Earth would like the Planning Committee to action these comments please, because as much as possible needs to be done to reduce the impact of new developments on climate change: Please require that the fabric goes above and beyond current Building Regulations so the dwellings are well insulated, highly efficient and zero carbon (passivhaus or equivalent) to avoid being retrofitted later. Include heat recovery ventilation to avoid damp issues owing to being highly insulated. Please require one shared/community highly efficient heating system for the building (heat pump, ground source if possible). Sustainable materials should be used for the construction and the whole life cycle of carbon should be taken into consideration and accordingly measures should be taken to reduce the carbon emissions from the whole cycle. Please require that electrical appliances which are fitted must be certified energy saving products and all lighting is LED. Ensure all suitable roof space has photovoltaic or solar thermal installed and that all rainwater is harvester for grey water use. Explore battery storage for the property. Ask Transport for London to review the nearby bus routes to ensure they have capacity. Create segregated cycle lanes from the development to the nearest Tube station large developments. Ensure the property is easily accessible to good walking routes and not just a car park Ensure plentiful cycle storage Limit parking spaces to the minimum for less able bodied people and ensure all parking spaces have electric vehicle charging points Ensure as many trees are planted in the landscaping as possible and that no plastic fake lawn is allowed. All external paved surfaces should be porous to allow drainage and reduce flooding. Ensure it is very easy to recycle (easier than to dispose of general waste) including adequate storage in communal areas, Kitchen designs to include separate bins, etc Ensure there is onsite composting Ensure fixtures and fittings are durable, so replacements are not needed frequently All paved areas to include space for vegetation Existing mature trees to be retained wherever possible and additional trees to be planted Provision for wildlife such as nesting boxes, bat boxes and wildlife tunnels.

Internal Consultees

PLANNING POLICY OFFICER (summary):

Loss of Employment Floor space

The proposal would result in the loss of 10,815sqm of office floor space (Use Class Eg (i)), which would be replaced with 124 residential units. However, the application site is not located within a preferred location for office development or designated town centre, these requirements of Policy DME 3 of the Local Plan: Part 2 do not apply.

However, Policy DME 2 of the Local Plan: Part 2 does apply which sets out that proposals which involve the loss of employment floorspace or land outside of designated employment areas will normally be permitted if:

- i) the existing use negatively impacts on local amenity, through disturbance to neighbours, visual intrusion or has an adverse impact on the character of the area; or
- ii) the site is unsuitable for employment reuse or development because of its size, shape, location, or unsuitability of access; or
- iii) Sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate there is no realistic prospect of land being reused for employment purposes; or
- iv) The new use will not adversely affect the functioning of any adjoining employment land; or
- v) The proposed use relates to a specific land use allocation or designation identified elsewhere in the plan.

Overall, as set out in the pre-application response from a land use perspective, we are accepting of the loss of employment floorspace due to site specific circumstances in this instance.

Green belt

The entire site is located within the Green Belt. The NPPF sets out certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. This includes the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.

The applicant has stated that only limited external works are proposed as a part of the application. Overall, given the existing use of the site it is considered that the change of use and the limited external works proposed would not have a greater impact upon the green belt it is therefore deemed that the proposal would comply with paragraph 150(d) of the NPPF in this instance.

Housing mix

Policy DMH 2 of the Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires the provision of a mix of housing units of different sizes in schemes of residential development to reflect the Council's latest information on housing need. Paragraph 4.6 outlines that there is a substantial borough-wide requirement for larger affordable and private market units, particularly three-bedroom properties. The London Plan defines family housing as "A dwelling that by virtue of its size, layout and design is suitable for a family to live in and generally has three, four, five, or more bedrooms."

The applicant has provided details with regards to the housing mix and set out the following:

- 65 no. 1 bed (52.5%)
- 41 no. 2 bed (33%)
- 17 no. 3 bed (13.7%)
- 1 no. 4 bed (0.8%)

The planning statement sets out in paragraph 2.25 "From the initial pre-app meetings, officers emphasised the importance and the need in the borough for family homes, and that the proposals should seek to deliver as close as possible to the policy 9 target of 20%. The Applicant fully recognises this and has sought to deliver a variety of new homes that would be suitable for families, both in terms of conventional 3-bedroom homes, and oversized 2-bedroom homes with ancillary spaces." Furthermore, the applicant has argued that given the number of larger two-bedroom units that the family housing

provision on the site is closer to 30%. However, as given the definition of family housing, it is considered that the proposal would only supply 14.5% of family units, which is also recognised by the applicant in paragraph 5.25 of the planning statement.

It should also be noted that 25 of the one-bedroom units are referenced as 1 bedroom 1 person units. In this regard paragraph 4.10.4 of the London Plan sets out that "one-person and one-bed units are the least flexible unit type", as such the inclusion of 20.2% of these types of units is not considered to be in line with the policy requirements. It should also be noted that some of the studios, includes double beds within the plans, which is considered to raise additional concerns with how these units should be defined. In addition to this, there is also an over-dominance of 1-bedroom units with the provision of 52.5% which would be contrary to Policy H2 of the London Plan, which requires a range of unit sizes and mixes to promote inclusive neighbours.

The applicant has argued that the proposal is in line with the current housing mix in the surrounding area, however this statement is not correct. Furthermore, this is not considered to be sufficient justification to not comply with the policies within the development plans. Further to this, the council's housing supply is considered on a borough wide basis, and as such is not considered to be an accurate representation of the overall housing need within the borough.

As a part of the proposal the applicant has submitted a housing mix report. Paragraph 1.20, 1.21 and 1.22 of the housing mix report for example makes reference to the design-led approach and capacity for sites in relation and that high density developments should generally be promoted in well-connected developments. The paragraphs also refer to PTAL ratings. In this regard, it should be noted that the application site has a PTAL rating of 1 and given this and the site context these arguments cannot be applied for this specific site in relation to the limited family housing provided.

It is recognised that some of the arguments are accepted there are also parts of the housing mix document which the council disagrees with, including the interpretation of policies within the development plans. As set out in the pre-application response generally in locations with a low PTAL rating, it is expected that the development should provide above 20% of family housing with schemes typically exceeding this. These sites are generally less constrained and any departure from the preferred housing mix will need to be justified, taking account of the requirements of Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

In this regard it is also recognised that there are some clear site constraints for the proposal, which includes Grade II* listed buildings and it is up to the applicant to clearly demonstrate why the proposal is unable to provide a policy compliant housing mix.

One of the key arguments made regarding the proposed housing mix, is that providing more three-bedroom units would jeopardise the proposal as a whole due to the proposal's financial viability and the overall estimated profit/losses linked to different unit sizes.

It is however up to the case officer to determine whether the proposed housing mix would on balance be acceptable when considering the proposal as a whole, including the site constraint presented by the listing and the financial viability of the proposal.

Affordable Housing

The Local Plan Part 2 policy DMH 7 and London Plan policy H5, sets out that subject to viability and if appropriate in all circumstances, a minimum of 35% of all new homes on sites of 10 or more units should be delivered as affordable housing, with the tenure split 70% Social/Affordable Rent and 30%

Intermediate as set out in Policy H2: Affordable Housing of the Local Plan Part 1. The applicant has submitted a viability assessment stating that they are unable to provide any affordable housing on the site and that they are unable to provide any contributions towards off-site affordable housing. It is therefore necessary that the viability assessment is tested by a third-party consultant.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

The issues noted by the Planning Policy Officer are considered in detail and weighed up within the main body of the report.

WASTE STRATEGY OFFICER:

Waste provisions and collection plan acceptable.

NOTE: Recycling containers are currently only available in size 1100L directly from Hillingdon Council. If 1280L recycling containers are required, these would need to be purchased privately and should be metal with a black body and lid. please contact recycling@hillingdon.gov.uk for details of our preferred supplier.

ACCESS OFFICER:

This proposal has been reviewed against the requirements of the 2021 London Plan policy D7 which should not be applied to the Change of Use from office buildings to provide 124 flats. Conclusion: no objections raised from an accessibility perspective.

NOISE SPECIALIST:

Sufficient information has been provided by the Applicant to make a recommendation with respect to noise and vibration. It is recommended that no objection is made on noise or vibration grounds subject to the inclusion of suitable condition which should be met based on the design information provided and considering measurement and prediction uncertainty. Hence:

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. This has regard to the guidance set out in 'Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings' British Standard Institution BS8233: 2014.'

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:

I have reviewed the following document, which was submitted in support of the Application:
Title: Phase 1 Environmental Report, Hayes Park, Hayes Road. Hayes Hillingdon UB48FE; Date: June 2023; Prepared by; Avison Young (UK) limited.

The report provides a preliminary risk assessment to indicate the site is considered to represent a low environmental risk based on findings from the abovementioned phase 1 study.

However, in terms of potential land contamination issues, and the proposed change of use to residential property, the LPA shall require the following observations to be considered in further detail, including but not limited to the provision of a phase 2 intrusive investigation and associate risk assessment, because:

- The site was previously identified to have a mantle of made ground materials present (approx. 2.5

metres thickness), which will require further investigation, because there is a possibility that unacceptable contamination may have been introduced and or ground gases may be present, from made ground materials introduced to the location during development of the site and earlier infilling of ponds.

- Earlier development of the existing building/s may have involved introduction of asbestos materials which shall require further investigation/testing.

- There is evidence of above ground and possibly underground diesel storage tanks at the site. These shall require further investigation works.

Therefore, notwithstanding the provision of acceptable details within the conclusions and recommendations (section 13 of the phase 1 report), I recommended the Local Planning Authority should impose the standard contamination condition to any award of planning permission for this application.

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

These highway comments refer to a proposal to change of use of the Grade II* Listed Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South office buildings (Use Class E) to 124 residential flats (Use Class C3) including 25no. x Studios, 40no. x one-bed, 41no. x two-bed, 17no. x three-bed and 1no. x four-bed homes. The proposal would provide 124no. car parking spaces of which 15no. disabled persons accessible.

The site is situated within the greenbelt and is remote from shops, services, facilities and transport opportunities. The nearest train station is Hayes and Harlington, located 2.5 miles to the south of the site. It is a 520m walk to the nearby bus stop. The site has 2no. vehicular points of vehicular access, from the east via Park Lane and from the west from Hayes End Road. In addition, pedestrians and cyclists would be able to access the site from Park Lane Road and Mead House Lane.

Transport for London use as system called PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) to measure access to the public transport network. PTAL assesses walk times to the nearest public transport location taking into account service frequency. The location is then scored between 0 and 6b where 0 is the worst and 6b the best. The site has a PTAL ranking of 0, the worst possible, suggesting that there would be a strong reliance on the private car for trip making.

The published London Plan 2021 Policy T6.1 Residential Parking requires that development proposals must comply with the relevant parking standards. For a change of use of the buildings from office (Use Class E) to 124no. new homes comprising 25no. x Studios, 40no. x one-bed, 41no. two-bed, 17no. x three-bed and 1no. x four-bed the London Plan would allow a maximum of 186no. car parking spaces. As mentioned above 15no. disabled persons car parking spaces would be provided, this is accordance with the London Plan and accepted. All of these car parking spaces should be allocated to a specific unit, Policy T6.1 of the London Plan requires that these car parking spaces are leased and not sold, this requirement should be secured by a planning condition.

Policy T6.1 of the London Plan requires "All residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. At least 20 per cent of spaces should have active charging facilities, with passive provision for all remaining spaces." The applicant has confirmed that this standard will be provided which again is accepted.

The development would provide a total of 203no. long-stay and 4no. short-stay cycle parking spaces, 10no, of these would be Sheffield Stands suitable for adapted bicycles, this standard of provision is in accordance with the London Plan and accepted.

To support the proposal the applicant has provided a Transport Assessment. This document provides information upon trip generation with the site in its existing use as offices and as the site redeveloped for housing. To determine number of trip rates associated with the site, the applicant has interrogated the TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) database. The sites selected for comparison purposes have been reviewed and are considered representative. The developer reports that the office development would have generated approximately 121no. two-way car driver trips in the AM Peak 08:00 to 09:00h and 957no. movements daily. With the site built out for housing the number of AM Peak two-way car driver movement would fall to 36no. and 345no. daily. Having the site repurposed as a housing use would therefore have a beneficial impact on the highway network.

Included in the Transport Assessment is an Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment. This has identified key destinations and the routes to them by walking and cycling. These routes have then been assessed against the 10no. Healthy Streets indicators and the barriers to active travel along these routes have been identified. The five key destinations selected by the applicant and approved by the Highway Authority are:

- Key Route 1 - Site to Hewens Primary School
- Key Route 2 - Site to The Parkview Surgery
- Key Route 3 - Site to Lilliput Pre-School Hayes
- Key Route 4 - Site to Co-op Food Convenience Store
- Key Route 5 - Site to Hayes and Harlington Station

The Highway Authority has taken the finding of the ATZ and added any interventions that the applicant has overlooked, using the Council's term contractors schedule of rate a budget estimate has been prepared. Set out below of those works considered necessary for the development to function without resulting in transport problems.

The Highway Authority require that the applicant enter a s.106 legal agreement that commits the developer to delivering the improvements identified. This is a requirement of the published London Plan 2021 Policy T2 Healthy Streets that requires that development proposals should "demonstrate how they will deliver improvements that support the ten Healthy Streets indicators in line with Transport for London guidance". This investment would broaden residents travel choice thereby reducing their reliance on the private car for trip making. If this investment is not provided residents may resort to owning a car and in the absence of parking on-plot they may park injudiciously on-street leading to parking stress, and increased risk to road safety and hindering the free flow of traffic.

If the planning application is approved, then the Highway Authority would require the following planning conditions.

- A planning condition requiring that a car parking management plan is provided and that all car parking spaces are leased and not sold in order to be in accordance with the published London Plan 2021 Policy T6.1 Residential Parking.
- A planning condition requiring the submission for approval of a Construction Logistics Plan to be in accordance with the published London Plan Policy T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction.
- A planning condition requiring the submission for approval of a Service and Delivery Plan to be in accordance with the published London Plan Policy T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction.
- A planning condition requiring the applicant to enter a 1990 Town and Country Planning Act s.106 legal

agreement obliging them to make a contribution of £327,400 for investment in Healthy Streets measures that will support the transport needs of the development taking into account its poor access to public transport, shops, services and facilities.

- The applicant enter a 1990 Town and Country Planning Act s.106 legal agreement with the Council that prohibits future residents of the development from applying for a permit to join any parking management scheme in the vicinity of the site.

Subject to all the above there are no highway objections to this proposal.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

In response to the comments received from the Council's Highways Officer, the Applicant Team submitted a Transport Note which disputed the need for a financial contribution. The Highways Officer was re-consulted and the response is set out below.

HIGHWAYS OFFICER FOLLOW-UP:

The proposed development would be situated in a location remote from public transport, shops, services and facilities - the absence of public transport travel opportunities is confirmed by the sites PTAL ranking of zero. The characteristics of the site indicate that there would be a significant reliance upon the private car for trip making, whether this is driving to work or making a short trip to a local shop to collect essential groceries. Whilst the development would generate fewer private car movements than the previous use the private car mode share would be far higher compared to other residential development situated in areas better serviced by public transport and within convenient walking or cycling distance of local shops, service and facilities. The proposal would also generate trips to new destinations such as the local school whereas the former office use did not. It is set against this background that the Highway Authority requires a developer contribution for investment in Healthy Streets measures. The published London Plan Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport requires that development proposals should facilitate the 'delivery of the Mayor's strategic target of 80 per cent of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041'. The developer contribution sought would be in pursuance of this Policy with it being used to improve the attractiveness, safety and convenience of trip making by public transport, walking and cycling in turn increasing the share of these modes. All of the works to be delivered would be to improve the existing infrastructure, it would add value and not be day to day maintenance.

An Active Travel Zone assessment identifies key destinations from a proposal site and then audits the routes to them to identify barriers to active travel and consider the works and investment needed for these to be overcome. Hayes and Harlington station is some 3.4km from the site, it does not matter if a barrier to active travel is 100m from the site or 3.3km away, unless the route is barrier free for its entire length then trip making by public transport, walking and cycling is not genuine travel choice.

The following contribution is sought to help reduce the reliance on the private car for trip making to and from the site.

Footpath H5 £17,000.00
Safer routes to Hewens Primary £17,000.00
Dropped kerbs and tactile paving 28 locations £184,000.00
10 benches £22,000.00
20 street trees £7,040.00
£247,040.00

HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALISTS:

Energy

I have no objections to the proposed development subject to securing conditions relating to the following:

- 1 - That the energy report (Hoare Lee, May 23) is part of the approved documents.
- 2 - Full details of the low and zero carbon technology to be used in accordance with the energy assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- 3 - Standard 'be seen' condition
- 4 - A S106 contribution of £137,527 for carbon offsetting is secured.

CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN OFFICER:

Summary

During the pre-app process the applicant has proactively worked with the Local Planning Authority. Many of the revisions delivered as part of the full application are acknowledged and supported. However, while some heritage benefits have been achieved others are insufficient or need further justification and collectively may not mitigate the less than substantial harm to an acceptable level. These aspects include the following:

- The openness of the canteen area in Hayes Park South;
- The restoration of the pool at Hayes Park South;
- Condition report justifying the wholesale replacement of the curtain walling with condition report.

The landscape proposed need minor revisions see below comments with some aspects requiring more information which can be resolved by way of a condition.

Background

Previous discussions have identified that the harm to the listed buildings would be less than substantial harm at the higher level.

Comments

It is agreed that conversion to residential is the optimum viable use by Hillingdon Council and Historic England. Heritage benefits were identified at the pre-app stage as a means of mitigating the less than substantial harm at the higher level of the proposal.

It is therefore vital that there is a clear and convincing justification made and that the less than substantial harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposals, including where appropriate its optimum viable use.

External treatments

Curtain walling - Glazing fenestration details

The proposals for the glazing fenestration is for the wholesale replacement of the curtain walling. The condition report stating the curtain wall is beyond repair is required in order to justify such a drastic

approach. The survey needs to state that the curtain wall is beyond repair, fails to conform to modern building standards and cannot be successfully altered to achieve access to the balconies.

While it is acknowledged that the curtain wall proposals replicate the dimensions of the existing window framing and lower spandrel in a similar looking material, the heavy frame of the doors would alter the visual uniform rhythm of the existing curtain walling. As proposed this aspect is harmful without sufficient justification.

Further these proposals for the curtain walling will need to be tested with a mock up of both the curtain wall/sliding doors and balcony treatment for inspection by Historic England and Hillingdon Council's Conservation or Urban Design Officer to support this full application. This aspect is such an important part of the heritage considerations it cannot to be left to the Condition stage of the planning process.

Reinstatement of darker glass

The curtain wall glazing is proposed in the Heritage Statement which describes the original glass as grey and is welcomed but the D&A suggests the replacement glass will be blue/grey. Every effort should be made to match the original dark grey colour glazing.

Balconies

The Council has recognised the need to provide amenity space in the form of balconies. The sketches and images of the balconies propose a mesh infill with simple railing and uprights. A sample of the mesh infill was reviewed at the 21st February site visit and agreed in principle subject to seeing a full scale mock up on site and accurate CGIs. However, the challenge of how the balcony rail and uprights relates to the windows and horizontal line of the lower spandrel remains. The detail drawing of the balconies (Drawing No. 0419-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-253230) fails to indicate the distance between the uprights and how this related to the windows behind.

As discussed above, given the sensitivity of the facade treatments and potential impact on the Grade II* listed buildings, the most effective solution to assessing the relationship between the concrete frame, screen wall and the details of the balcony will need to be done through a mock up in order to assess the impact on the buildings.

Further the balcony proposals should include details of how the pebbles that currently cover the existing areas of the proposed balconies, (possibly part of the original design) should be integrated into the balcony designs.

Repair and cleaning of the concrete frame:

The repair and cleaning of the concrete frame as proposed in the D&A is stated as being Torq or other non-abrasive method. This is accepted but more detail is needed by way of a condition.

PV panels

The PV panels should be set back from the edge of the roof to ensure no visual impact from the surrounding views. The Heritage Statement states that they will be behind the parapet ensuring that views of them are limited. They should not be visible at all.

Internal Layouts

Three bedroom Units

The amount of 3 bed units is 14% well below the optimum 20%. The layouts should be revised to increase the number of 3 beds, this could be achieved by either;

- combining the studio flats with the 2 bedroom flats on the first floor of Hayes Park South. The studio flats on the first floor have wall partitions that fail to align with the external pillars which would increase the visual harm and or;
- combine the studio flats on the ground floor of Hayes Park South along the west elevation with the adjacent 2 bed units to create an additional 3 bed unit.
- Combining some of the studio flats within Hayes Park Central to create 3 Bed units.

Accommodation Quality

Hayes Park Central

The new opening to create a courtyard in the centre of HPC is supported as this opening brings daylight/sunlight into the current deep floor plate of the building. It should be noted that the limited width of the opening delivers below BRE guidance levels of daylight/sunlight to the rooms edging the courtyard. However, it is acknowledged that 93% of the 301 rooms tested comply with the guidelines and when converting existing buildings some daylight/sunlight compromises can be inevitable.

There are rooms on the ground floor that appear to have no windows. Clarification is sought that this is not the case.

On the upper levels 1 and 2 a bedroom window on a unit on the west elevation is block by the opening of a door. This door should be hung the other way to avoid this situation.

The contemporary architecture language surrounding the courtyard is accepted.

Hayes Park South

The primary concerns with the Hayes Park South proposals is;

Firstly, the limited communal space which opens out around two piers but is not the full width of the bays. This fails to deliver on this potential heritage gain to mitigate the harm. This issue was raised during the pre-app process. The effect of looking through from front to back is effectively restricted to a narrow corridor.

Secondly, the restoration of the central pool (also identified as a heritage gain to mitigate the harm) is not a full restoration but a hybrid with a pathways, seating and Japanese garden. Therefore the heritage benefits are less than hoped for. Encouraging seating in the courtyard will potentially create privacy and noise issues for the bedrooms directly positioned looking onto the courtyard. While a path through connecting the with the east/west access route through the building is accepted this should align with the path through the courtyard.

Both from a heritage and liveability perspective it would be preferable to increase the openness of the canteen as a communal social space rather than encouraging tenants to use the courtyard, which would likely increase the privacy issues to the ground floor units.

Like Hayes Park Central, within Hayes Park South there are units with sub-optimal daylight/sunlight conditions. These are the four single aspects units facing into the internal courtyard.

It appears that some bedrooms ground floor are shown with no windows, clarification is sought to show this is not the case.

Landscaping

The applicant has engaged proactively through the design process to deliver the landscape proposals in every effort to address the issues raised during the pre-app process.

Landscape Cut outs to residential private amenity space

The principle of retaining the existing retaining walls with only two additional retaining walls to Hayes Park South and Hayes Park Central to achieve patio garden areas for the lower floors is accepted. However, the CGIs show that the combination of the mounding and planting creates discernible mounds along the building edge.

The raised mounding should be kept as shallow or the planting a continuation of the grassland to maintain the open landscape character while ensuring the buildings appear as two storey in the landscape. Likewise, the principle of the interface between the public and private areas with mounding is accepted subject to revision of the planting or reduced mounding.

However, the extent of the balustrading along the retaining walls would have a visual impact on the openness of the landscape character and should be removed except in areas where it is needed either side of stairways.

The removal of the bike store and access road south of Hayes Park South is a heritage gain, with the reinstatement of the green pastoral landscape along the south elevation of the building.

The New Square

As discussed on site and as part of the pre-app process the New Garden Square introduces additional hard surfacing between Hayes Park North (permitted development) and Hayes Park Central.

While the landscape concept for this area was accepted in broad terms, the progression of the design needs to avoid this space becoming overly urban in character to conform to Green Belt policy and the original landscape pastoral concept. It is considered that the current proposals extend the hard surfacing removing areas of green which is not compatible with the character of the site or the green belt. Given the large area of green amenity space around the site it is unlikely that this area between the roads will be used as a seating area. Accordingly, the New Garden Square needs to be revised to deliver increased greening of this space.

Play Space

The original comments for the Play Space in the northeast corner of the site suggested it be subtly integrated into this landscape or relocated to the west of Hayes Park Central. The aim being to retain open views of the buildings from the access road.

It is considered that the 1m high retaining wall surrounding the space could necessitate earthworks that would run contrary to the flat open character of the site visually interrupting views of the buildings. Potentially, the play space retaining wall could be reduced in height to 450mm to allow seating around the edge, requiring less aggressive ground works while ensuring the play space visual impact is limited.

The site wide play strategy expressed in the design and access statement states the provision of 'informal play areas' with mown paths, secondary trails and pockets of open lawn with seating. This design intent has not been followed through to the Landscape masterplan drawing no. 0419-SEW-ZZ-DR-L-001004. Further, the trim trail is limited to a small part of the north east corner of the site.

The landscape masterplan needs to be updated to express the design intent set out in the D and A, to include natural elements such as timber play features, additional specimen trees and seating within the western grass area to encourage amenity use of the full site.

The proposed felled tree location should be re-located from near the New Garden Square to the informal landscape part of the site.

Pastoral Meadow

The principle of a pastoral meadow landscape soft routes through the landscape is supported. The various mowing regimes for each area of the grassland/paths needs to be shown to ensure the landscape intent expressed in the Design and Access Statement is delivered. It is suggested this information come forward as part of the landscape maintenance schedule by way of Condition.

Hard surfacing proposals

The hard surfacing materials are accepted apart from the path that runs from at the junction of the path entering Hayes Park South from the west running to the south of the Hayes Park South. This path will be used less and should be a more subtle surfacing such as self-binding gravel. These materials will be subject to a Condition to ensure samples are presented to the council for approval by way of Condition.

Cycling parking

It is appreciated that following comments at the pre-app stage the majority of the cycle parking has been located within the building. This approach is supported.

Conditions

If minded to grant this application the conditions requiring details of materials and landscaping should be applied.

CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN OFFICER FOLLOW-UP:

These comments are an urban design, architectural and landscape response to the Hayes Park Planning, LSH, HE and GLA Responses as well as the viability report.

Viability

Paragraphs 189-208 of the NPPF require consideration of the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and assessment of the identification of any harm. Where there is harm identified, Paragraph 202 states that 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

Materials

The key issue to preserving the heritage quality of Hayes Park Central and South is the proposed materials for the curtain walling, glazing and balconies. The applicant proposes these elements be Conditioned. The Condition should be satisfied pre-commencement.

PV Panels

It is accepted that the PV panels will not be visible from the surrounding landscape.

Accommodation Quality - Hayes Park South

Canteen

The previous conservation comments related to the Canteen area are retained.

Reflective pool

There are four single aspect units on the ground floor of each corner of the reflective pool. These suffer from limited outlook, sub-optimal daylight/sunlight and privacy issues with residents provided with seating within the north side of the reflective pool. The proposed indicative planters (shown on drawing SEW 0419-SEW-HS-00-DR-A-253225) to mitigate privacy issues would create visual clutter that lacks design coherence with the Japanese garden design and open area of the reflective pool. As previously stated, it would be preferable to reinstate the entirety of the pool, removing the seating that would likely create privacy issues for the residents of the ground floor units to improve the accommodation standard, particularly of the four corner units around the courtyard, which suffer other liveability compromises.

It is also considered that the adaptive Japanese garden design with trees, boulders and gravel walkway with seating is at odds with the design clarity of the reflective pool on the other side of the walkway.

Further, clarification is sought on the reason for the central walkway failing to align with the Canteen communal space entrance.

Landscape Cut Outs - Hayes Park and Hayes Park South

The principle of mounding is accepted. However, it is considered that in some instances the mounding should be better integrated into the existing levels with a gentler slope, to ensure it is almost visually imperceptible. It is considered that, Hayes Park Central north, east elevations and Hayes Park South north, east and west elevations particularly need to be revised to look less engineered.

Clarification is sought on where the additional soil will be imported from.

Garden Square

While the updates are looking less urban, the proposed area of hardstanding is still considered to be too extensive. Reducing the hard-surfacing would reduce costs. Clarification is sought that a bin store will no longer be located in this area.

Surfacing Proposals

The path to the east of Hayes Park Central running north of Hayes Park South should visually blend with the other paths of bounded gravel. Accordingly, a top dressing should be proposed to be visually similar

to the proposed bounded gravel.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

The Applicant submitted document reference 'Planning Responses (Dated 21st November 2023)' in response to the Urban Design Officer, noting the following points:

- The Canteen - the Applicant considers that the canteen space, which will be used as a residential lobby in the proposed scheme, is an appropriate scale and size for the intended use and it continues to allow the key views to be appreciated.
- Reflective Pool - the Applicant considers the design approach for this space to be entirely appropriate.
- Landscape Mounds - the Urban Design Officer recommended that the scale of some of the landscape mounds be reduced. Some minor changes have been made to reduce the size of these in certain locations.
- Garden Square - the Applicant has considered the comments on increasing the greening on the garden square. The square needs to be designed to be multifunctional. As such, no further greening has been proposed here.
- Surfacing - regarding the comment on changing one of the surfacing types, one route needs to be a different surface.

The design of the scheme is considered within the main body of the report. The responses on the above points are considered to be sufficient and acceptable on balance.

CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN OFFICER FOLLOW-UP:

Following previous comments regarding the condition of the glazing, a Glazing Investigation Report has been submitted. This provides information indicating the rationale for replacing the glazing. Accordingly, the Condition to provide a Glazing Condition report can be omitted.

THIRD PART DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT CONSULTANT (Summary):

The BRE guidance gives recommended reflectances and factor to use in analysis, these have not been used and different reflectances and factors have been used. We are not sure why different figures have been used in the analysis.

Appendix C states after what they are saying below 'Surface reflectances used should be presented in the assessment, along with a specification of the materials if non-default reflectances are used'.

They have used non-default reflectances and not specified the materials.

Of the 301 rooms analysed for daylight, 281 rooms meet the target values. The 20 bedrooms that fell short are located around either a courtyard or lightwell.

All rooms pass sunlight testing.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENTS:

The Applicant Team responded by providing details on methodology, including details on materials and their associated reflectance. This was agreed by the Council's Daylight and Sunlight Consultant as acceptable.

FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT:

Review Summary

- The applicant has stated within the Sustainable Drainage Proforma that proposed runoff will not exceed 5.55l/s for up to and including the 1 in 100yr rainfall event, however the volume storage calculations show that a rate of 6.9l/s is proposed for the 1 in 100yr rainfall event.

TO BE CONDITIONED - The applicant is required to undertake soakage testing and provide results to confirm whether infiltration is feasible.

To address this, please can the applicant submit information which:

- Justifies the higher runoff rate for the 1 in 100yr rainfall event and/or updates the volume storage calculations.

The following can be addressed at Condition stage:

- The applicant is required to undertake soakage testing and provide results to confirm whether infiltration is feasible.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

The information submitted at the planning stage of the process is considered to be sufficient and acceptable, subject to further detail being secured by planning condition.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

EMPLOYMENT LAND

The proposal involves the loss of Class Eg (i) (offices) uses on both sites totalling a loss of 10,815sqm of office floorspace, and its replacement with residential use. The plans for Hayes Park South indicate the provision of smaller communal work spaces, considered to be ancillary to the C3 use proposed, but there will be an overall loss in employment floorspace. The proposed development site does not sit within any designated employment sites in the borough.

As the site is a Grade II* listed building, evidence is required to demonstrate that the office use is no longer viable and that other uses which would cause minimal harm to the Grade II listed building cannot be accommodated. The applicant has submitted marketing evidence, a strategic economic case report and a supply/demand report. Notably, Hayes Park Central has been vacant since September 2020 and Hayes Park South has been vacant since the Summer of 2017. Both buildings have been marketed since 2018 and have been unsuccessful in finding occupants for the offices.

The applicant has also submitted further information to demonstrate which other uses (other than residential) have been considered for the site and options for development which minimise the impact on the listed building.

Policy DME 3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) identifies preferred locations for new office development. It also states that proposals involving the loss of office floorspace in preferred locations for office growth should include information to demonstrate that the site has been actively marketed for two years, that the site is no longer viable for office use, taking account of the potential for internal and external refurbishment, and surrounding employment uses will not be undermined. Part D of the policy also requires proposals involving the loss of office floorspace within designated town centres to be supported by evidence of continuous vacancy and marketing over a 12 month period. Offices outside of these locations are not protected by the policy. As the existing offices are not within a preferred location or designated town centre, these requirements of Policy DME 3 do not apply.

While Policy DME 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) requires marketing for the loss of any employment floorspace, Policy DME 3, which relates specifically to offices states that the Council will support proposals for new office development in the preferred locations of Stockley Park and Uxbridge Town Centre, and in designated town centres and LSELS (mentioned in para 2.14). DME 3 only requires marketing in these locations. As DME 3 requires proposals for new office floorspace to be in preferred locations, town centres or LSELS unless supported by a sequential test, marketing to justify the loss of office floorspace outside of these locations is not required.

The London Plan supports this position. Part D of Policy E1 outlines that diverse office markets in outer London should be consolidated and extended where viable, focusing new development in town centres and other existing office clusters supported by improvements to walking, cycling and public transport connectivity and capacity. It outlines in part D2), that some existing business parks (such as Chiswick Park, Stockley Park and Bedfont Lakes) should be included in this list of locations where office floorspace should be consolidated and extended. Part E suggests retaining viable office floorspace outside of these areas (and releasing surplus capacity) and supporting this through Article 4 Directions, however, Hillingdon Council have chosen not to support this area through the recent confirmation of Article 4 Directions across the borough.

As part of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), the Council also reviewed the need to retain its existing business parks and designated a number of Locally Significant Employment Locations (LSEL), including Stockley Park. Hayes Park was reviewed as part of this process and was not deemed that it should be protected via a LSEL designation. It is therefore considered that the site is appropriate for other uses.

In summary, from a land use perspective only, the loss of employment floorspace is accepted in this specific circumstance.

Policy DMH 3, Part A), of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) should also be considered and states that:

Where offices are found to be redundant, their demolition and redevelopment for office accommodation will be supported. Where this is not feasible or viable, proposals for the conversion of offices to residential which fall outside of current permitted development rights will be supported where:

- i) the conversion of offices provide an external finish that is suitable to a residential building and in keeping with the character of the area;
- ii) balconies and/or amenity spaces are designed into the development as integral facilities and the creation of well designed public realm and landscaping is demonstrated;
- iii) any additional functional features that are needed such as pipes, flues or communications equipment are grouped together and routed through existing features where possible, and kept off publicly visible elevations; and
- iv) proposed homes have a dual aspect wherever possible (see Mayor of London's Housing SPG). A sole aspect home overlooking a parking court or other shared use rear area will generally be unacceptable.

The above detail is considered further in the relevant design section of the report.

RESIDENTIAL USE

The proposed development would deliver a mix of units and will specifically contribute to the delivery of housing within the borough. The NPPF encourages the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Policy GG4 (Delivering the homes Londoners need) of the London Plan (2021) states that to create a housing market that works better for all Londoners, those involved in planning and development must:

- ensure that more homes are delivered.
- support the delivery of the strategic target of 50 per cent of all new homes being genuinely affordable.
- create mixed and inclusive communities, with good quality homes that meet high standards of design and provide for identified needs, including for specialist housing.
- identify and allocate a range of sites, including small sites, to deliver housing locally, supporting skilled precision-manufacturing that can increase the rate of building, and planning for all necessary supporting infrastructure from the outset.
- establish ambitious and achievable build-out rates at the planning stage, incentivising build-out milestones to help ensure that homes are built quickly and to reduce the likelihood of permissions being sought to sell land on at a higher value.

Policy H1 (Housing Growth) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Plan 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) requires that the borough meets and exceed its minimum strategic dwelling requirement in accordance with other Local Plan policies. The Borough's target was increased as part of the London Plan (2021).

The re-use of this brownfield site for residential dwellings accords with the local, regional and national planning policies. The proposed residential use is supported in general terms, subject to compliance with other policies in the development plan.

UNIT MIX

The London Plan (2021) outlines in Policy H10 that schemes should generally consist of a range of unit sizes and sets out a number of factors which should be considered when determining the appropriate housing mix on a particular scheme. This includes local evidence of need. Policy DMH 2 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) requires the provision of a mix of housing units of different sizes in schemes of residential development to reflect the Council's latest information on housing

need. Paragraph 4.6 outlines that there is a substantial borough-wide requirement for larger affordable and private market units, particularly three-bedroom properties.

In terms of factors specific to a site, Policy H10 also includes a need to consider, the mix of uses in the scheme, the range of tenures in the scheme and the nature and location of the site, with a higher proportion of one and two bed units generally more appropriate in locations which are closer to a town centre or station or with higher public transport access and connectivity.

Family housing is defined within the glossary of the London Plan and outlines it must generally be of a size that has three or more bedrooms. It is worth noting that the Secretary of State directed changes to Policy H10, in order to address the need for new family housing, to prevent families from being forced to move outside of London. These changes are incorporated into the new London Plan (2021).

This unit mix proposed is summarised below:

- 25 no. studio units (20%)
- 40 no. 1-bed units (32%)
- 41 no. 2-bed unit (33%)
- 17 no. 3-bed unit (14%)
- 1 no. 4-bed unit (1%)

The proposal for only 15% family housing is less than would be expected for such a scheme. Generally in locations with a low PTAL rating, it is expected that the development should provide above 20% of family housing with schemes typically exceeding this. These sites are generally less constrained and any departure from the preferred housing mix will need to be justified, taking account of the requirements of Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

The Planning Statement submitted explains that the proposal delivers conventional 3-bedroom units and oversized 2-bedroom units which can be used by families. The Council's position is that defined by the London Plan (2021) which is that family units must have at least 3-bedrooms.

It is noted that 25 (20%) of the one-bedroom units are referenced as 1 bedroom 1 person units. In this regard paragraph 4.10.4 of the London Plan sets out that "one-person and one-bed units are the least flexible unit type". There is also an over-dominance of 1-bedroom units, totalling 65 units, equal to 52% of units. Policy H2 of the London Plan (2021) requires that a range of units and the significant number of 1 bedroom units would be considered to contrary to such requirements.

In this regard it is recognised that there are some clear site constraints for the proposal, which includes the Grade II* listed status of the buildings. It is also acknowledged that providing more three-bedroom units would decrease the number units proposed which would then impact on the financial viability of the scheme. Following the assessment of the scheme by third party consultants and the Greater London Authority, it is concluded that the scheme as proposed would generate a deficit but would be in the range of deliverability when accounting for growth within the market. Despite this, the developer has also made a 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer which is considered to reduce the viability of the scheme further whilst increasing the deficit.

Any request for an increase to the number of family units, which would therein result in a overall reduction of units, would compromise viability and potentially jeopardise the delivery of the scheme. On balance, the unit mix as proposed is accepted but the lack of family housing does not weigh in

its favour.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy DMHB 17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that all new residential development should take account of the Residential Density Matrix contained in Table 5.2.

Paragraph 5.67 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that Hillingdon will apply the density standards set out in the London Plan in a flexible manner, according to local circumstances. Large parts of the borough, including many areas in close proximity to town centres, are suburban in character and will lean heavily towards the applications of lower to mid range density scales. Table 5.3 represents a starting point for discussions on the issue of residential density, which should ultimately be determined by a design led approach.

The area surrounding the site is suburban and semi-rural in character. If such density guidelines are applied, Table 5.2 states that the density should be between 105-300 habitable rooms per hectare and 35-100 units per hectare. Using an approximate site area of 2.6 hectares (not including the access roads), the site should provide 273-780 habitable rooms or 91-260 units. The development proposal would sit within this range. Density however is only one indicator of a sites capacity and it is necessary to consider the proposal holistically, taking into account amenity space requirements, the design, heritage harm and highways considerations. This accords with the requirements of the Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021).

7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

ARCHAEOLOGY

Policy DMHB 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that the Council, as advised by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS), will ensure that sites of archaeological interest within or, where appropriate, outside, designated areas are not disturbed. If that cannot be avoided, satisfactory measures must be taken to mitigate the impacts of the proposals through archaeological fieldwork to investigate and record remains in advance of development works. This should include proposals for the recording, archiving and reporting of any archaeological finds.

GLAAS have been consulted as part of the application process and have confirmed that proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest. All necessary processes have been followed and the proposal would not be considered contrary to Policy DMHB 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

LISTED BUILDING

Background:

The site contains two rectangular commercial office buildings designed by the American architect Gordon Bunshaft and built between 1962 and 1965. Bunshaft was America's leading proponent of mid-20th century office architecture, and designed many highly regarded modernist commercial buildings. The Hayes Park offices are rare examples of Bunshaft's work outside America - one of only two schemes by him in Western Europe, and his only project in England.

The two office buildings - Hayes Park Central (former research laboratories) and Hayes Park South (administrative headquarters) were built for Heinz UK, the American food processing company, within the grounds of a demolished Victorian house on the outskirts of London. The mature

parkland setting for the offices was also intended to promote the physical and mental wellbeing of the workforce. As noted in the list entry, the Heinz site is the most important early example in Britain of this type of headquarters complex on a greenfield site.

Both buildings are low-rise, in part due to their sunken positioning within the landscape with curved retaining walls. The list description explains that this was due to Metropolitan Green Belt policies which were introduced in London after WWII. Architecturally, both buildings are highly significant for their sophisticated sculptural form, comprising an elegant three-storey grid frame constructed in pre-cast concrete with a granite aggregate finish. Set behind the frame is full-height aluminium-framed glazing with blue opaque glass. The recessed glazing and its reflective qualities allow the concrete framework of floor slabs and columns to appear almost as an entirely independent structure, and this effect is particularly dramatic at the building corners where clear sky can be seen through the frame

In summary, the Hayes Park buildings are of special architectural and historic interest for their distinctive and unique character and greenfield setting, designed by a leading proponent of modernist office architecture for a world-famous American-owned multinational. For these reasons, the building complex is highly listed at Grade II*.

Policy Context:

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty on the Local Planning Authority, requiring that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Pertinent paragraphs of the NPPF (2023) are listed below:

Paragraph 206 states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification;

Paragraph 208 states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Paragraph 212 states that local planning authorities should look for opportunity for new developments within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance.

Paragraph 020 of the Historic Environment section of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG, updated 24 June 2021) states:

"Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits, for example, works to a listed private dwelling which secure its future as a designated heritage asset could be a public benefit. Examples of heritage benefits may include:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting

- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation"

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) The Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment.

Development that has an effect on heritage assets will only be supported where:

- i) it sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset and puts them into viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- ii) it will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to an asset, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide public benefit that would outweigh the harm or loss, in accordance with the NPPF;
- iii) it makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area;
- iv) any extensions or alterations are designed in sympathy, without detracting from or competing with the heritage asset;
- v) the proposal would relate appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials;
- vi) buildings and structures within the curtilage of a heritage asset, or in close proximity to it, do not compromise its setting; and
- vii) opportunities are taken to conserve or enhance the setting, so that the significance of the asset can be appreciated more readily.

B) Development proposals affecting designated heritage assets need to take account of the effects of climate change and renewable energy without impacting negatively on the heritage asset. The Council may require an alternative solution which will protect the asset yet meet the sustainability objectives of the Local Plan.

C) The Council will seek to secure the repair and reuse of Listed Buildings and monuments and improvements to Conservation Areas on the Heritage at Risk Register, through negotiations with owners, the provision of advice and guidance, the use of appropriate legal action, and through bids for external funding for improvement works.

Policy DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) Applications for Listed Building Consent and planning permission to alter, extend, or change the use of a statutorily Listed Building will only be permitted if they are considered to retain its significance and value and are appropriate in terms of the fabric, historic integrity, spatial quality and layout of the building. Any additions or alterations to a Listed Building should be sympathetic in terms of scale, proportion, detailed design, materials and workmanship.

B) Applications should include a Heritage Statement that demonstrates a clear understanding of the importance of the building and the impact of the proposals on its significance.

C) The substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a statutory Listed Building will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances when the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable use of the building, no viable use can be found through marketing, grant-funding or charitable or public ownership and the loss is outweighed by bringing the site back into use. In such circumstances, full archaeological recording of the building will be required.

D) Planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building.

The above policies are supported by Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

Marketing Evidence:

Hayes Park Central has been vacant since September 2020 and Hayes Park South has been vacant since the Summer of 2017. Both buildings have been marketed since 2018 and have been unsuccessful in finding occupants for the buildings as offices. Marketing exercises have been carried out by Cushman & Wakefield to review the prospects of securing tenants for the Hayes Park Central and South buildings in their existing form, or via a refurbishment, based on the office market supply and demand and characteristics of the existing building and consented modifications to the scheme. The Cushman & Wakefield Marketing Report (Dated July 2022) concludes as follows:

"In conclusion, in our professional opinion we have tested the market since 2017, whilst the other 2 buildings have been occupied. Now that all buildings are vacant we believe the task is considerably harder and the capital expenditure required would be much greater. Fundamentally, the suburban location, the lack of public transport, the out-dated design, lack of amenities and poor (EPC) plus non-existent performance certifications (WELL, FITWELL, NABERS, Wired Score) is of such significance that it makes reoccupation unviable. Reoccupation is particularly unviable when set in the context of the supply and demand dynamics of the current market. To compete with other office parks for occupiers, the refurbishment of the buildings, landscaping, landlord amenity offering, and procurement of performance certifications would need to be carried out on a speculative basis. The high cost of doing this work, set against the uncertainty of securing a tenant makes it an unviable strategy for the landlord.

In summary, reoccupation of the existing space is not realistic as the park does not meet modern occupier standards and a speculative refurbishment is not financially viable when there is little likelihood of securing a tenant."

Officer's do not dispute these conclusions.

Optimum Viable Use:

Paragraph 24 of the 'Hayes Park Central and South - Optimum Viable Use' (Dated 18th October 2022) states:

'It should be noted that an alternative to residential use would not necessarily be less harmful. The conversion of the building to a hotel, school or health facility is similarly likely to cause a degree of disruption to the plan form, historic patterns of circulation, and may resultantly cause a degree of harm. The difficulty in finding suitable occupation for the building because of its location, sensitivities and market conditions mean that, a residential use is considered to be presented as the Optimum Viable Use which will produce an overall resultant heritage benefit to significance.'

The submission makes the case that an alternative to residential use would not necessarily be less harmful. The conversion of the building to a hotel, school or health facility is similarly likely to cause a degree of disruption to the planform, historic patterns of circulation, and may resultantly cause a degree of harm.

The best use of a building is the use that it was originally intended for which in this case would be as offices and laboratories. The change of use of the listed buildings to residential use would require alterations which would result in harm to the heritage assets for which there would need to be a clear and convincing case. There are other potential uses that the buildings could be used as, if the buildings are no longer viable as offices, that could be less damaging to its fabric. However, it is accepted that other less damaging uses would not necessarily be a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site and therefore would not constitute the optimum viable use.

The proposed change of use to C3 residential use would result in a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site, this being something that is considered unlikely to be possible for alternative uses of the Hayes Park Central and South buildings.

The scheme has been subject to viability testing by the Council's third party consultants and the Greater London Authority. Following such assessment, it has been concluded that a scheme which proposes no affordable generates a deficit but is within the range of deliverability when accounting for growth within the market. It is concluded that the proposed residential use is the optimum viable use.

Proposed Works:

Hayes Park Central and South

The proposals would remove the existing open plan arrangement of both Hayes Park Central and South, which although is not original to the buildings, does allow the listed structures to be seen internally. This alteration is considered to result in a low level of harm to the significance of the listed buildings.

Private balcony spaces are proposed within the external floor slabs of Hayes Park Central and South. This is the proposal on the first and second floors with the exception of the corners of the buildings in order to reduce the visual impact. These balconies would include balustrades constructed of metal uprights and light-weight tensile wiring. The balustrading proposals will inevitably result in some level of harm to the significance of the listed buildings by diminishing the orderly modernist character.

The glazing is also proposed to be replaced to improve the energy performance of the buildings. Although the listing specifically mentions the slender glazed frames and opaque blue glass, the existing glazing utilised in the buildings currently is not original and does not comply with building regulations. The glazing proposal will inevitably result in some level of harm to the significance of the listed buildings, again by altering the orderly modernist character.

Together, there is a risk that the balustrading and glazing could be visually detracting and that the amenity spaces could become cluttered with paraphernalia. If recommended for approval, a planning condition would require the submission and approval of mock-up samples, in consultation with Historic England, in order to ensure that the materials proposed are of an appropriate design quality.

Hayes Park Central

In terms of the works proposed to Hayes Park Central, the most significant proposal to convert the building for residential use includes the creation of a central atrium within the footprint of the service core. Whilst a significant intervention, the atrium would have limited impact on the significance of the listed building due to the non-original plan form and lack of internal features of interest.

Hayes Park South

An east-west link is proposed through the centre of the floorplan to provide a physical and visual access through the central courtyard. The reflecting pool and island is proposed to be restored as

originally conceived. The boxed-in central columns are also to be revealed and the original remnants of the Heinz branding in the floor treatments are to be incorporated in the proposed designs. All of these proposals are considered to deliver heritage benefits, which also constitute public benefits as per the Historic Environment section of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG, updated 24 June 2021).

Landscape

The scheme also include proposals for the landscaping. Within the immediate setting of the buildings, some of the earth bank is to be cut out to improve the daylight and amenity to the ground floor residential units. It is also proposed to provide additional hardstanding to facilitate pathways for building users. These changes risk causing a small degree of harm to the appreciation of the offices sunken within their greenfield setting. A notable enhancement to the landscaping would be the removal of the unsightly roundabout to the north of Hayes Park Central, and the creation of a new square.

Heritage Significance and Harm:

The following paragraphs from the NPPF (2023) are highlighted:

205. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

206. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

208. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

During the application process, the Council's Conservation Officer raised concerns over the following elements of the proposal:

- The openness of the canteen area in Hayes Park South;
- The restoration of the pool at Hayes Park South;
- Condition report justifying the wholesale replacement of the curtain walling with condition report.

The openness of the canteen has been identified as an element of the scheme which fails to deliver on potential heritage gain which could be used to mitigate against the harm posed to the significance of the Hayes Park South building. The Applicant has responded on this point and notes that whilst smaller than the original canteen, this redesigned space effectively preserves critical views through the building, suitably sized for its new purpose. It is noted that any increase in the width of this space would result in a reduction to the number of units proposed, which would in turn reduce the viability and deliverability of the scheme which is already finely balanced (please refer to Section 07.13 of the report for further consideration of viability). On this basis, the openness of the canteen area is accepted as proposed, although its heritage gain is not as significant as it would be otherwise if proposed as a more open space.

The restoration of the central pool in Hayes Park South is identified as a heritage gain to mitigate the harm but is not a full restoration of the original pool. It is proposed as a hybrid with an off-centre pathway, seating and Japanese garden. The Applicant has responded on this point and notes that the placement of the off-center walkway is strategic, aimed at maximizing the pool's size while maintaining a clear, direct connection between the two lobby spaces. This design intent is accepted and is considered to deliver heritage gain.

A condition report justifying the wholesale replacement of the curtain walling will be secured by planning condition in the event of an approval.

As confirmed by the Council's Conservation Officer, the harm identified in this case is considered to be 'less than substantial harm'.

Public Benefit

The duties imposed by section 72 of the Act are in addition to the duty imposed by section 3(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to determine the application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The principal heritage objective is preserving the special interest of the Listed Building, as per the duties under section 16 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

In this case, the primary issue relates to the character and special interest of the listed buildings the heritage assets. A proposal which would cause harm should only be permitted where there are strong countervailing planning considerations which are sufficiently powerful to outweigh the harm caused.

The NPPF (2023) requires its own exercise to be undertaken as set out in Chapter 16; Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. Paragraphs 195-214 require consideration of the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and assessment of the identification of any harm. In particular, paragraph 208 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The harm identified in this case is considered to be 'less than substantial harm' to the Grade II* Hayes Park Central and South buildings. In line with paragraph 208 of the NPPF (2023), the less than substantial harm arising from the impact of the development on the listed buildings needs to be weighed against the public benefits arising from the scheme.

Historic England references Planning Practice Guidance in their response, noting that public benefits can include heritage benefits. They therefore consider the proposal to deliver the following public benefits:

- the restoration of the original courtyard design to Hayes Park South, including the revealing of the reflecting pool and island;
- the removal of unsympathetic accretions to the interior, and the revealing of the distinctive structural columns throughout;
- the enhancements to the external landscaping particularly the replacement of the unsightly roundabout with a new public square;

- the repair and cleaning of the concrete frame, the details of which should be provided by condition.

The Applicant Team have highlighted the following public benefits:

- Returning two Grade II* Listed buildings back into use and securing their long-term future.
- The high-quality heritage led refurbishment of two Grade II* Listed buildings, supported by Historic England.
- Reusing two long-term vacant buildings through following the retrofit-first approach.
- Creation of a new residential community of high quality homes.
- Provision of improved biodiversity and urban greening.
- Improving the sustainability of the buildings and maximising energy efficiency.
- Contributions towards local highways improvements, new street trees and public open space.

Having taken all aspects of the proposal into consideration, it is considered that the less than substantial harm is justified and that public benefits that would result from the delivery of the proposed scheme. Specifically, the re-use of the Grade II* Listed buildings and securement of their long-term future, alongside the identified heritage gains, are considered to be the primary public benefits. Notably, the scheme is supported in principle by Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer. When weighing the harm against the benefits, the public benefits are considered to cumulatively surmount the less than substantial harm posed to the heritage asset. For this reason, and subject to the necessary planning conditions and obligations, the development is considered to accord with relevant conservation planning policy requirements.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Policy DMAV 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) The Council will support the continued safe operation of Heathrow Airport and RAF Northolt and will consult with the airport operator on proposals in the safeguarded areas. Proposals that may be a hazard to aircraft safety will not be permitted.

B) In consultation with the Airport Operator, the Council will ensure that:

- i) areas included in Airport Public Safety zones are protected from development which may lead to an increase in people residing, working or congregating in these zones; and
- ii) sensitive uses such as housing, education and hospitals are not located in areas significantly affected by aircraft noise without acceptable mitigation measures.

National Air Traffic Services (NATS), the Ministry of Defence and Heathrow Airport Safeguarding have been consulted and have confirmed either no comment or no safeguarding objection to the proposed development. As the proposed development creates new habitats which may attract and support populations of large and / or flocking birds close to aerodromes, a Bird Hazard Management Plan is required. The constructions details to be secured by planning condition should also provide details for the use of any cranes. If recommended for approval, this would be secured by planning condition.

Subject to such a condition, the proposed development would accord with Policy DMAV 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

7.05 Impact on the green belt

The application site forms part of designated Green Belt land. The following planning policies are therefore taken into consideration:

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF (2023) states that the Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF (2023) sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'. Paragraph 148 continues this, stating:

"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."

In terms of local policy, the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) gives strong protection to Green Belt land. Policy EM2 states that the Council will seek to maintain the current extent of the Green Belt and any proposals for development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will be assessed against national and London Plan (2021) policies, including the very special circumstances test.

Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) Inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances.

B) Extensions and redevelopment on sites in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will be permitted only where the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, and the purposes of including land within it, than the existing development, having regard to:

- i) the height and bulk of the existing building on the site;
- ii) the proportion of the site that is already developed;
- iii) the footprint, distribution and character of the existing buildings on the site;
- iv) the relationship of the proposal with any development on the site that is to be retained; and
- v) the visual amenity and character of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.

This above is supported by Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021).

Notably, paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2023) states that the construction of new buildings are considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include:

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; 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.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF (2023) also states that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These include:

...

d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds)...

Paragraph 155(d) of the NPPF (2023) is considered to be the most pertinent and allows for the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction. Paragraph 154(g) of the NPPF (2023) also allows for limited infilling provided that the development does not result in a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Overall, the proposed change of use and limited external works proposed are not considered to have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The development is considered to be appropriate development within the Green Belt and accords with the Development Plan.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that:

A) All development 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.

B) Development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

C) Development will be required to ensure that the design safeguards the satisfactory re-development of any adjoining sites which have development potential.

D) Development proposals should make sufficient provision for well designed internal and external storage space for general, recycling and organic waste, with suitable access for collection. External bins should be located and screened to avoid nuisance and adverse visual impacts to occupiers and neighbours.

The above policies are supported by Policy BE 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012).

A summary of the proposed works for Hayes Park Central are listed below:

- Creation of new central atrium;
- Removal of existing open plan form;
- Creation of private balcony space within the external floor slabs on the first and second floors, except for the corners, including balustrades constructed of metal uprights and light-weight tensile wiring; and
- Replace the glazing.

A summary of the proposed works for Hayes Park South are listed below:

- Removal of existing open plan form;
- Creation of east-west connection through the central courtyard;
- Restoration of the reflecting pool and island;
- Revealing boxed in central columns;
- Creation of private balcony space within the external floor slabs on the first and second floors, except for the corners, including balustrades constructed of metal uprights and light-weight tensile wiring; and
- Replace the glazing.

Within the landscape, the following is proposed:

- Earth bank cut out to improve the daylight and amenity of the ground floor units;
- Additional hardstanding is proposed for building spill out;
- The roundabout is proposed to be removed and replaced with a communal square.

The Hayes Park Central and South buildings are located within their own parkland setting, separate from the more suburban context established in neighbouring residential estates. As such, the site is only really visible from within the site itself.

As the proposed seeks permission for the change of use of the Hayes Park Central and South buildings from offices to residential, a significant number of the proposed changes to the buildings are internal and are not therefore visible externally. The alterations to the external glazing of the buildings, provision of external balconies with balustrades and landscaping works will be visible externally. The glazing and balconies are considered to be acceptable in principle and will be subject to planning conditions in order to secure acceptable detailing. The proposed landscaping has been subject to discussion and amendments, again with the final detail to be secured by planning condition.

Subject to planning conditions, the proposed development is considered to accord with Policy BE 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

7.08 Impact on neighbours

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that:

B) Development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Paragraph 5.38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states: "The Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties, schools or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain levels of privacy and to prevent the possibility of overlooking. In some locations where there is a significant difference in ground levels

between dwellings, a greater separation distance may be necessary."

Paragraph 5.40 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states: "For the purposes of this policy, outlook is defined as the visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows or from their garden. 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."

Paragraph 5.41 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states: "The Council will aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight and sunlight and unacceptable overshadowing caused by new development on habitable rooms, amenity space and public open space. The Council will also seek to ensure that the design of new development optimises the levels of daylight and sunlight. The Council will expect the impact of the development to be assessed following the methodology set out in the most recent version of the Building Research Establishments (BRE) "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice".

The Hayes Park Central and South buildings do not immediately adjoin any existing residential properties. There is an extant consent to convert Hayes Park North to residential units but this site is circa 60 metres away from Hayes Park Central and 120 metres away from Hayes Park South. It is also noted that the Hayes Park Central and South buildings are separated from each other by circa 21m and would not therefore compromise the amenity of future occupiers. The privacy of future residents located around the central courtyards of both buildings is considered to be a potential issue (as covered in Section 07.09 of the report) and it is recommended that a condition secures the detail of mitigation measures. Subject to appropriately worded conditions, the development would not compromise the amenity of neighbouring residents, in accordance with Policy DMHB 11, part B), of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

RESIDENTIAL QUALITY

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that 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:

- i) meet or exceed the most up to date internal space standards, as set out in Table 5.1; and
- ii) in the case of major developments, provide at least 10% of new housing to be accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

Table 3.1 of London Plan (2021) Policy D6 requires the following:

One storey:

- 1-bed 1 person unit should provide a minimum of 39 square metres Gross Internal Area (GIA) with a bathroom (or 37 square metres with shower room);
- 1-bed 2 person unit should provide a minimum of 50 square metres GIA;
- 2-bed 3 person unit should provide a minimum of 61 square metres GIA;
- 2-bed 4 person unit should provide a minimum of 70 square metres GIA;
- 3-bed 4 person unit should provide a minimum of 74 square metres GIA; and
- 3-bed 5 person unit should provide a minimum of 86 square metres GIA.

Two storey:

- 2-bed 4 person unit should provide a minimum of 79 square metres GIA;

- 3-bed 5 person unit should provide a minimum of 93 square metres GIA; and
- 4-bed 7 person unit should provide a minimum of 115 square metres GIA.

The above is also supported by Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

The proposed development includes both single storey units and two storey duplex units. Based on the plans submitted, all of the proposed units meet the minimum space requirements and are provided with adequate outlook from all habitable rooms. A large number of the units exceed minimum standards, in some cases up to 20%. Over 53% of the proposed homes are dual or corner aspect, with the majority of single aspect homes facing east or west. The 'scissor' apartments are integral to maximising the amount of dual aspect homes and ensuring that the majority of homes would maintain a predominantly south-facing aspect, whilst ensuring only 4% of new homes proposed are single aspect north facing.

The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted notes that layouts have been fully optimised from an internal daylighting perspective given the heritage constraints of the Listed Buildings, with the development proposals ensuring an acceptable level of compliance with BRE Guidelines to all main living spaces. Subject to conditions, the Council's Noise Consultant also confirms that a satisfactory noise environment can be achieved for the proposed habitable rooms.

It has been noted that the habitable rooms located around the central courtyards of both Hayes Park Central and South are slightly compromised in terms of their privacy. It has been suggested in the Planning Responses document (Dated 21st November 2023) that a privacy film/screen could be applied to the units impacted by such concerns. In the event of an approval, the detail of this would be secured by planning condition.

Subject to conditions, the residential quality of the proposal is considered to be acceptable, in accordance with Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

- A) All new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. Amenity space should be provided in accordance with the standards set out in Table 5.2.
- B) Balconies should have a depth of not less than 1.5 metres and a width of not less than 2 metres.
- C) Any ground floor and/or basement floor unit that is non-street facing should have a defensible space of not less than 3 metres in depth in front of any window to a bedroom or habitable room. However, for new developments in Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character or for developments, which include Listed Buildings, the provision of private open space will be required to enhance the streetscene and the character of the buildings on the site.
- D) The design, materials and height of any front boundary must be in keeping with the character of the area to ensure harmonisation with the existing street scene.

Table 5.2 states that studio and 1-bedroom flats should provide a minimum of 20 square metres of amenity space, 2-bedroom flats should provide a minimum of 25 square metres of amenity space and 3+ bedroom flats should provide a minimum of 30 square metres of amenity space.

Based on the above requirements, the proposal should be delivering the following amenity space

provisions:

- 65 no. 1 bed: 1,300m²
- 41 no. 2 bed: 1,025m²
- 18 no. 3+ bed: 450m²
- Total: 2,775m²

The proposed private amenity space varies for different dwelling types across the site. Apartments at ground floor have courtyard gardens created through cut-outs in the landscaping and balconies are provided to some flats at upper floor levels. The private amenity space provision totals 1,183m² and would fall below the local plan standards. Weighing against such a conflict with local plan standards is the provision of both play space and communal amenity space. Circa 950m² of play space is proposed, 500m² is proposed as an exercise trim trail area, and the remaining grounds would be accessible as additional communal amenity space, totalling up to 1 hectare in area (equal to 10,000 square metres).

The Applicant also notes that the proposal includes 412m² of internal communal amenity proposed across the development. Large residential lounge spaces with co-working facilities are provided across both ground floors allowing opportunities for social and communal gatherings. At upper levels, four winter-garden / lounge areas are proposed.

Taking this into consideration, the proposal is considered to provide sufficient amenity space on balance. Details of the internal and external amenity spaces would be secured by condition in the event of an approval.

PLAY SPACE

Policy S4 of the London Plan (2021) states that residential development proposals should incorporate good-quality, accessible play provision for all ages. At least 10 square metres of play space should be provided per child that:

- a) provides a stimulating environment
- b) can be accessed safely from the street by children and young people independently
- c) forms an integral part of the surrounding neighbourhood
- d) incorporates trees and/or other forms of greenery
- e) is overlooked to enable passive surveillance
- f) is not segregated by tenure

This is supported by the Mayor's supplementary planning guidance (SPG) 'Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation', which sets a benchmark of 10m² of useable child play space to be provided per child, with under-fives play space provided on-site as a minimum, and makes clear that play space should not be segregated by tenure.

Policies DMCI 5 and DMHB 19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) state:

- A) For all major development proposals, the Council will apply Hillingdon's child yields and the London Plan SPG; 'Providing for Children and Young Peoples Play and Informal Recreation', which specifies that 10sqm of play space should be provided for each child and an accessibility standard of 400 metres to equipped playgrounds.
- B) In areas of deficiency, there will be a requirement for new provision to be made to meet the benchmark standards for accessibility to play provision.
- C) The Council will resist the loss of existing play spaces unless:

- i) a replacement play space of equivalent size and functionality is provided to meet the needs of the local population. Where this is not possible, development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are over-riding planning merits to the proposal; and
- ii) it can be demonstrated robustly that they are no longer required and that their loss would not lead to a shortfall in overall play provision in the local area.

Paragraph 5.79 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that the Council's Open Space Strategy proposes an accessibility standard for children's playgrounds based on a 400 metre travel distance. Specifically, Pinkwell Park is located over 600 metres to the west of the site. Whilst Hillingdon contains approximately 100 equipped playgrounds within parks and other areas of open space, there are areas of deficiency in relation to the accessibility standard. One of the main areas of deficiency is located within Pinkwell, the ward for the application site.

Based on the Mayor's supplementary planning guidance (SPG) 'Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation', play space requirements is divided into 3 categories;

- age 0-4; door step play/within 100m;
- age 5-11 years; play within 400m of site;
- age 12+ years; play within 800m of site.

Based on the GLA Population Yield Calculator (v3.2), it is anticipated that the following numbers would be yielded from the proposed development:

- 22.3 no. children under the age of 5 years old;
- 14.7 no. children aged 5 to 11 years old; and
- 5.2 no. children aged 12 to 17 years old.

This yields a total of 42.2 children, requiring 421.9 square metres of play space.

Based on the plans submitted, it can be identified that approximately 950m² of play space is proposed, therefore exceeding the minimum requirements. Subject to a condition which secures acceptable detailing, the proposal accords with the requirements of Policy S4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DMCI 5 and DMHB 19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Policy G4 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should create areas of publicly accessible open space, particularly in areas of deficiency, where possible.

Policy EM4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) states that the Council will safeguard, enhance and extend the network of open spaces, informal recreational and environmental opportunities that operate as carbon sinks and that meet local community needs and facilitate active lifestyles by providing spaces within walking distance of homes. Provision should be made as close as possible to the community it will serve. There will be a presumption against any net loss of open space in the Borough. The Council will identify new opportunities for open space through an Open Space Strategy. Major developments will be expected to make appropriate contributions to the delivery of new opportunities, or to the improvement and enhancements of existing facilities.

Policy DMCI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

- A) Proposals for major new residential development will be supported where they make provision for new open space, or enhancements to existing open space, which meets the needs of the occupiers of the development and contributes to the mitigation of identified deficiencies in the

quantity, quality and accessibility of open space. Regard will be had to Hillingdon's local recommended standards of provision for all relevant typologies of open space.

B) The provision of major new pieces of open space should contribute positively to Hillingdon's existing networks of green spaces. In major town centre developments, new civic space may be required as an alternative to green open space.

C) Proposals for major new residential development that fail to make provision for new or enhanced open space, or which would result in open space that is inappropriate in type, quality or location, will be resisted.

In support of this, Table 7.1 states the following requirements:

- Quantity:

* a borough-wide quantity standard of 6.0 ha of unrestricted open space per 1,000 population.

* a borough-wide quantity standard of 2.0 ha of unrestricted "Recreational" open space per 1,000 population.

- Accessibility - All residents within the borough should have access to:

* A Small or Local (or higher level) open space within 400m of where they live; and

* A District (or higher level) open space within 1,200m of where they live; and where feasible:

* A Metropolitan open space within 3.2 km of where they live.

- Quality:

* All unrestricted open spaces to achieve a minimum quality score of 3 out of 5 by 2026.

Using a 20 square metres per person requirement (based on 2.0 ha per 1,000 people required by London Borough of Hillingdon Open Space Strategy 2011-2026 (July 2011)) and estimated 331 occupants (based on 2.67 average household size in Hillingdon (as of 2011 census) to reflect that they will never be full at the same time), the development should provide 6,620 square metres of publicly accessible open space.

The proposed plans indicate that no publicly accessible open space is to be provided.

If sufficient publicly accessible open space cannot be accommodated within the site, a financial contribution is required. In the context of the proposed development, it is considered appropriate that contributions are sought for the enhancement of existing public open space in Charville which is identified as a ward with insufficient open space (London Borough of Hillingdon Open Space Strategy 2011-2026 (July 2011)). Based on the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (July 2014), this is calculated as follows:

Contribution = (Build Costs + On-costs) x (- Existing Capacity)

In this context, these variables would equate to the following:

- Build Costs: £20 per square metre (capital costs for providing open space per person)

- On-costs: £5 per square metre (capital/revenue costs of establishment, maintenance and management for an initial period or in perpetuity)

- 'Standard Provision per person': 20 square metres per person (based on 2.0 ha per 1,000 people required by London Borough of Hillingdon Open Space Strategy 2011-2026 (July 2011))

- 'Occupancy of Development': 331 occupants (based on 2.67 average household size in Hillingdon (as of 2011 census) to reflect that they will never be full at the same time)

- Existing Capacity: 0 (zero)

Based on the proposed scheme, the financial contribution works out to the following:

$$((20+5) \times ((20 \times 331) - 0)) = \text{£}165,500$$

Subject to a Section 106 agreement securing a financial contribution in accordance with the above, the proposal would accord with Policy DMCI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy EM4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy G4 of the London Plan (2021).

7.10 Traffic impact, Car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The site is located off Park Lane and Hayes End Road. Based on TfL's WebCAT planning tool, the site has a low PTAL rating between 0, 1a and 1b.

The following planning policies are considered:

Policy DMT 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) Development proposals will be required to meet the transport needs of the development and address its transport impacts in a sustainable manner.

Policy DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that proposals must ensure that safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided, schemes do not contribute to the deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety of all road users and residents. Also that impacts on local amenity and congestion are minimised and there are suitable mitigation measures to address any traffic impacts in terms of capacity and functions of existing and committed roads.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) requires that proposals comply with the Council's parking standards in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity. This should be viewed in conjunction with Policies T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021).

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF (2023) states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. This is supported by Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021).

Residential Car Parking:

Policy T6.1, Table 10.3, of the London Plan (2021) states that sites in Outer London with a PTAL of 0 to 1 should provide up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling. The proposal for 124 units should therefore provide up to 186 car parking spaces. A total of 124 spaces are proposed, equalling 1 space per unit. This has been considered by the Council's Highways Authority and is accepted.

Disabled Person Car Parking:

Policy T6.5, Table 10.6, of the London Plan (2021) states that 5% of all car parking spaces should be provided as designated disabled persons parking bays and 5% should be provided as enlarged parking bays which are capable of being converted to disabled persons parking.

Based on the plans submitted, a total of 15 disabled persons parking spaces are proposed. This exceeds the 10% requirement and is accepted by the Council's Highways Authority.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points:

Policy T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) requires that all residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. At least 20 per cent of spaces should have active charging facilities, with passive provision for all remaining spaces.

The information submitted includes a commitment to accord with this requirement. In the event of an approval, compliance would be secured by planning condition.

Cycle Parking:

Policy T5 of the London Plan (2021) outlines the following cycle parking requirements:

- Long-stay:
 - 1 space per studio or 1 person 1 bedroom dwelling
 - 1.5 spaces per 2 person 1 bedroom dwelling
 - 2 spaces per all other dwellings

- Short-stay:
 - 5 to 40 dwellings: 2 spaces
 - Thereafter: 1 space per 40 dwellings

Based on the above requirements, the proposal should be providing 203 long stay spaces and 4 short stay spaces. The development would accord with these requirements. In the event of an approval, the detail of such provision would be secured by planning condition.

Parking Management Plan:

In the event of an approval, a Parking Management Plan would be secured by planning condition, ensuring that spaces are allocated appropriately, are not sold and that the multi storey car park will not be available to future occupiers.

Trip Generation:

To support the proposal the applicant has provided a Transport Assessment. This document provides information upon trip generation with the site in its existing as offices and as the site redeveloped for housing. To determine number of trip rates associated with the site, the applicant has interrogated the TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) database. The sites selected for comparison purposes have been reviewed and are considered representative. The developer reports that the office development would have generated approximately 121no. two-way car driver trips in the AM Peak 08:00 to 09:00h and 957no. movements daily. The proposed residential use would reduce AM Peak two-way car driver movement to 36no. and 345no. movements daily. The reductions in trips is considered favourably.

Access:

The site has 2no. vehicular points of vehicular access, from the east via Park Lane and from the west from Hayes End Road. In addition, pedestrians and cyclists would be able to access the site from Park Lane Road and Mead House Lane.

Highways Improvements:

Policy T1 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should facilitate the

'delivery of the Mayor's strategic target of 80 per cent of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041'.

Policy T4, part C, of the London Plan (2021) states that where appropriate, mitigation, either through direct provision of public transport, walking and cycling facilities and highways improvements or through financial contributions, will be required to address adverse transport impacts that are identified.

The proposed development would be situated in a location remote from public transport, shops, services and facilities. The absence of public transport travel opportunities is confirmed by the sites PTAL rating of zero. The characteristics of the site indicate that there would be a significant reliance upon the private car for trip making, whether this is driving to work or making a short trip to a local shop to collect essential groceries. Whilst the development would generate fewer private car movements than the previous use the private car mode share would be far higher compared to other residential development situated in areas better serviced by public transport and within convenient walking or cycling distance of local shops, service and facilities. The proposal would also generate trips to new destinations such as the local school whereas the former office use did not. It is set against this background that the Highway Authority requires a developer contribution for investment in Healthy Streets measures. The developer contribution sought would be in pursuance of this Policy with it being used to improve the attractiveness, safety and convenience of trip making by public transport, walking and cycling in turn increasing the share of these modes. All of the works to be delivered would be to improve the existing infrastructure, it would add value and not be day to day maintenance.

A £247,040 financial contribution has been agreed with the Applicant to facilitate more sustainable forms of travel. In the event of an approval, this sum will be secured by a Section 106 legal agreement.

Parking Permits:

In the event of an approval, a Section 106 obligation will ensure that the residents of this development will not be eligible for parking permits within the Parking Management Areas and Council car parks in the vicinity of the site, apart from Blue Badge holders and a charge made against the site to ensure the future buyers are aware of the parking restrictions.

Travel Plan:

In the event of an approval, a Travel Plan would be secured by legal agreement.

Construction Logistics Plan and Service Delivery Plan:

In the event of an approval, a Construction Logistics Plan, and Delivery and Servicing Plan would be secured by planning condition.

Summary:

Subject to the necessary planning conditions and obligations, the proposed development would not be considered to prejudice conditions on the local highways network, in accordance with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2, DMT 5 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policies T4 and T7 of the London Plan (2021).

7.11 Urban design, access and security

URBAN DESIGN

Please see Section 07.07 of the report.

ACCESS

Please see Section 07.12 of the report.

SECURITY

Policy DMHB 15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that the Council will require all new development to ensure safe and attractive public and private spaces by referring to the Council's latest guidance on Secured by Design principles. Where relevant, these should be included in the Design and Access Statement. Development will be required to comprise good design and create inclusive environments whilst improving safety and security by incorporating the following specific measures:

- i) providing entrances in visible, safe and accessible locations;
- ii) maximising natural surveillance;
- iii) ensuring adequate defensible space is provided;
- iv) providing clear delineations between public and private spaces; and
- v) providing appropriate lighting and CCTV.

This is supported by Policy D11 of the London Plan (2021).

The Metropolitan Police Service have been consulted and they have made a number of comments and confirmed that they raise no objection to the proposals. Specifically, the Metropolitan Police Service Officer comments that there is a requirement for the site to have a secure perimeter due to the isolated nature of the buildings. It is noted that the site will need to be made secure with a perimeter fence or planting (e.g. brambles etc) with access control gates that only provide access to residents. This is proposed to be resolved through securing a detailed landscape scheme by planning condition.

If recommended for approval, a secure by design condition would be attached to achieve appropriate accreditation.

Subject to the necessary planning conditions, the proposal would accord with Policy DMHB 15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) and Policy D11 of the London Plan (2021).

7.12 Disabled access

Policy D5 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. They should:

- 1) be designed taking into account London's diverse population;
- 2) provide high quality people focused spaces that are designed to facilitate social interaction and inclusion;
- 3) be convenient and welcoming with no disabling barriers, providing independent access without additional undue effort, separation or special treatment;
- 4) be able to be entered, used and exited safely, easily and with dignity for all; and
- 5) be designed to incorporate safe and dignified emergency evacuation for all building users. In all developments where lifts are installed, as a minimum at least one lift per core (or more subject to

capacity assessments) should be a suitably sized fire evacuation lift suitable to be used to evacuate people who require level access from the building.

Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) states:

A) To provide suitable housing and genuine choice for London's diverse population, including disabled people, older people and families with young children, residential development must ensure that:

- 1) at least 10 per cent of dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'
- 2) all other dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.

A total 16 units (12.9%) of homes are proposed to comply with M4(3) standards and the remaining 108 units (87%) are proposed to comply with M4(2) standards. The Council's Access Officer has reviewed the details submitted and raised no objection. A condition is recommended to secure this provision.

In the event of an approval, details to demonstrate that all external areas and amenity areas would be accessible to older and disabled people, including wheelchair users, would be secured by planning condition. Details of accessible play equipment for disabled children, including those with a sensory impairment, or complex multiple disabilities, would also be secured by condition.

Subject to condition, the proposal would accord with Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan (2021).

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Paragraph 66 of the NPPF (2023) states that major residential development should expect at least 10% of the total number of homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development:

- a) provides solely for Build to Rent homes;
- b) provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students);
- c) is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or
- d) is exclusively for affordable housing, a community-led development exception site or a rural exception site.

It is noted that none of the exemptions listed above are applicable to the application proposal and as such, at least 10% of the total number of homes should be made available for affordable home ownership.

As per Policy DMH 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2020) and Policies H5 and H6 of the London Plan (2021), the development will need to provide affordable housing. Policy DMH 7 states that development with a capacity to provide 10 or more units will be required to maximise the delivery of on-site affordable housing. Subject to viability, and if appropriate in all circumstances, a minimum of 35% of all new homes on sites of 10 or more units should be delivered as affordable housing, with a tenure split of 70% social/affordable rent and 30% intermediate, as set out in Policy H2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012).

Where an application does not meet the requirements set out in Policy H5, Part C, of the London Plan (2021) it must follow the viability tested route. Policy H4, Part B, of the London Plan (2021) also states that affordable housing should be provided on site and only provide off-site or as a cash in lieu contribution in exceptional circumstances. This is supported by Policy DMH 7.

The Planning Statement submitted makes the case that there are clear inherent constraints on this site which restricts the viability of residential development on this site. The Grade II* listed status of Hayes Park Central and South, alongside its Green Belt designation, removes the possibility of extending the building to deliver more units and improving viability. It is agreed that extending the buildings would not be considered appropriate in this context. It is also agreed that delivering a residential scheme in Grade II* listed buildings will necessitate higher construction costs than is typical for a residential scheme which is not constrained by heritage considerations.

The scheme has been subject to viability testing by the Council's third party consultants and the Greater London Authority. Following such assessment, it has been concluded that a scheme generates a deficit but is within the range of deliverability when accounting for growth within the market. Despite this, the developer has also made a 'without prejudice' 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer. This offer increases the deficit generated by the scheme and reduces its viability and deliverability. It is therefore concluded that this offer would represent the maximum viable affordable housing provision possible, within the agreed range of deliverability. It would also accord with paragraph 66 of the NPPF (2023) which requires that at least 10% of homes proposed should be delivered as affordable.

In the event of an approval, it is recommended that the 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer is secured by legal agreement and includes Early and Late Stage Viability Review mechanism as defined by Policy H5 of the London Plan (2021). All reasonable endeavours should be made to secure a Registered Provider to take on the affordable units. Should all reasonable endeavours fail, the obligation shall secure the payment of a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing.

7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

TREES AND LANDSCAPING

Policy G1 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into London's wider green infrastructure network. Notably, Policy G5 of the London Plan (2021) requires that major development proposals contribute to the greening of London by including urban greening as a fundamental element of site and building design, and by incorporating measures such as high-quality landscaping (including trees), green roofs, green walls and nature-based sustainable drainage. This is supported by Policy DMEI 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) also require that new development is high quality, sustainable, adaptable, and harmonises with the local context. Landscaping and tree planting should enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to provide a landscape scheme that includes hard and soft landscaping appropriate to the character of the area, which supports and enhances biodiversity and amenity particularly in areas deficient in green infrastructure.

The site is covered by Tree Protection Order 24. A total of three category C trees are proposed to

be removed and a total of 25 semi-mature trees are proposed to be planted in the landscaped amenity areas. This aspect of the proposal is supported.

The principle of a pastoral meadow landscape with soft routes through the landscape is supported. The various mowing regimes for each area of the grassland paths need to be shown to ensure the landscape intent expressed in the Design and Access Statement is delivered. In the event of an approval, this would be secured as part of the landscape maintenance schedule to be secured by planning condition.

Notably, the Hayes Park Central and South buildings are constrained by their designated Grade II* listed status. As such, it would not be appropriate to provide green roofs or walls as part of the proposals due to the harm they would pose to the significance of the buildings.

Subject to a condition which secures a detailed landscape scheme, the development is considered to accord with relevant planning policies.

URBAN GREENING FACTOR

Policy G5 of the London Plan (2021) states:

- a. Major development proposals should contribute to the greening of London by including urban greening as a fundamental element of site and building design, and by incorporating measures such as high-quality landscaping (including trees), green roofs, green walls and nature-based sustainable drainage.
- b. Boroughs should develop an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) to identify the appropriate amount of urban greening required in new developments. The UGF should be based on the factors set out in Table 8.2, but tailored to local circumstances. In the interim, the Mayor recommends a target score of 0.4 for developments that are predominately residential, and a target score of 0.3 for predominately commercial development.

The information submitted confirms that the proposed development achieves a score of 0.32 which falls slightly below the target score.

The total site area used to calculate the Urban Greening Factor (UGF) is based on the planning boundary, which includes areas of parking and estate roads, adding approx. 7000m² of area not intended for development. The total site area used does not fairly represent the 'development area' and therefore is the reason for the lower UGF value. Using a 'development boundary' as the total site area which omits the car park to the west, and the estate roads, the UGF scores 0.39. Given the high design quality of the proposed scheme, this UGF score is accepted on balance.

ECOLOGY

The Environment Act 2021 has established that all planning permissions granted in England have to deliver at least 10% BNG from January 2024. It is noted that this is applicable to schemes submitted from January 2024 onwards. As this application was submitted prior to this date, this requirement is a material consideration but cannot be strictly enforced.

Paragraph 180 of the NPPF (2023) states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. This is supported by Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy EM7 of the

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2012) and Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

Policy DMEI 7 also notes that if development is proposed on or near to a site considered to have features of ecological or geological value (e.g. a SINC), appropriate surveys and assessments must be submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause harm to these sites, as proposals that cause significant harm to biodiversity which cannot be avoided, mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, will normally be refused. In this regard, Policy DMEI 6 sets out that new developments adjacent to SINC's should incorporate measures to ensure the proposal assimilates into surrounding area.

The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations. The Hayes Shrub site of importance for nature conservation (SINC) is, however, located a short distance to the north-east of the site within the parkland setting. The extent of the development proposals are contained within the site boundary and direct impacts on nearby designated sites are considered to be unlikely. The main impacts will be during construction. In the event of an approval, a Construction Environment Management Plan will be secured by condition.

Bat Surveys have been undertaken at the application site and these have confirmed that no bat roosts were identified. Low levels of foraging and community activity were recorded on site at the time of the survey for four common bat species. No mitigation measures in relation to bats are required, however, measures to enhance the site for both roosting and foraging is required.

The Biodiversity Impact Assessment submitted states that the proposals would result in a net increase of 72.70% increase in ecological value and 10.27% increase in hedgerow units. As such, no further information is required.

Subject to conditions, including the securement of an ecological management and enhancement plan to maximise net gains in biodiversity, the proposal is considered to accord with the NPPF (2023), Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy EM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Policy EM11 of the Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) requires all new development to address waste management at all stages of a development's life from design and construction through to the end use and activity on site, ensuring that all waste is managed towards the upper end of the waste hierarchy.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that:
D) Development proposals should make sufficient provision for well designed internal and external storage space for general, recycling and organic waste, with suitable access for collection. External bins should be located and screened to avoid nuisance and adverse visual impacts to occupiers and neighbours.

Refuse stores are located on the north-eastern corner of the ground floors of each building where vehicular access is possible within the estate and where they would have the least visual impact. The stores are accessed via the central core through a protected lobby. These stores are considered to be sufficiently accessible and are accepted by the Council's Waste Strategy Officer. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to accord with Policy EM11 of the Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMHB 11, part D), of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

CIRCULAR ECONOMY

Policy EM11 of the Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) requires all new development to address waste management at all stages of a development's life from design and construction through to the end use and activity on site, ensuring that all waste is managed towards the upper end of the waste hierarchy.

Policy SI 7, Part B, of the London Plan (2021) states that referable applications should promote circular economy outcomes and aim to be net zero-waste. A Circular Economy Statement should be submitted, to demonstrate:

- 1) how all materials arising from demolition and remediation works will be re-used and/or recycled
- 2) how the proposal's design and construction will reduce material demands and enable building materials, components and products to be disassembled and re-used at the end of their useful life
- 3) opportunities for managing as much waste as possible on site
- 4) adequate and easily accessible storage space and collection systems to support recycling and re-use
- 5) how much waste the proposal is expected to generate, and how and where the waste will be managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy
- 6) how performance will be monitored and reported.

A Circular Economy Statement has been submitted and is considered by LBH Planning Officers to be acceptable. A post-construction circular economy monitoring report would be secured by planning condition. Subject to such a condition, the proposed development would accord with Policy SI 7 of the London Plan (2021).

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

CO2 EMISSIONS

Policy DMEI 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) requires that:

- A) All developments make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with London Plan targets;
- B) All major development proposals must be accompanied by an energy assessment showing how these reductions will be achieved;
- C) Proposals that fail to take reasonable steps to achieve the required savings will be resisted. However, if the Council is minded to approve the application despite not meeting the carbon reduction targets, then it will seek an off-site contribution to make up for the shortfall. The contribution will be sought at a flat rate at of £/tonne over the lifetime of the development, in accordance with the current 'allowable solutions cost'.

This is supported by Policy EM1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012).

Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021) states that major development should be net zero-carbon, in accordance with the energy hierarchy: Be lean: use less energy and manage demand during operation; Be clean: exploit local energy resources (such as secondary heat) and supply energy efficiently and cleanly; Be green: maximise opportunities for renewable energy by producing, storing and using renewable energy on-site; and Be seen: monitor, verify and report on energy performance.

The Energy Strategy for the development is to utilise air source heat pumps and 996.2m² of PV panels. The PV panels will not be visible when viewed from ground level and is considered to be

appropriately sensitive to the significance of the Grade II* Listed Buildings. Following the energy hierarchy, all measures accumulate to achieve an 85.5% improvement over Part L for the development. Given that there is a zero-carbon requirement for the residential development, the applicant has made a commitment to ensure the shortfall is met via payment to the Hillingdon's carbon offset fund. If recommended for approval, a Section 106 legal obligation will secure £137,527 at a cost of £95 per tonne of carbon over a 30-year period.

Subject to the condition and Section 106 planning obligation, the proposed development would not be considered contrary to Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021), Policy EM1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DME1 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

WHOLE LIFE-CYCLE CARBON

Policy SI 2, Part F, of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals referable to the Mayor should calculate whole life-cycle carbon emissions through a nationally recognised Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions taken to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions.

The applicant has submitted a Whole Life-Cycle Carbon (WLC) assessment. If recommended for approval, a condition would secure the submission of a post-construction assessment to report on the development's actual WLC emissions. Subject to such a condition, the proposal would accord with Policy SI 2, Part F, of the London Plan (2021).

ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

Policy SI 3 of the London Plan (2021) states that major development proposals within Heat Network Priority Areas should have a communal low-temperature heating system:

- 1) the heat source for the communal heating system should be selected in accordance with the following heating hierarchy:
 - a) connect to local existing or planned heat networks
 - b) use zero-emission or local secondary heat sources (in conjunction with heat pump, if required)
 - c) use low-emission combined heat and power (CHP) (only where there is a case for CHP to enable the delivery of an area-wide heat network, meet the development's electricity demand and provide demand response to the local electricity network)
 - d) use ultra-low NO_x gas boilers
- 2) CHP and ultra-low NO_x gas boiler communal or district heating systems should be designed to ensure that they meet the requirements in Part B of Policy SI 1 Improving air quality
- 3) where a heat network is planned but not yet in existence the development should be designed to allow for the cost-effective connection at a later date.

The information submitted states that there are no existing or planned district energy networks within feasible vicinity of the site that would enable a connection to the development, nor are there currently any feasible future connections planned. In the event of an approval, a planning condition would be secured to ensure that the development will connect to a district heating network should one become available in future and should it be viable to do so. Subject to such a condition, the development would comply with Policy SI 3 of the London Plan (2021).

OVERHEATING

Policy SI 4 of the London Plan (2021) states:

- A) Development proposals should minimise adverse impacts on the urban heat island through design, layout, orientation, materials and the incorporation of green infrastructure.
- B) Major development proposals should demonstrate through an energy strategy how they will reduce the potential for internal overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems in accordance with the following cooling hierarchy:
- 1) reduce the amount of heat entering a building through orientation, shading, high albedo materials, fenestration, insulation and the provision of green infrastructure;
 - 2) minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design;
 - 3) manage the heat within the building through exposed internal thermal mass and high ceilings;
 - 4) provide passive ventilation;
 - 5) provide mechanical ventilation; and
 - 6) provide active cooling systems.

As set out in the Energy Statement, the London Plan cooling hierarchy has been used to assess the risk of overheating in the flats proposed. Whilst Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery is provided, there is also a natural ventilation strategy possible and a number of units have dual aspect to allow for cross ventilation. It is considered that the information submitted is sufficient for the planning application stage of the process, subject to further detail being submitted at a later date. In the event of an approval, the final details of the Overheating Strategy shall be secured by condition. Subject to such a condition, the proposal would accord with Policy SI 4 of the London Plan (2021).

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021) requires that development proposals ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated. Policy SI 13 of the London Plan (2021) also requires that development proposals utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible. This is supported by Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policies DMEI 9 and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020). Notably, proposals that fail to make appropriate provision of flood risk and surface water flooding mitigation will be refused.

According to the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Map, the site is located within Flood Zone 1, indicating that the site is at a low risk of flooding. The Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of this application, demonstrates that there is generally a low risk of flooding from most sources, although there is some scope for groundwater flooding at below ground level and recommends steps should be taken to mitigate any groundwater flooding risk to basement areas. The Drainage Strategy Report confirms the discharge of surface water into the sewers and proposes the use of attenuation tanks.

The development incorporates green infrastructure and SuDS features into the proposed drainage strategy. It is considered that the information submitted is sufficient for the planning application stage of the process, subject to further detail being submitted at a later date. Subject to appropriately worded planning conditions, the proposed development would comply with Policies DMEI 9 and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policies SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021).

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Policy SI 5 of the London Plan (2021) states:

C) Development proposals should:

- 1) through the use of Planning Conditions minimise the use of mains water in line with the Optional Requirement of the Building Regulations (residential development), achieving mains water consumption of 105 litres or less per head per day (excluding allowance of up to five litres for external water consumption)
- 3) incorporate measures such as smart metering, water saving and recycling measures, including retrofitting, to help to achieve lower water consumption rates and to maximise future-proofing

E) Development proposals should:

- 1) seek to improve the water environment and ensure that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is provided
- 2) take action to minimise the potential for misconnections between foul and surface water networks.

During the consultation process, Thames Water provided comments requesting that any grant of permission secures a planning condition ensuring that either:

1. All surface water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or-
2. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied.

Subject to the necessary planning conditions, the proposed development would accord with Policy SI 5 of the London Plan (2021).

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

NOISE

Policy D13 of the London Plan (2021) places the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise and other nuisance-generating activities or uses on the proposed new noise-sensitive development. Development should be designed to ensure that established noise and other nuisance-generating uses remain viable and can continue or grow without unreasonable restrictions being placed on them.

Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021) states that in order to reduce, manage and mitigate noise to improve health and quality of life, residential and other non-aviation development proposals should manage noise by:

- 1) avoiding significant adverse noise impacts on health and quality of life
- 2) reflecting the Agent of Change principle as set out in Policy D13 Agent of Change
- 3) mitigating and minimising the existing and potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, as a result of, or in the vicinity of new development without placing unreasonable restrictions on existing noise-generating uses
- 4) improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes (including Quiet Areas and spaces of relative tranquillity)
- 5) separating new noise-sensitive development from major noise sources (such as road, rail, air transport and some types of industrial use) through the use of distance, screening, layout, orientation, uses and materials - in preference to sole reliance on sound insulation
- 6) where it is not possible to achieve separation of noise-sensitive development and noise sources

without undue impact on other sustainable development objectives, then any potential adverse effects should be controlled and mitigated through applying good acoustic design principles
7) promoting new technologies and improved practices to reduce noise at source, and on the transmission path from source to receiver.

This is supported by Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

A Noise Assessment has been submitted and assessed by the Council's Noise Specialist. It is considered that sufficient information has been provided to conclude that the development would achieve a sufficient and acceptable noise environment for future occupants. Subject to a condition ensuring compliance with the necessary noise limits, the proposal would accord with Policies D13 and D14 of the London Plan (2021), Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

AIR QUALITY

Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) states that the Council will seek to safeguard and improve all land, water, air and noise quality. All development should not cause deterioration in the local air quality levels and should ensure the protection of both existing and new sensitive receptors. Policy SI 1 of the London Plan (2021) further supports this.

Policy DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) Development proposals should demonstrate appropriate reductions in emissions to sustain compliance with and contribute towards meeting EU limit values and national air quality objectives for pollutants.

B) Development proposals should, as a minimum:

- i) be at least "air quality neutral";
- ii) include sufficient mitigation to ensure there is no unacceptable risk from air pollution to sensitive receptors, both existing and new; and
- iii) actively contribute towards the improvement of air quality, especially within the Air Quality Management Area.

The application site is located within the Hillingdon Air Quality Management Area and a short distance to the north of the Uxbridge Road Air Quality Focus Area. The proposed development, due to its size and location, will add to current exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide annual mean limit value within this sensitive area as a result of traffic emissions. The proposal is also not air quality neutral in terms of traffic emissions.

As advised by the Council's Air Quality Officer, the level of mitigation required for traffic emissions associated with the proposed development is £363,583. Planning conditions pertaining to a Low Emission Strategy and control of Non-Road Mobile Machinery are also required. The Applicant Team has agreed to pay the financial contribution and comply with the necessary planning conditions. Subject to such planning obligations and conditions, the proposal would accord with Policy DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) and Policy SI 1 of the London Plan (2021).

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

Please see Section 06.1 of the report.

7.20 Planning obligations

Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

A) To ensure development is sustainable, planning permission will only be granted for development that clearly demonstrates there will be sufficient infrastructure of all types to support it. Infrastructure requirements will be predominantly addressed through the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

B) Planning obligations will be sought on a scheme-by-scheme basis:

i) to secure the provision of affordable housing in relation to residential development schemes;

ii) where a development has infrastructure needs that are not addressed through CIL; and

iii) to ensure that development proposals provide or fund improvements to mitigate site specific impacts made necessary by the proposal.

C) Applications that fail to secure an appropriate Planning Obligation to make the proposal acceptable will be refused.

The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 2010 (Regulations issued Pursuant to the 2008 Act) and the NPPF have put three tests on the use of planning obligations into law. It is unlawful (since 6th April 2010) to request planning obligations that do not meet the following tests:

i. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms

ii. directly related to the development, and

iii. fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development

The effect of the Regulations is that the Council must apply the tests much more strictly and is only to ask for planning obligations that are genuinely necessary and directly related to a development. Should planning obligations be requested that do not meet the policy tests the Council would have acted unlawfully and could be subject to a High Court challenge.

On the basis of the NPPF and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 2010, it is only considered reasonable to request contributions towards the following:

i) Affordable Housing: Planning obligation for on-site provision of 12 no. Shared Ownership units (equal to 10% of all units by habitable room), comprising 2 x 3 bed units, 4 x 2 bed units and 6 x 1 bed units. This shall include an Early and Late Stage Viability Review mechanism as defined by Policy H5 of the London Plan (2021). All reasonable endeavours should be made to secure a Registered Provider to take on the affordable units. Should all reasonable endeavours fail, the obligation shall secure the payment of a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing.

ii) HUDU Health Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £7,409 shall be paid to the Council for the enhancement of health infrastructure provision.

ii) Public Open Space: A financial contribution amounting to £165,500 shall be paid to the Council for the enhancement of existing public open space in the borough.

iii) Carbon Offset Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £137,527 shall be paid to the Council's carbon offset fund. Any additional shortfall identified through the ongoing reporting required by Condition shall form a cash in lieu contribution to the Council in accordance with Policy SI2 of the London Plan (2021) at a rate of £95/tCO₂ annualised for not more than 30 years beginning on the commencement of development. .

iv) Air Quality Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £363,583 shall be paid to address the air quality impacts of the proposed development.

v) Travel Plan: A full Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan will include such matters as: targets for sustainable travel arrangements; effective measures for the ongoing monitoring of the Travel Plan; and a commitment to delivering the Travel Plan objectives.

vi) Active Travel Zone Improvement Works Contribution: A financial contribution amounting to £247,040 shall be paid to the Council for the implementation of active travel zone improvement works.

vii) Parking Permit Restriction: The residents of this development will not to be eligible for parking permits within the Parking Management Areas and Council car parks in the vicinity of the site, apart from Blue Badge holders and a charge made against the site to ensure the future buyers are aware of the parking restrictions.

viii) Employment Strategy and Construction Training: Details shall be in accordance with the Council Planning Obligations SPD with the preference being for an in-kind scheme to be delivered. Securing an Employment/Training Strategy Agreement is the Council's priority. A financial contribution will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances.

ix) Project Management & Monitoring Fee: A financial contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions secured from the scheme to enable the management and monitoring of the resultant agreement.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Please be advised that as from 1 April 2012, all planning approvals for schemes with a net additional internal floor area of 100m² or more will be liable for the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (Mayoral CIL), as legislated by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011. The liability payable will be equal to £60 per square metre (from April 2019). The London Borough of Hillingdon is a collecting authority for the Mayor of London and this liability shall be paid to LBH in the first instance.

In addition the development represents Chargeable Development under the Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy, which came into effect on 1st August 2014.

The liability payable is as follows:

Hillingdon CIL: £1,662,628.27

Mayoral CIL: £754,149.09

Total: £2,416,777.36

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable.

7.22 Other Issues

DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY

Policy SI 6 of the London Plan (2021) states:

A) To ensure London's global competitiveness now and in the future, development proposals should:

- 1) ensure that sufficient ducting space for full fibre connectivity infrastructure is provided to all end users within new developments, unless an affordable alternative 1GB/s-capable connection is made available to all end users
- 2) meet expected demand for mobile connectivity generated by the development
- 3) take appropriate measures to avoid reducing mobile connectivity in surrounding areas; where that is not possible, any potential reduction would require mitigation
- 4) support the effective use of rooftops and the public realm (such as street furniture and bins) to accommodate well-designed and suitably located mobile digital infrastructure.

A planning condition would ensure that sufficient ducting space for full fibre connectivity infrastructure is provided within the development. Subject to the recommended condition, the proposed development would accord with Policy SI 6 of the London Plan (2021).

CONTAMINATED LAND

Policy DMEI 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that:

A) Proposals for development on potentially contaminated sites will be expected to be accompanied by at least an initial study of the likely contaminants. The Council will support planning permission for any development of land which is affected by contamination where it can be demonstrated that contamination issues have been adequately assessed and the site can be safely remediated so that the development can be made suitable for the proposed use.

B) Conditions will be imposed where planning permission is given for development on land affected by contamination to ensure all the necessary remedial works are implemented, prior to commencement of development.

C) Where initial studies reveal potentially harmful levels of contamination, either to human health or controlled waters and other environmental features, full intrusive ground investigations and remediation proposals will be expected prior to any approvals.

D) In some instances, where remedial works relate to an agreed set of measures such as the management of ongoing remedial systems, or remediation of adjoining or other affected land, a S106 planning obligation will be sought.

The Council's Contamination Officer considers that the proposal is acceptable subject to a planning condition requiring details of a remediation strategy. Subject to such a condition, the proposal is not considered contrary to Policy DMEI 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020).

FIRE SAFETY

Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021) states that all major development proposals should be submitted with a Fire Statement, which is an independent fire strategy, produced by a third party, suitably qualified assessor. The statement should detail how the development proposal will function in terms of:

- 1) the building's construction: methods, products and materials used, including manufacturers' details
- 2) the means of escape for all building users: suitably designed stair cores, escape for building users who are disabled or require level access, and associated evacuation strategy approach

- 3) features which reduce the risk to life: fire alarm systems, passive and active fire safety measures and associated management and maintenance plans
- 4) access for fire service personnel and equipment: how this will be achieved in an evacuation situation, water supplies, provision and positioning of equipment, firefighting lifts, stairs and lobbies, any fire suppression and smoke ventilation systems proposed, and the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of these
- 5) how provision will be made within the curtilage of the site to enable fire appliances to gain access to the building
- 6) ensuring that any potential future modifications to the building will take into account and not compromise the base build fire safety/protection measures.

A fire statement has been prepared by a fire engineer who is a member of the Institution of Fire Engineers. GLA Officers have commented that they are satisfied that the fire statement has been prepared by a third party, suitably qualified assessor, as required by Policy D12 and the Fire Safety LPG and Policy D5. In order to comply with Policy D12, the applicant should submit further detail on a fire engineered arrangements they are proposing to adopt to mitigate the travel distances being exceeded.

A final fire strategy will be secured by condition if recommended for approval and will need to be assessed by a suitably qualified Fire Safety Specialist. The discharge of condition application should be accompanied by a Building Control application. Subject to such a condition, the proposal would accord with Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021).

HEALTH

Paragraph 96 of the NPPF (2023) states that planning decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which:

c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs.

Paragraph 97 of the NPPF (2023) states that planning decisions should:

b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community.

Policy GG3 of the London Plan (2021) states that in order to improve Londoners' health and reduce health inequalities, those involved in planning and development must:

a) ensure that the wider determinants of health are addressed in an integrated and co-ordinated way, taking a systematic approach to improving the mental and physical health of all Londoners and reducing health inequalities

b) assess the potential impacts of development proposals and Development Plans on the mental and physical health and wellbeing of communities, in order to mitigate any potential negative impacts, maximise potential positive impacts, and help reduce health inequalities

c) plan for appropriate health and care infrastructure to address the needs of London's changing and growing population

Policy CI1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) states that the Council will ensure that community and social infrastructure is provided in Hillingdon to cater for the needs of the existing community and future populations.

Paragraph 7.2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) also states that there is a particularly

pressing need in the Borough for additional health care facilities to address higher than expected birth rates and an increase in the older population.

The floorspace occupied by affordable housing qualifies for relief from Community Infrastructure Levy. Under the scheme proposed, a total of 12 no. Shared Ownership units (equal to 10% of all units by habitable room) are proposed, comprising 2 x 3 bed units, 4 x 2 bed units and 6 x 1 bed units. Accordingly, the HUDU Planning Contributions Model has been used to assess the health service requirements and cost impacts of the affordable housing units. A financial contribution amounting to £7,409 has been calculated and would be secured as part of the Section 106 legal agreement in the event of an approval.

INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT

Policy D2 of the London Plan (2021) states that an unallocated site that may cause planned infrastructure capacity to be exceeded might need to provide additional infrastructure proportionate to the development. This can only be identified through an infrastructure assessment during the planning application process.

In respect of the impact upon infrastructure, the proposal will generate Hillingdon and Mayoral CIL contributions to fund the provision of infrastructure. A comprehensive set of planning obligations are also to be secured by a Section 106 legal agreement if recommended for approval. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy D2 of the London Plan (2021).

8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

General

Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

Planning Obligations

Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to

make the development acceptable in planning terms. The obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances.

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable

10. CONCLUSION

The proposed change of use of the Grade II* Listed Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South office buildings (Use Class E) to 124 residential flats (Use Class C3) is considered to be acceptable in principle. The loss of the offices and employment floorspace is considered to be acceptable in this circumstance and the proposed residential use of brownfield land is generally supported.

The scheme has been subject to viability testing and the developer has also made a 'without prejudice' 10% shared ownership affordable housing offer. This is proposed to be secured by a S106 legal agreement with Early and Late Stage Viability Review mechanisms.

The harm posed to the Grade II* Listed buildings is considered to be 'less than substantial harm' and the public benefits associated with the proposal are considered to cumulatively surmount the harm.

Planning obligations are proposed to secure affordable housing provisions, a HUDU health contribution, public open space contribution, carbon offset contribution, air quality mitigation contribution, a full travel plan, active travel zone improvement works, parking permit restriction, employment strategy and construction training.

Subject to the planning conditions and obligations recommended, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle and with respect to density, heritage significance, airport safeguarding, green belt, character and appearance, neighbour amenity, living conditions, traffic,

highway safety, urban design, access, security, affordable housing, trees, landscaping, ecology, waste, energy, sustainability, flooding and drainage, noise, air quality, digital connectivity, contaminated land, fire safety, health, and infrastructure.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the reasons outlined within the main body of the report, this application is considered to comply with the Development Plan and is recommended for approval, subject to securing the necessary planning conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement.

11. Reference Documents

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

National Design Guide (2021)

National Model Design Code (2021)

The London Plan (March 2021)

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

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

Accessible Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document (September 2017)

Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (July 2014)

Hillingdon Townscape Characterisation Study (November 2013)

Contact Officer:

Michael Briginshaw

Telephone No:

01895 250230