

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	2
3. PLANNING HISTORY	3
4. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	5
5. POLICY ASSESSMENT	7
6. CONCLUSION	21

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement is produced to support a planning application for the erection of two light industrial units following the demolition of an existing building at Scotch Lake Farm, Moor Lane, Harmondsworth, UB7 0AP.
- 1.2 This planning statement will cover the background to the application and provide the necessary information to enable its determination by officers at the Council. It will consider the proposal in light of relevant planning policies and other material considerations. The conclusion reached is that key material considerations, and the wider objectives of National and Local planning policy, support the grant of permission.
- 1.3 In addition to this planning statement, the application is accompanied by the appropriate planning application forms and ownership certificate, duly signed and completed, and the following documents prepared by Bhatti's Group:
- 1:2500 Site Location Plan
 - 1:200 Existing Site Plan
 - 1:200 Proposed Site Plan
 - 1:50 Proposed Roof Plan
 - 1:50 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - 1:50 Proposed Elevations
- 1.4 The relevant application fee will be submitted by the applicant separately.

2. Site Location and Description

- 2.1 The application site comprises 0.37ha of rectangular-shaped former agricultural land currently occupied by one bungalow, a stable building, as well as buildings in use as offices and light industrial.
- 2.2 Planning history dictates that the site lawfully comprises of a chalet style bungalow (which has no agricultural occupancy condition), alongside a Class B1 light industrial and Class E office buildings.
- 2.3 The building which is proposed to be demolished within this application is shown below for clarity.



- 2.4 The site is bounded to the south by a footpath and the Swan Lake. Accommodation Lane runs to the northwest whereas The Duke of Northumberland River runs to the east. The site is linked from the Harmondsworth by a locally listed bridge over the adjoining river.
- 2.5 The site lies within the designated Green Belt, whilst the surrounding area comprises a mix of residential and commercial uses.
- 2.6 The site lies within the Colne Valley Regional Park and the Heathrow Archaeological Priority Zone (APZ); whilst the site also adjoins the Harmondsworth Village Conservation Area. The site is located within Flood Zone 1.

3. Planning History

- 3.1 A range of previous planning applications have been made at Scotch Lake Farm. The applications that are relevant to this submission are discussed below.

Application 19327/B/77/0654

- 3.2 Application 19327/B/77/0654 was approved for the erection of a bungalow on the site. This application was approved on the 11/05/1977.

- 3.3 The proposed bungalow was approved for an agricultural occupancy condition (condition 12), which limited who could live and reside in the dwelling.

Application 19327/APP/2000/1029

- 3.4 Application 19327/APP/2000/1029 sought a certificate of lawfulness for the existing use of the site for Class B1 (Business – Excluding Outdoor Storage), alongside the use of bungalow as an independent dwellinghouse in conflict with the agricultural occupancy condition.

- 3.5 This certificate was approved on the 21/09/2000 as another evidence was provided to highlight that the site has been utilised for a commercial use and private market housing for in excess of 10 years.

- 3.6 As such, the sites lawful use is commercial and residential.

Application 19327/APP/2014/2866 (and subsequent appeal)

- 3.7 Application 19327/APP/2014/2866 sought the erection of 8 dwelling on the site, following demolition of the existing light industrial and residential built form on site.

- 3.8 The application was refused on the 13/10/2014, with Hillingdon Council confirming that the proposal would be considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 3.9 An appeal was submitted, under reference 3138918, where the decision was overturned; with the appeal being granted on the 25/05/2016.
- 3.10 The inspector concluded that the proposal was appropriate development in the Green Belt with the following key conclusions being established.
- The site is considered to be previously developed land due to its industrial/commercial use.
 - Development was concentrated to the centre of the site to reduce impacts
 - Development of this site would not result in merging, sprawl, or encroachment into the countryside.
- 3.11 As this scheme for 8 units did not come forward, this application seeks to develop the existing site. An existing site which matches that which was sought to be developed in the above application and appeal.
- 3.12 Therefore, these conclusions are relevant to the determination of this application as the existing site is the same.

4. Development Proposals

- 4.1 The National Design Guide (2019) identifies that “well-designed homes and buildings are functional, accessible and sustainable. They provide internal environments and associated external spaces that support the health and well-being of their users and all who experience them. They meet the needs of a diverse range of users, taking into account factors such as the ageing population and cultural differences. They are adequate in size and are adaptable to the changing needs of their occupants over time” (para 120-121).
- 4.2 Regarding the requirements of NPPG Paragraph: 029 Reference ID: 14-029-20140306 in respect of Design and Access Statements, the proposal is described as follows:
- 4.3 **Use and Amount:** The proposal seeks to demolish the existing building, replacing this with two light industrial units on the site. The existing building is utilised as a storage building in connection with the overreaching commercial use of the site. As confirmed within the previous planning appeal, the agricultural use of the land has ceased.
- 4.4 The proposal also comprises the 3 parking spaces alongside a cycle store and bin store. Two of the parking spaces will contain electric vehicle charging.
- 4.5 The proposal also includes the erection of a gate and subsequent landscaping. The gate is required to provide nighttime security to the proposed building and the reminder of the site.
- 4.6 **Layout and Scale:** The existing buildings to be demolished has a footprint and floor area of 71.95 sqm. The volume of the building to be demolished is 201.6 m3.

- 4.7 In comparison, the proposed replacement industrial units have a floor area and footprint of 153 sqm, whilst the proposed volume is 489.6 m³.
- 4.8 The height of the existing building is 1.6m at the rear rising to 2.6m to the front. The increase in volume largely relates to an increase in height where the rear of the building is 2.9m and the front is 3.7m.
- 4.9 The new units will be erected in the same location as the existing building, with a small car parking area being created to make efficient use of the space.
- 4.10 The new units will include a disabled toilet alongside a small area to undertake commercial work.
- 4.11 **Landscaping:** The site will be landscaped to include some new hedges and permeable hardstanding which seek to create a parking area.
- 4.12 **Appearance:** The proposed industrial unit will be erected with green rustic cladding alongside a green roof with four 1.6m x 5.0m rooflights.
- 4.13 The roof will utilise metal insulated roof sheets to ensure that the building is of high-quality whilst a concrete block base will provide support to the proposed structure
- 4.14 External lights, roller shutters, and wooden doors will be utilised alongside a dark grey UPVC which matches the metal roof.
- 4.15 **Access & Parking:** The proposal will include landscaping and the laying of hardstanding to erect an additional 3 parking spaces to the front of the industrial units.
- 4.16 These parking spaces ensure that the proposed units are served by a suitable and required number of car parking spaces.

- 4.17 Access is already afforded to the site, and this application will not alter the wider access.

5. Policy Assessment

- 5.1 **Principle of Development:** Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise

Principle of Development: Commercial Use

- 5.2 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states that “*Local planning authorities should approach decision on proposed development in a positive and creative way*” and “*at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible*”.
- 5.3 Paragraph 124 of the NPPF comments that planning should “make effective use of land” in “meeting the need for homes and other uses, whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions”.
- 5.4 Paragraph 60 confirms the Government’s objective to boost the supply of housing, and paragraph 8 identifies the three objectives of sustainable development, as economic, environmental and social.
- 5.5 This proposal seeks to provide light industrial units that will support the rural economy within the borough whilst meeting the need for commercial uses within the borough.

- 5.6 Furthermore, paragraph 88-89 of the NPPF seek to ensure that a prosperous rural economy is supported with planning decisions enabling '*diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses*' alongside the '*growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas*'.
- 5.7 The NPPF clearly supports the provision of rural businesses with the presumption in favour of sustainable economic development.
- 5.8 Strategic objective SO15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) states that land for employment uses should be protected to supported different sectors of the economy. As confirmed within application 19327/APP/2000/1029, the building and land in which the proposed units are located on is Class B1 land.
- 5.9 This proposal seeks to ensure that the existing unit, which is utilised for storage in association with adjacent commercial uses, is redeveloped to create a building that can contribute to meeting the Council's employment need on land which has already been determined as commercial in nature.
- 5.10 Policy E6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) states that small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) will be supported in the borough, specifically development that supports these companies in sustainable locations.
- 5.11 Again, this land is already classified as B1 and commercially utilised; therefore, providing new and improvement workspaces for SMEs clearly complies with this policy.
- 5.12 Therefore, local policies clearly evidence the importance of providing employment space and locations for SMEs. The provision of such built form within this location is a consideration which should be given significant weight in the assessment of this planning submission.

Principle of Development: Green Belt

- 5.13 The site is located within the Green Belt and, as such, the proposal must adhere to Green Belt policy. Policy EM2 of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) confirmed that development within the Green Belt should be assessed against national policy.
- 5.14 Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) states that redevelopment of sites in the Green Belt must have regard to:
1. The height and bulk of the existing building
 2. The proportion of the site that is already developed
 3. The footprint, distribution, and character of the existing buildings on the site
 4. The relationship of the proposal with any development on site that is to be retained
 5. The visual amenity and character of the Green Belt
- 5.15 Paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2024) clearly denotes what development is acceptable within the Green Belt. Paragraph 154g) is relevant in this instance with the policy copied in full below for clarity.

Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:

*'Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause **substantial** harm to the openness of the Green Belt.'* [**my emphasis**]

- 5.16 As defined within the planning history by Hillingdon Council and by the Planning Inspectorate; the land and building subject to this application is viewed to be Use Class B1 land and previously developed land.
- 5.17 As such paragraph 154g) is relevant in that PDL land can be redeveloped as long as there is no substantial harm on the openness of the Green Belt. The test for whether the proposal is acceptable is whether the impact on openness is substantial or not.
- 5.18 Firstly, application 19327/APP/2014/2866 was approved for the erection of 8 dwelling on site as this was viewed to not have a harm on the openness of the Green Belt. The current built form on site, alongside this proposed unit, has significantly less impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared to 8 dwellings, which were previously determined to have no impact.
- 5.19 Secondly, it is accepted that there is a 112% increase in footprint/floor area and a 143% increase in volume associated with the proposed redevelopment. Therefore, there is a significant increase in regard to physical built form that must be considered when assessing this submission.
- 5.20 However, when we access policy DMEI 4 of the Local Plan, the height and bulk of the proposal compared to the existing building is only 1/5 of the considerations. The impact on openness is not simply a numerical calculation. There are visual and spatial considerations that influence the impact of a proposal alongside the overall increase in size and scale as per policy DMEI 4.
- 5.21 Firstly, the site is already classified as commercial land whilst the remainder of the site contains a number of commercial units. This application seeks to replace one of the existing buildings utilised for

storage with a similar unit, to those adjacent and existing on site, which can be utilised for commercial use.

- 5.22 Therefore, when we look at points 2, 3 and 4 of Policy DMEI 4 above, the proposal has no adverse increase on the proportion of the site developed as it utilises existing built form and space within the commercial envelope whilst the relationship with adjacent development in regard to scale, size, character, and use is retained.
- 5.23 The proposal is located where the existing building already was, ensuring that there is no new development away from the centre of the site which encroaches outwards into the countryside or Green Belt. More scale and size are only proposed centrally, in lawful commercial land.
- 5.24 Again, when we look at point 5 of Policy DMEI 4, the building is single storey in nature and has a green roof and green cladding. Therefore, due to the height of the proposal, the building is screened by the boundary treatments and surrounding vegetation. The building is largely not visible from any public vantage points or the street scene.
- 5.25 The height of the building does not exceed the height of adjacent units, ensuring that the proposal does not appear excessive or overly large when compared to its surroundings on site.
- 5.26 In addition, the materials ensure that the building is rural in appearance and blends into the countryside and Green Belt due to the pallet utilised.
- 5.27 When the design and appearance of the proposed units are considered, it is strongly argued that even though there is a significant size increase, the overall impact on the visual amenity and character of the Green Belt is not adverse and is contained via design.

As such there is no 'substantial' impact on the openness of the Green Belt as per the relevant policy test.

- 5.28 The fundamental aim has not changed, being *'to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'* as stated in paragraph 137.
- 5.29 Paragraph 8.20 of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) reinforces this in which is confirmed that *'the main purpose of Hillingdon's Green Belt is to keep land open and free from development'*. The land is already commercial land and already contains built form that is to be replaced.
- 5.30 Paragraph 143 explains the five purposes of the Green Belt, the proposal would not conflict with any of the five purposes in this instance as development would not result in sprawl, merging, or encroachment into the Green Belt.
- 5.31 The proposed development seeks to replace an existing building in this location, making effective use of the land. Built form is already located on site and the proposal does not seek to develop any vacant land away from the centre of an already developed site.
- 5.32 The proposal will not have any impact on the historic character of towns nor urban regeneration ensuring that the proposal complies with the purposes of development within the Green Belt. The lack of conflict with the purposes should be given moderate weight within a planning assessment.
- 5.33 No sprawl, encroachment or merging is created via this proposal whilst the scale and size of the replacement building is required to provide suitable, practical, and functioning units for commercial use.

The design and appearance have carefully been considered to ensure that there is no substantial impact.

5.34 Notwithstanding the above, it is crucial to consider paragraphs 38 and 40 of the attached judgement, *Euro Garages Ltd v The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government & Anor* [2018] EWHC 1753 (Admin) (11 July 2018) (appendix 1 accompanying this statement)

5.35 For context in comparing this particular Green Belt test to the 'greater harm' test paragraph 24 of the judgement stated:

*'24. ...Having said that, there is an obvious reason why the wording in differs paragraphs and bullet points differs. Where there is no existing development, consideration must be given to whether the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt. **Where there is some existing development, the openness of the Green Belt has not been wholly preserved and there will necessarily have been some impact on the openness of the Green Belt already.** It makes sense, therefore, to consider whether there will be a greater impact...' [My Emphasis].*

5.36 Paragraph 38 reads:

*'38. Firstly, in paragraph 14 of the Decision Letter there is reference to the timber fencing around the new container not being as open as the previous palisade fencing. It is not at all clear whether that was a factor that the Inspector took into account but, if she did, then, looked at on its own, it seems to me that that involved a misinterpretation of the policy, **in that it was concerned with the openness of the site and not of the Green Belt.** There may, of course, be circumstances in which the replacement of an open fence with a solid structure could impact the openness of the Green Belt but here the open fence surrounded tanks and the solid fence*

*surrounds a container (of lesser height) and **it is difficult to see how there could be an impact on the openness of the Green Belt as distinct from the site itself*** [**My Emphasis**].

- 5.37 Similarly to the Euro Garages site, the proposed industrial units barns have been clad, are single storey, and have an appearance which significantly mitigates their impact on the openness of the Greenbelt. Therefore, even though there is a size increase on site when the context of the existing building and use of the site is considered; it cannot be seen that there is an impact on the openness of the Green Belt which is distinct from the site itself.
- 5.38 In addition, it is confirmed within the *Eurogarages Judgement* that because a development can be seen does not automatically result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- 5.39 This judgement emphasises that the context of the site is relevant to how the impact on openness should be considered, whilst the impact on openness must be viewed on the whole Green Belt and not just how an individual site is being altered.
- 5.40 In essence, even if size and scale is being increase on a site, this doesn't just result in there being an impact on openness.

Principle of Development: Green Belt Very Special Circumstances

- 5.41 If Hillingdon do not agree with the above statement and conclude that the proposed units do have a substantial impact on the openness of the Green Belt; it is important to also consider the relevant very special circumstances that justify development.
- 5.42 NPPF, at paragraph 153, states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. '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.

- 5.43 **Fall-Back:** Paragraph 154hiv could be utilised to 're-use' the existing building whilst paragraph 154d) can be utilised to replace an existing building as long as the new building is not materially larger.
- 5.44 Therefore, it would be possible for the building to be re-used and replaced on site, in line with Green Belt policy. If this building was replaced by utilising the above policies, it would only be able to be replaced in a 'materially larger' way (circa a 40% increase in floor area and volume).
- 5.45 This would result in a building which is significantly smaller than the proposed building, with a floor area of circa 100 sqm and a volume of 282 m3.
- 5.46 It is recognised that this is less than the proposed building, but this size must be considered as the fall-back position for what could be obtained via other approaches under the NPPF.
- 5.47 As the proposal still exceeds this fall-back position, it is recognised that this should only be given limited weight. However, as a point of comparison it does serve a purpose to evidence that the proposed increase in size and scale is not excessive when compared to what is possible under the above metric.
- 5.48 Therefore, it is questioned as to whether the impact of the proposal has a substantial impact over and above what could be created via the above approach.
- 5.49 **Economic Use:** As stated above, there are a number of local and national policies which seek to support business use and rural business uses.

- 5.50 Again, the overall commercial use of this site needs to be viable to the landowner,
- 5.51 The economic benefits of the scheme should be given significant weight.
- 5.52 **Green Belt Purposes:** As stated above, it is clear that the proposal does not conflict with any overarching aims and objectives of the Green Belt. Therefore, if there is no impact on the wider Green Belt, there is no adverse impact that warrants refusal of this application.
- 5.53 This should be given moderate weight.
- 5.54 **Use of Land:** As stated above, the site has a lawful commercial land use, and this proposal seeks to make effective and efficient use of land in accordance with the existing context of the site.
- 5.55 Making efficient use of land accords with the requirements of the NPPF; whilst Hillingdon is a borough that has a large percentage of Green Belt land. If the borough does not seek to support SME's in locations like the proposed site, there is not enough space within the existing settlements and commercial areas to accommodate the provision for such uses; existing sites like this within the Green Belt and countryside must be utilised as effectively and efficiently as possible.
- 5.56 Furthermore, the proposal seeks to utilise previously developed land within a site which already has a commercial use as defined. As such, this should be given moderate weight.
- 5.57 **Design/Visual improvements:** The specific design (single storey) and materials (green cladding, green roof) utilised seek to drastically reduce any impacts created.

- 5.58 Visually, the proposal will have a beneficial appearance when compared to the existing building on site in terms of design and character. This should be given moderate weight.
- 5.59 **Biodiversity Net Gain:** The proposal will result in a considerable amount of landscaping which will improve the visual appearance of the site whilst also providing circa 15% of net gain. This should be given moderate weight.
- 5.60 **Character and Appearance of the Area:** The site is commercial in nature, and the proposed building seeks to replicate surrounding uses. The proposed building is similar in size and scale to the adjacent built form that is utilised commercially on site.
- 5.61 As the use of the site is already acceptable for a commercial use, no change of use is proposed and, thus, there is no adverse impact on the character of the area.
- 5.62 As discussed above, the design of the building is rural in materials and utilises a natural pallet to ensure that there is no impact on the character of the area.
- 5.63 The erection of a single storey sympathetic structure is not seen to have a drastic impact on the character of the area.
- 5.64 When the previous appeal was assessed, the inspector stated that

'The site sits within a well-used and attractive piece of urban fringe countryside, next to a public footpath and a Regional Park. Other land surrounding the site is also accessible to the public at times, so that despite tree planting outside of the perimeter of the site, its buildings and uses are generally visible. The existing buildings are low key and functional. There is nothing much wrong with that, but aside from the bungalow they are of low quality.'

'As set out above, I see no reason why a well-designed, laid out and landscaped development should not enhance this site and the local area, and this would include the setting of the nearby Harmondsworth Conservation Area. I cannot agree with the objectors that this would completely change the rural character of the lane. Good design and new tree planting should help the new development to blend in.'

- 5.65 The proposal is a well-designed, landscaped development which is extremely sympathetic to its surroundings. The proposal will improve the visual appearance of the site and is seen to have no impact on the conservation area.
- 5.66 **Residential Amenity:** One dwelling is located to the north east of the site adjacent to Moor Lane, with the commercial use being located to the rear.
- 5.67 A sufficient separation distance is retained between the proposed units and the adjacent dwelling, whilst screening will also be provided. This will ensure that no overbearing, overlooking, or privacy impacts are created.
- 5.68 The proposed units should be subject to a conditioned limiting what type of future occupier can utilise the building. It is suggested that a condition is utilised to ensure that no vehicle repair/motor trade or food production activities can take place. This is due to the buildings not being constructed in accordance with the regulations to support such uses, and to minimise any noise impacts that are created within the proposed units.
- 5.69 With the above condition, it is strongly argued that the proposal will have no adverse impact on the adjacent dwelling in regard to amenity impacts.

- 5.70 **Trees and Landscaping:** The proposal seeks to replace the existing building and then built on adjacent grassland. The proposal does not seek to remove or prune any existing trees nor would any development be located within the RPA's of any protected of Class A/B trees.
- 5.71 As such, no arboricultural assessment was required to support this application and no impact on trees is created via this proposal.
- 5.72 Trees and landscaping is proposed within the design to improve the visual appearance of the site and to provide a suitable net gain on site.
- 5.73 **Transport and Parking:** Policy DMT1 and DMT2 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020) states that development needs to have accessible public transport and will need to ensure that no highways impacts are created on site.
- 5.74 The existing access on site will be utilised whilst a car parking area is provided with sufficient space for turning areas and safe movement.
- 5.75 The proposal provided cycle parking, as discussed below, whilst Candover Close and Dukes Bridge bus stops are located within 0.5 miles of the application site (13-minute walk).
- 5.76 As such the proposal accords with the relevant policies and has no impact on highways.
- 5.77 Policy DMT6 confirms that all parking must comply with the parking standards set out in Appendix C Table 1.
- 5.78 The parking bays must be 2.4m x 4.8m whilst electric vehicles parking should be provided at a 5% ratio. The relevant parking size and parking type is provided within the proposed scheme.

- 5.79 The parking policy states that 2 spaces must be provided plus an addition space per every 50-100 sqm of floorspace. As the proposal seeks to provide 153sqm of floorspace, 3 parking spaces must be provided on site.
- 5.80 As 3 spaces have been provided, the proposal complies with policy DMT6. As such, the proposal has no impact on highways and complies with the relevant policies.
- 5.81 **Cycle and Refuse Provision:** A cycle store is proposed to ensure that any future employees or staff can attend the site via these methods, if they are desired.
- 5.82 Alongside this, two recycling bins are provided to the front of the unit which provide a safe and secure place for collection of waste materials that either future occupier creates. These bin stores also act as collection points.
- 5.83 **Ecology:** The PEA confirmed that there would be no foreseen impacts on any designated sites due to the distance between the proposed development and any such site.
- 5.84 A bat report was undertaken following the PEA, and it was confirmed that no bat roosts were identified within the building to be demolished.
- 5.85 Table 3 within the bat report details recommendations regarding the construction phase and the method of construction whilst enhancements are also listed.
- 5.86 The applicant is happy to develop the site in accordance with table 3 to ensure that there is no impact on any protected species. It is suggested that if any further information is required, this is conditioned alongside the details of this report.

- 5.87 A biodiversity net gain assessment is also provided which highlights that the proposed development will result in a 15.04% net gain. This does not include the additional biodiversity benefits to be added to the development such as bat boxes.
- 5.88 As such, it is foreseen that the proposed development will provide an acceptable improvement to biodiversity whilst having no impact on protected species.
- 5.89 Therefore, the proposal is in compliance with policy DMEI7 and is acceptable.
- 5.90 **Affordable Housing:** As the proposal does not seek residential units no affordable housing contribution is required in accordance with Policy DMH7 of the Local Plan.
- 5.91 **Community Infrastructure Levy:** The Hillingdon CIL charging schedule was released on the 10th of July 2014 whilst an annual rate summary was released in 2025 to account for indexed rates.
- 5.92 The charging schedule states that CIL charges will be obtained for any development within the following use classes, A1, B1, C1, C3, and B8. All of uses are listed as having no charge.
- 5.93 As this proposal seeks permission for a light industrial unit (Use Class B2) no CIL contribution is required in this instance.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 This statement has demonstrated that the proposed development is acceptable in principle and makes an efficient use of land.
- 6.2 Material planning considerations have been carefully considered and analysed, as evidenced in section 5 of this statement and the

supporting plans and documents. It is considered the proposed development would provide suitable employment space within the borough to support SME's and the Council's rural economy.

- 6.3 The proposal will have no adverse effect on the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring residents, ensuring that the proposal is acceptable on these grounds.
- 6.4 It is argued that the proposal complies with paragraph 154g) of the NPPF, as no substantial harm is created on the openness of the Green Belt. However, if Hillingdon are of the opinion that the scheme is not compliant, very special circumstances must be considered on balance.
- 6.5 The economic benefits of the scheme, and the existing class of the land, ensures that, on balance, this proposal should be considered suitable.
- 6.6 It is considered that the proposed scheme complies with relevant Development Plan Policies and is further supported by National Guidance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that planning permission is granted.

Sam Peacock BA (Hons) MSc

Principal Planner | ET Planning

200 Dukes Ride Crowthorne RG45 6DS

sam.peacock@etplanning.co.uk 01344 508048