



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 June 2021

by Robin Buchanan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3265428

29-31 Shepiston Lane, Hayes, London UB3 1LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Hanif Bhimji (KAZ Hotels Shepiston Ltd) against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 13338/APP/2019/2414, dated 16 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 3 storey plus basement 97 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1), together with soft and hard landscaping, servicing, cycle storage, car parking and refuse and recycling facilities'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 3-storey, plus basement, 84-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1), together with soft and hard landscaping, servicing, cycle storage, car parking and refuse and recycling facilities at 29-31 Shepiston Lane, Hayes, London UB3 1LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13338/APP/2019/2414, dated 16 July 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. During the Council's consideration of the application the development was amended, including from 97 to 84 bedrooms. This was publicised by the Council and it undertook further consultation prior to its decision. I have therefore altered the description in my formal decision above to refer to 84 bedrooms and considered the appeal on this basis.
3. Since the Council's decision, and after the appeal was lodged, the Mayor of London published the London Plan, March 2021 (the LP). In the Council's decision notice, Policies 7.1 and 7.6 of the London Plan, March 2016 (the LP 2016) are cited in reason for refusal No 1 — these policies are now superseded by LP Policies D4, D5 and D6. Policy 8.2 of the LP 2016 and Policy DF1 of the London Plan Intend to Publish version, December 2019 are cited in reason for refusal No 4 — these policies are now superseded by LP Policy DF1. The main parties have had an opportunity to comment on the LP and I have taken comments received into account. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
4. During the appeal the appellant submitted a signed unilateral undertaking dated 21 September 2021 (the UU). It relates to obligations in respect of

infrastructure provision for construction training and employment, highway works, a travel plan, air quality and monitoring. The Council has confirmed that the UU is acceptable, including in respect of land ownership, and considers it overcomes its reason for refusal No 4, which it is no longer pursuing. I deal with the UU in 'other matters' below.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

- the character and appearance of the area;
- the living conditions of the existing occupiers of nearby dwellings with regard to privacy and noise and general disturbance; and
- highway safety with regard to egress from the site;

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is in a medium density, mainly residential, suburban area and fronts onto Shepiston Lane. Along both sides of this straight, wide road is a row of large two-storey semi-detached houses closely spaced to each other, including either side of the site¹. Most of these houses have fully hipped roofs, many have bay windows and some have vertical front facing or forward projecting bays and roof gables at, or near, main roof ridge height. The appearance, scale and massing of this built form and its pattern and sequence along this road is locally distinctive.
7. Shepiston Lodge² is an extended, former detached two-storey house, which at the front is similar in design and external appearance to other houses in Shepiston Lane. On the other side of the site the scale and massing of the detached chalet bungalow, and this dwelling type, is an anomaly in the streetscene. Both properties are vacant and somewhat run down.
8. At the rear of the proposed hotel, on one side of the site, a flat roof would step down in height over the ground and first floors, and would occupy a footprint above ground, similar to Shepiston Lodge. In siting, scale and massing it would not therefore be materially different to that which exists and it would be well-designed. It would, in any event, be behind the wider and taller front part of the hotel and, notwithstanding the set-back in the building line of the houses to the south, most of this part of the hotel at the rear would be sited next to or behind No 33. Consequently, it would not be prominent or therefore unduly conspicuous in public views from Shepiston Lane.
9. At the front, the hotel would occupy most of the width of the site and follow the building line of the houses to the north, including No 27. This part of the hotel would be taller to eaves and main roof ridge than the houses in Shepiston Lane, including No 27 and No 33. However, the additional height would not be substantial, or therefore discordant, and as a result this part of the hotel would not significantly depart from the general prevailing rhythm of building heights and eave and roof lines along both sides of Shepiston Lane. Accordingly, the

¹ At No 27 and No 33 Shepiston Lane.

² A hotel providing bed and breakfast.

hotel would not appear unduly prominent or manifestly out of keeping in terms of height.

10. The front elevation would be well-designed and include four sets of bay windows capped by forward facing projecting dormer windows with gabled roofs. The dormers would have side hipped roofs and the central connecting part of the building would be glazed and indented, set back from the plane of the front elevation, including stepped in at roof level. While the dormer windows would add built form at roof level, it would not be excessive or significantly different to the projecting roof gables in some other houses nearby in Shepiston Lane.
11. Moreover, although the hotel would be a wide building in a wide plot, this articulation in the design of the front elevation and roof would significantly break-up the overall scale, bulk and massing of the hotel. It would successfully convey the impression of two pairs of semi-detached houses. The building would therefore be reflective of its proposed use and stature as a hotel but also in keeping with the overall appearance, pattern and sequence of houses either side of Shepiston Lane.
12. The basement floor would be extensive in area but have no meaningful physical or visual presence above ground. The spaces and gaps at either end of the building, including above the hipped roofs, would be broadly representative of typical spaces and gaps between nearby houses in Shepiston Lane. The apparent extent of the gaps would also vary depending on the angle of view of the hotel from the road, as do the gaps between the houses. Consequently, satisfactory 'sky views' and the prevailing spatial arrangement of buildings along Shepiston Lane would be maintained. The hotel would therefore be readily assimilated in short and long distance public views in the Shepiston Lane road corridor and not appear overly cramped on the site or in relation to adjoining houses.
13. Many of the houses along Shepiston Lane have front garden parking spaces with no boundary hedgerow or trees and few visible trees or shrubs in back gardens. The most significant local landscaping is the trees and grass verges that separate Shepiston Lane from service roads either side. While there would be hard surfacing within the site, the proposal would include a low hedge along most of the front boundary with low shrub planting behind and next to the hotel. There would also be shrub and tree planting elsewhere within the site and the flat roofs would be living 'green' roofs. This planting would therefore enhance existing planting on the site and make an appreciable positive visual contribution to the Shepiston Lane streetscene.
14. The hotel would operate as a bed and breakfast without a kitchen or food prepared on-site³, thus no requisite related plant or equipment. No details have been provided about the nature and location of other plant and equipment. However, there is no evidence that it could not be placed on the site or attached to the hotel building in an acceptable way and which did not compromise its design integrity or appearance, especially in public views. Satisfactory details could be secured by a condition.
15. Considering the above, while there would be a material increase in built-form at the front of the site, I find that the proposal would not cause harm to the

³ A 'continental' breakfast will be provided, with no meals at other times of the day.

character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies, November 2012 (the LPP1), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHB14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies, January 2020 (the LPP2) and with LP Policy D4. These policies include that development should deliver good, high quality design, enhance local distinctiveness and be appropriate to the local area in terms of townscape, landscaping, views and the public realm, layout, plot coverage, street pattern, building lines, rooflines, gaps, scale, height, form and materials. It would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development will add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive in architecture, layout and landscaping (including trees), sympathetic to distinctive local character and the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

Privacy

16. The height and siting of proposed 1.8m boundary walls, or intervening parts of the hotel building, would significantly restrict views from ground floor hotel bedroom windows towards any nearby dwellings or rear gardens. First and second floor west (front) elevation bedroom windows would face Shepiston Lane and be a substantial distance from opposing houses. The hotel would have no side (north or south) facing second floor windows.
17. A majority of the south elevation first floor bedroom windows would face towards the side of No 33 with a separation distance significantly greater than that between most houses in Shepiston Lane. Two bedroom windows would, though, align approximately perpendicular to the rear elevation of No 33. However, the oblique angle, or downward direction, of view from these windows would significantly restrict the extent of view.
18. The closest part of the north elevation to No 27 Shepiston Lane would contain no side facing first floor bedroom windows. Views from the corridor window in this part of the hotel would be intermittent or glimpsed and, in any event, at an oblique angle to this house. Side facing bedroom windows in the inset part of this elevation of the hotel, at the rear, would be significantly further away from No 27. A corner of the hotel would, in any event, obstruct views from these windows towards habitable rooms in this house.
19. The first floor east (rear) elevation bedroom windows would be a significant distance from the dwellings that back onto the site in Clement Gardens. In addition, views from the second floor corridor windows in this elevation would be similarly distant and, anyway, intermittent or glimpsed in nature.
20. There would therefore be no actual unduly intrusive views into habitable rooms in these adjoining dwellings. Notwithstanding that some of these proposed first and second floor windows would be similar in number, position and orientation to existing windows in Shepiston Lodge, clear glazed or fully opening windows would nonetheless result in a tangible and discomforting perception of habitable rooms being overlooked. Moreover, there would be actual unacceptable overlooking of the rear gardens of these dwellings.
21. However, subject to the approval of satisfactory details of obscured glazing and restricted opening mechanisms for the relevant hotel windows by a condition,

there would be no actual unduly intrusive overlooking of rear gardens at No 27 or No 33 Shepiston Lane or the dwellings in Clement Gardens that back onto the site. This mitigation would also significantly lessen the perception of habitable rooms or gardens being overlooked.

Noise and general disturbance

22. There are 22 bedrooms in Shepiston Lodge. The proposal would result in 62 extra bedrooms and a commensurate increase in the number of guests. However, even if the hotel is operated by a national chain, there would be no outside amenity space for guests or internal facilities, such as a restaurant, to generate noise. Moreover, most of the additional bedrooms (42) would be below ground, with about a third of these without windows. As a result, noise from their occupation, including rooms with windows facing deep light wells, would likely be imperceptible from the outside.
23. While there would be almost twice as many bedrooms above ground as existing, a majority of these would face to the front or rear of the site. Noise within these rooms would therefore be appreciably diminished by the significant separation distance to nearby dwellings or gardens in both directions. Given the proposed siting and orientation of the above ground bedrooms, internal noise would either not be close enough, or facing towards, No 27 and its garden to cause undue disturbance. Noise from within ground floor bedrooms next to No 33 would be attenuated by the close proximity and construction of a 1.8m high brick boundary. Moreover, this part of the hotel would be sited further from the common boundary with No 33 (than Shepiston Lodge) and this house and the main part of its rear garden is on the south side of its plot, furthest from the facing first floor bedrooms.
24. Car parking spaces would increase from 13 to 18 located at the rear of the site. While this would be a notable increase in the number of cars and people in this part of the site, it would not be excessive. Moreover, predicted noise levels from this activity would be significantly below ambient noise levels and the increase in noise level would be minimal (less than 1dB) — below the smallest subjectively noticeable change. Furthermore, a majority of the spaces would be near the ends of adjoining rear gardens (generally likely to be the least private or used parts) and all spaces would be enclosed by a 1.8m brick boundary wall which would extend along one side of the internal access road next to the rear garden of No 27. There would be no casual visitor car parking and spaces would need to be pre-booked by guests. Warning signs or a barrier control could also be implemented at the site to prevent unauthorised use of, and activity in, the car park and suitable details could be secured by a condition.
25. The appellant's evidence suggests that the frequency of service and delivery vehicles attending the site would either not change or would increase by between 3-4 such vehicles a week and approximately 2 vehicle movements a day Monday to Saturday. However, even if this increase occurred, such activity would take place spread over these long periods of time. Moreover, while it would in a worst case increase in noise levels of up to 2dB above background levels, this would nonetheless have a 'low impact' during delivery hours and would not therefore be overly intrusive. While refuse bins would need to be wheeled past No 27 and its garden this activity would be contained behind a 1.8m high boundary wall and would, in any event, be an infrequent, transient event and not therefore unduly intrusive.

26. Furthermore, servicing or delivery activity would not take place at unduly anti-social hours, and could be controlled by a condition, and vehicles for this purpose would be scheduled to avoid queuing or running of engines at the site. Moreover, these vehicles would be stationed at the centre front of the site, furthest from the adjoining dwellings and facing towards the noisier environment of Shepiston Lane, as would be the drop-off and pick-up of guests by taxi or any coaches or minibuses.
27. Consequently, these circumstances would significantly diminish the effect or influence of vehicle engine noise, headlight glare, fumes and the comings and goings associated with the use of the parking spaces and hotel on arrival, departure or during a guests stay. It would also have a significant mitigating effect on similar potential adverse effects of servicing and delivery activity at the hotel.
28. Construction works are an inevitable, albeit temporary, consequence of development. While such activity would be in reasonably close proximity to nearby dwellings and gardens, hours of working (including the operation of equipment, machinery and vehicles at the site) can be controlled by a condition to avoid undue disturbance or nuisance, particularly at antisocial hours.
29. Considering the above, while use and activity across the entire site would be intensified, I find that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of existing occupiers of nearby dwellings with regard to privacy and noise and general disturbance. Consequently, it would comply with LPP1 Policy BE1 and LPP2 Policies DMHB11 and DME5. These policies include that development, embracing hotels, should protect the amenity of adjacent residential properties, including to avoid nuisance or adverse impact. It would also be consistent with the Framework which seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing users and healthy living conditions.

Highway safety

30. Vehicles would enter the site by a re-designed access from Shepiston Lane and exit using an existing access onto a service road that runs parallel to it, creating a one-way flow of hotel traffic. The service road includes a footway and provides access to front garden and on-street parking for the houses along one side of it.
31. The exit crossover point into the service road is within about 2m of the junction of this road with Shepiston Lane. This would be significantly closer than the Council's standard 5m separation distance for a new exit. However, a new exit is not proposed. Moreover, whilst there would be additional vehicles using this exit, it would not be a substantial increase in number and all vehicles, in particular large service and delivery vehicles, would be able to conveniently exit the site in a forward gear.
32. The road geometry at the exit would allow a single car to leave the site, turn right, into the service road, and wait correctly aligned behind the 'give way' line at the junction with Shepiston Lane. It would not therefore obstruct a vehicle turning left from Shepiston Lane into the service road. While a car emerging from the site could cross the path of a left turning vehicle, this coincidence of vehicles is likely to be relatively infrequent and would anyway be a short, transient event.

33. Furthermore, approaching left turning vehicles in Shepiston Lane would be braking towards this junction and cause traffic behind to slow. In addition, these drivers (or cyclists and pedestrians) would have good forward visibility of any vehicle emerging from the site exit, across the low site front boundary and the wide footway next to the exit. A second car leaving the site turning right and stationary in the service road would obstruct a left turning vehicle or cyclist, or stationary in the pavement would obstruct pedestrians. However, this would plainly be evident to the emerging driver and not likely therefore to be a common practice. Instead, cars are more likely to wait until the junction with Shepiston Lane was clear, or would be able to proceed straight ahead, along the service road for a short distance, and join Shepiston Lane at a second nearby junction.
34. A large service or delivery vehicle exiting the site and turning right would temporarily obstruct left turning vehicles in Shepiston Lane from entering the service road. However, this is not intended. Instead, drivers would be managed and instructed to proceed straight along the service road and enter Shepiston Lane at the second junction. The Council has not objected to the suitability of this junction for this purpose. Some directional surface markings within the site are shown in the submitted plans. However, to encourage considerate and responsible driver behaviour in this regard, including cars, details of these, and other appropriate warning signs within the site, can be secured by a condition.
35. Large vehicles passing front garden parking spaces or cars parked on-street in the service road would be a relatively infrequent occurrence and a transient event. In addition, drivers of large vehicles would have good forward visibility and drivers of parked cars (or pedestrians and cyclists) would have good intervisibility with large vehicles given the limited extent of front garden boundaries or planting and the wide footway at the site exit. Large vehicles in the service road would not therefore be unduly hindered nor unduly impair the use of these parking spaces by residents or visitors, or the use of the highway by pedestrians and cyclists.
36. Notwithstanding the above, the Council could additionally, if necessary, consider road markings and signs within the highway which might seek to restrict on-street parking on Shepiston Lane, slow traffic on the approach to the left turn into the service road, prohibit a car from entering part of the service road or the footway from the site exit or prohibit a right turn at the site exit for large vehicles. Suitable and appropriate details could be agreed as part of the Highway Works in the UU.
37. Considering the above, while there would be increased vehicular activity and movements at the site, including large vehicles, I find that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or any severe cumulative residual impact with regard to egress from the site. Consequently, it would comply with LPP2 Policies DMT1 and DMT2. These policies include that development is required to maximise safe, convenient and efficient access for all road users and residents and adequately address delivery and servicing requirements. It would also be consistent with the Framework which seeks to ensure safe and suitable access to the site for all users and to allow for the efficient delivery of goods and access by service vehicles.

Other Matters

Unilateral undertaking

38. By virtue of the UU, an 'in-kind' scheme would provide training and employment for some local people during construction works or, exceptionally, a financial contribution in-lieu would help deliver construction training courses by a suitable registered provider. The UU would also ensure that local highway improvement works were funded and carried out and that a suitable travel plan be implemented to encourage means of travel to the hotel other than by private car. The UU would also secure financial contributions towards initiatives to improve air quality in the local area and in the Borough as a whole. It would also provide for the Council's costs of administering and monitoring fulfilment of the planning obligations.
39. The Council has provided a written justification for these requirements, which would comply with LPP2 Policy DMC17 and LP Policy DF1 and the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, July 2014. These obligations would make satisfactory provision for infrastructure and would be significant benefits of the proposal. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the UU would be necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. As such, it would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the tests for planning obligations in Framework paragraph 57.

Green Belt

40. The appeal site is 94m from the closest edge of the Metropolitan Green Belt. It is, and as would be the proposed development, surrounded by and separated from the Green Belt by intervening roads and development. The proposal would therefore have no effect on the visual or spatial openness of the Green Belt. The Council reached the same conclusion.

On-street parking

41. Notwithstanding the concerns of some interested parties, there is no compelling evidence that the increase in hotel bedrooms on the site would result in staff or guest parking off-site in nearby residential roads. In any event, the appellant's parking survey indicates that there is on-street parking capacity in some of these roads. Moreover, the proposed access would be conducive for taxi pick-up or drop-off within the site. Even if taxis used surrounding roads instead, temporary stationary vehicles are unlikely to cause undue inconvenience. In addition, the hotel would be accessible by buses and trains (then walking or cycling) and the travel plan would encourage use of these alternative modes of transport.
42. Notwithstanding the above, the Council could exercise other regulatory powers to restrict on-street parking in the surrounding area, which might seek to limit parking duration or for residents only, and to control any associated antisocial noise or disturbance. Alternatively, the latter would be a matter for the Police.

Planning Balance

43. The proposed hotel building would be greater in height, scale and massing and site coverage and be within a larger plot than nearby development. The additional built form would not be excessive in itself, or within the appeal

site, and would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area. There would be an increase in people and in cars and large vehicles on the site and increased outlook towards nearby dwellings, noise and general disturbance and traffic movements. Subject to conditions or the provisions of the UU, this intensification of use and traffic would cause no harm to the living conditions of the existing occupiers of these dwellings or any significant adverse highway impact with regard to egress from the site.

44. The development would not result in any harm to the living conditions of existing occupiers of nearby dwellings having regard to daylight, sunlight or overshadowing or to ecology. Subject to conditions the proposal would incorporate appropriate renewable energy technologies, make suitable provision for drainage and would not be at risk from flooding or contamination. The number and type of accessible rooms and vehicle and cycle parking spaces (and the layout of spaces) would be satisfactory. The development and construction activity would not cause a hazard to the operation of Heathrow airport. The absence of harm, or compliance with requirements of the Council's development plan or the Framework, in these regards are therefore neutral factors in my decision.
45. The Council did not object to the loss of the bungalow or, in principle, resist redevelopment of Shepiston Lodge with a new hotel. The provision of additional hotel accommodation would assist in meeting the Council's development plan objective to facilitate tourist and business visitors in the Borough. The development would create temporary and permanent employment and training opportunities, including for local people, and result in increased inward investment and spending in support of tourism and the local economy generally.
46. It would also make effective use of previously developed brownfield land, be high quality in design and result in a notable uplift in the appearance of development on the site and enhance the Shepiston Lane streetscene, including planting and opportunity for biodiversity net gains. Obscured glazed or restricted opening windows would provide a significant betterment over unhindered outlook from some windows in Shepiston Lodge and would safeguard the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings. The one-way in/out site access/egress would avoid large vehicles reversing onto the highway to the benefit all road users and the UU would deliver local and Borough wide infrastructure improvements, including to air quality, local highway works and a travel plan.
47. These would be significant social, economic and environmental benefits arising from the construction and operation of the hotel and would be aligned with relevant objectives of the Framework. Accordingly, these benefits have substantial weight.

Conditions

48. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council and the revisions to these suggested by the appellant. Where necessary I have amended the wording of conditions in the interests of clarity, and have combined others to make them more concise, in light of the tests and advice in Framework paragraph 56 and in Planning Practice Guidance⁴.

⁴ Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 21a-003-20190723.

49. Some of the suggested conditions are of a 'pre-commencement' type as the matters or outstanding details referred to therein need to be resolved before any development or specified works take place. These will assist with the efficient and effective delivery of the development and the appellant did not object to them. The main parties were given an opportunity to comment on non-standard conditions that were not suggested by either main party or where no wording was provided. I have taken the responses received into account.
50. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), a condition (2) is necessary to specify the approved plans and documents to ensure certainty. Conditions 3 to 10, 17 and 18 are necessary to ensure that specified development or works which could otherwise affect above or below ground conditions on the site or on adjoining land, or the existing occupiers of nearby dwellings or staff and guests of the hotel, are carried out at the appropriate time. Furthermore, to ensure that such development or works are undertaken in a suitable way to avoid harm to people or to safeguard the natural or built environments.
51. Conditions 11 and 12 are necessary to ensure that the development is carried out (and, as appropriate, thereafter retained or maintained) in accordance with specified details for external materials and landscaping. These are in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Conditions 13 to 16 are necessary to ensure that the operation of the hotel is carried out in accordance with specified details for plant and equipment, external lighting, crime prevention and accessible bedrooms. There are in the interests of the living conditions of existing occupiers of nearby dwellings or guests of the hotel and, additionally, for external Lighting (14) in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
52. I have imposed conditions 19 to 22. Conditions 19 and 20 respectively require that the tall appeal site boundary perimeter wall is constructed and that certain windows in the hotel are obscured glazed with restricted opening, before the hotel is brought into use. These are necessary in order to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings for the reasons explained in the second 'main issue' above. Conditions 21 and 22 respectively require that certain aspects of the operation of the hotel are controlled by a Hotel Management Plan and that the means of vehicular access is provided, before the hotel is brought into use. These are necessary in order to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings and to ensure highway safety for the reasons explained in the second and third 'main issues' above.
53. I am satisfied that these conditions would serve a useful planning purpose and are also relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

Conclusion

54. The proposal would accord with the development plan overall. There are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Robin Buchanan

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions (22)

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:
 - KH-AA-ALL-XX-DR-A-100 P1 Location plan and block plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-GF-DR-A-110 P1 Existing survey site plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-01-DR-A-111 P1 Existing survey internal plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-02-DR-A-112 P1 Existing survey elevations and survey
 - KH-AA-ALL-XX-DR-A-103 P02 Existing Block Plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-GF-DR-A-113 P02 Existing ground floor
 - KH-AA-ALL-01-DR-A-114 P02 Existing first floor
 - KH-AA-ALL-02-DR-A-115 P02 Existing roof level plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-R-DR-A-116 P02 existing roof plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-XX-DR-A-117 P02 Existing elevations
 - KH-AA-ALL-XX-DR-A-118 P02 Existing sections
 - KH-AA-ALL-B1-DR-A-199 P7 Proposed basement
 - KH-AA-ALL-GF-DR-A-200 P7 Proposed ground floor
 - KH-AA-ALL-01-DR-A-201 P6 Proposed first floor
 - KH-AA-ALL-02-DR-A-202 P7 Proposed second floor
 - KH-AA-ALL-R-DR-A-203 P5 Proposed roof plan
 - KH-AA-ALL-ZZ-DR-A-300 P3 Proposed sections
 - KH-AA-ALL-ZZ-DR-A-400 P4 Proposed elevations
 - KH-AA-ALL-XX-SC-A-700 P4 Proposed schedule
 - L013-PL-001 Rev A General arrangement plan
 - L013-PL-002 Rev A Hard landscape plan
 - L013-PL-003 Rev A Soft landscape plan
 - L013-PL-004 Rev A Landscape sections
 - Air Quality Assessment July 2019
 - Air Quality Assessment Addendum April 2020
 - Arboricultural Survey and Impact Assessment April 2020
 - Basement Impact Assessment June 2019
 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment April 2020
 - Design and Access Statement July 2019
 - Design and Access Statement Addendum (including revised landscape sections 4.10-4.13) April 2020
 - Energy Statement April 2020
 - Environmental Noise Impact Assessment April 2020
 - Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy April 2020
 - Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Assessment June 2019
 - Planning Statement July 2019
 - Planning Statement Addendum April 2020
 - Sequential Assessment April 2020
 - Structural Engineering Assessment April 2020
 - Sustainability Statement April 2020
 - Transport Statement April 2020

- 3) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development, demolition, site preparation, clearance or piling works, shall take place until a scheme to deal with contamination in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Guidance Document on Land Contamination shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:
- a) a site investigation, including, where relevant, soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, together with a report on the results of analysis and risk assessment, carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant or contractor. The report shall also identify all risks, limitations and recommendations for remedial measures to make the site suitable for the proposed use including that no contaminated soils or other materials, including for landscaping, shall be imported to the site; and
 - b) a written method statement providing details of a remediation scheme (RS), including the timing for implementation of the RS works, and how the completion of the remedial works for each phase will be verified prior to commencement of each phase, including details of a watching brief to identify any undiscovered contamination.

Any contamination at the site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved RS. If, during development or remedial works, contamination not addressed in the approved RS is identified, an addendum to the RS shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development or remedial works on the part of the site affected by unexpected contamination shall be suspended until such approval has been obtained and shall thereafter be resumed or continued in accordance with the approved RS scheme and addendum.

- 4) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development, demolition, site preparation, clearance or piling works, shall take place until details of a Demolition and Construction Management Plan (DCMP) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The DCMP shall include details of:
- a) the phasing of development works;
 - b) the hours during which development works, including piling and deliveries to or from the site, will occur;
 - c) a programme to demonstrate that the most valuable or potentially contaminating materials and fittings can be removed safely and intact for later re-use or processing;
 - d) measures to prevent mud and dirt tracking onto footways and adjoining roads (including wheel washing facilities);
 - e) traffic management and access arrangements (vehicular and pedestrian) and parking provisions for contractors during the development process (including measures to reduce the numbers of construction vehicles accessing the site during peak hours);
 - f) measures to reduce the impact of the development on local air quality and dust through minimising emissions throughout the demolition and construction process; and

- g) the storage of demolition/construction materials on site.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved DCMF, which shall be implemented and retained throughout the duration of the demolition and construction process.

- 5) Notwithstanding condition 2, no piling shall take place until a Piling Method Statement (PMS) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The PMS shall include details of:
 - a) the depth and type of piling to be undertaken;
 - b) the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure; and
 - c) a programme for the piling works.

Any piling shall be carried out in accordance with the approved PMS.

- 6) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development, demolition, site preparation, clearance or piling works, shall take place until a Fire Strategy Report (FSR) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall include details of provisions to meet Fire Safety Standards as set out in the London Plan and details of fire evacuation lifts and associated provisions. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved FSR, which shall be implemented on the site in conjunction with a suitably qualified consultant.
- 7) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development, demolition, site preparation, clearance or piling works, shall take place until details of registration in the Greater London Authority's database (nrmm.london.gov.uk/nrmm/about/what-nrmm-register) and compliance with London's Low Emission Zone for non-road mobile machinery requirements, including the requisite standards set out in The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition Supplementary Planning Guidance 2014, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These requirements apply to variable and constant speed engines for nitrogen oxide (NOx) and particulate matter (PM) and will be based upon engine emission standards set out in European Union (EU) Directive 97/68/EC or any subsequent amendment. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Notwithstanding condition 2, no above ground works shall take place until a Management and Maintenance Plan (MMP) for the drainage system shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The MMP shall cover the lifetime of the development and arrangements to secure its operation and include details of:
 - a) appropriate inspection regimes;
 - b) appropriate performance specification;
 - c) remediation and timescales for the resolving of issues; and
 - d) where there is overland flooding, the plan shall include the appropriate actions to ensure the safety of the users of the site.

Development shall be carried out, retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved MMP.

- 9) Notwithstanding condition 2, no above ground works shall take place until a scheme for the provision of sustainable water management shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall clearly demonstrate that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) have been incorporated into the design of the development in accordance with the hierarchy set out in the London Plan and shall:
- a) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - b) include a timetable for its implementation; and
 - c) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

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

- d) provide details of water collection facilities to capture excess rainwater; and
- e) provide details of how rain and grey water will be recycled and reused in the development.

Development shall be carried out, retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved scheme.

- 10) Notwithstanding condition 2, no above ground works shall take place until details of low and zero carbon technology shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include:
- a) a detailed roof plan and elevation plans showing the photovoltaic (PV) array and its location;
 - b) a specification for the PV array including, fixing mechanisms, tilt and orientation;
 - c) the location of the Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) within the site, including a suitable plan;
 - d) a specification (including noise emissions) for the ASHP; and
 - e) the impact of the PV array and ASHP on the carbon footprint of the development.

Development shall be carried out, retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

- 11) Notwithstanding condition 2, no above ground works shall take place until details, including the depth of window reveals, make, product, type, colour, photographs and images, of all external materials and external surfaces

shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 12) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development above ground floor level shall take place until a Landscape Scheme (LS) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The LS shall include details of:
1. Soft landscaping:
 - a) planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100);
 - b) written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken;
 - c) schedule of plants giving species mix, plant sizes, and proposed numbers or densities where appropriate; and
 - d) a schedule for planting or seeding and implementation.
 2. Hard landscaping:
 - a) refuse storage;
 - b) cycle storage for 32 spaces and changing and shower facilities alongside long stay cycle parking spaces;
 - c) means of enclosure and boundary treatments;
 - d) car parking layouts; and
 - e) hard surfacing materials.
 3. Living 'green' walls and roofs:
 - a) biodiversity-based roofs with extensive substrate bases (depth 80-150mm);
 - b) to cover all areas of proposed flat roof; and
 - c) justification as to why no part of the development can include living walls and roofs.
 4. Landscape maintenance:
 - a) landscape maintenance schedule for a minimum period of 5 years; and
 - b) proposals for the replacement of any tree, shrub, or area of surfacing or seeding within the landscaping scheme which dies or in the opinion of the local planning authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased.
 5. Other:
 - a) existing and proposed functional services above and below ground; and
 - b) proposed finished levels or contours.

Development shall be carried out, retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved LS.

- 13) Notwithstanding condition 2, no above ground works shall take place until details of the external noise level emitted from plant, machinery and equipment to be operated at the site, and mitigation measures as appropriate including silencing, shall have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The details shall ensure that the

external noise level emitted from such plant, machinery and equipment will be lower than the lowest existing background noise level by at least 5dBA, and by 10dBA where the source is tonal, as assessed according to BS4142:2014 at the nearest and/or most affected noise sensitive premises, with all machinery operating together at maximum capacity. Prior to its use, all machinery, plant and equipment including any extract or ventilation system and ducting shall be mounted with proprietary anti-vibration isolators and fan motors shall be vibration isolated from the casing. Plant, machinery and equipment shall be operated, retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

- 14) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used until details of external lighting, including the intensity of illumination and predicted lighting contours, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Once installed, external lighting shall be retained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
- 15) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used until details of 'Secured by Design' accreditation, awarded by the Hillingdon Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Adviser, on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers, shall have been submitted to the local planning authority.
- 16) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the quantity of accessible bedrooms provided, specified in accordance with BS 8300:2018 subsection 19.2.1.2 (or any subsequent amendment), shall be:
 - a) one room or 5%, whichever is greater, with a wheelchair accessible en-suite shower room for independent use;
 - b) one room, or 1%, whichever is greater, with a tracked hoist system, and a connecting door to an adjoining (standard) bedroom for use by an assistant or companion;
 - c) one room or 5%, whichever is greater, with an en-suite shower room to meet the requirements of people with an ambulant mobility impairment.

The building shall be retained thereafter in accordance with these requirements.

- 17) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a Verification Report (VR), demonstrating that the approved drainage and SuDS measures have been fully implemented, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The VR shall include details of:
 - a) as built drawings of the sustainable drainage systems, including level information if appropriate;
 - b) photographs of the completed sustainable drainage systems throughout the construction process;
 - c) any relevant certificates from manufacturers/suppliers of drainage features; and
 - d) a confirmation statement of the above signed by a chartered engineer.

- 18) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the remedial works in the approved contamination RS (and any addendum) have been completed and a Verification Report (VR) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The VR shall include the results of independent testing of imported soils for chemical contamination and details of the final remediation works and evidence that the works for each phase have been carried out in accordance with the approved RS (and any addendum) and the VR.
- 19) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the entire proposed 1.8m high boundary wall shall have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on the approved hard landscape plan, plan number L013-PL-002 Rev A.
- 20) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows in the first-floor north, south and east elevations, and in the second-floor east elevation, have been fitted with obscured glazing and a restrictive opening mechanism. Details of the type of obscured glazing and restrictive opening mechanism shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the windows are installed. Once installed the obscured glazing and restrictive opening mechanism shall be retained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
- 21) Notwithstanding the details submitted as part of the appeal, the development shall not be occupied until an updated and amended Hotel Management Plan (HMP), incorporating a car parking management strategy and an operational servicing and deliveries plan, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The HMP shall, in particular, include details of:
 - a) arrangements for scheduling servicing and deliveries to and from the site, which shall only take place between 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 10:00 to 13:00 on Saturday and Sundays;
 - b) how the use of the car park will be managed, including to ensure its efficient operation, especially at peak demand periods, and that it shall be used only by hotel staff or guests for the duration of, respectively, their shift or stay at the hotel; and
 - c) directional or warning surface markings or signs, or barriers, within the site, including to prohibit unauthorised use of the car park and to ensure that service and delivery vehicles exit the site with no right turn into the service road and instead proceed straight ahead, along the service road, and enter Shepiston Lane at the second junction.

The approved HMP shall be implemented as soon as the hotel is first brought into use and the hotel shall be operated thereafter in accordance with the approved HMP.

- 22) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the means of access into the appeal site, and the means of egress from the appeal site, shall have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on the approved hard landscape plan, plan number L013-PL-002 Rev A.