



HILLINGDON

LONDON

Meeting:	Hillingdon Planning Committee	
Date:	16 December 2025	Time: 7:00pm
Venue:	Council Chamber, Civic Centre	

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item: 6	Location: Heathrow Airport
Amendments/Additional Information:	Officer Comments:
<p>The final element of the ultrafine particle (UFP) Heads of Term has now been agreed as set out below:</p> <p>Prior to commencement of the development, UFP monitoring and action plans for ultrafine particles (UFP) shall be submitted in writing to the Council for approval. The Monitoring Plan shall include the location of and operating parameters of one additional monitor (funded by the applicant) and will set out an appropriate methodology for collecting and reporting data. The plan will be kept under review and amendments made with agreement from both parties.</p> <p>The UFP Action Plan shall set out how monitoring data will be reviewed and evaluated and how the applicant is responding to and observing any current national policy or statutory targets for UFPs, where these exist and so far as they relate to the development. The UFP Action Plan will be reviewed and submitted to the Council for approval every 4 years to consider monitoring outputs, and to provide assurance that any relevant national policy developments are being observed.</p>	For completeness
Comments received from Surrey County Council (summary):	
<p>SCC supports the collective HSPG response but wishes to highlight key concerns. Heathrow's operations must continue to rely on established noise-reduction measures, including night-time restrictions and full runway alternation that guarantees predictable respite. SCC stresses that the current planning application must not enable "full" mixed-mode operations by stealth, as any reduction in alternation would undermine the purpose of ending the Cranford Agreement, which was to secure full alternation for communities west of the airport. Mixed-mode operations—full or partial—have not been assessed in the environmental</p>	Operational conditions are discussed at paragraphs 8.5 to 8.14 of this report.

<p>impact assessment, so SCC seeks a planning condition legally requiring continued full alternation and restricting mixed-mode use to exceptional emergencies only.</p> <p>SCC has no concerns about the physical enabling works or construction impacts, but it does have concerns about operational impacts on Surrey. Ending the Cranford Agreement will increase arriving flights over Stanwell and Stanwell Moor, raising noise levels in areas currently protected from easterly landings. While parts of these communities already qualify for relocation or insulation schemes, no additional mitigation is proposed for wider Stanwell. SCC therefore requests detailed monitoring of actual noise impacts during the first five years of modified operations, with a process to identify and support any newly affected properties. The Residential Insulation Scheme must remain open to future applicants and should not impose time limits that exclude households affected later. Mitigation should also cover all community buildings—not just schools—including early years settings, places of worship, and community facilities, ensuring comparable protection standards.</p>	<p>Noise pollution is discussed at paragraphs 7.26 to 7.185 of this report. People and Communities are discussed at paragraphs 7.227 to 7.234 of this report.</p>
<p>Amend Paragraph 7.286 as follows:</p> <p>'The ES chapter concludes that the proposed development will have no significant adverse effects on the historic environment and the noise barrier does not harm the character or setting of Longford Conservation Area or listed buildings. In terms of noise pollution, it is recognised that there may be some limited harm to heritage assets, including Richmond Park, which is a Grade I listed registered Park and Garden. However, it is considered to be less than substantial harm which, when weighed against the public benefits of bringing greater equity of noise pollution and providing predictable respite, is deemed acceptable. The council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the submitted details and they have confirmed they agree that heritage assets would not be significantly harmed by the proposals. Officers therefore agree with the conclusions that are drawn in the ES and it is considered that the proposals accord with relevant planning policies quoted above.'</p>	<p>For clarity</p>
<p>Amend paragraph 7.170 as follows:</p> <p>'It is noted that it is already overflowed significantly when the airport operates on westerlies, though it is accepted that it would receive some adverse impacts from the development. However, Richmond Park is further from the main source of noise and therefore only marginal changes in the noise impacts have been identified. Consequently, it is considered that the less than substantial degree of harm in certain areas of the park is outweighed by some benefits to the park elsewhere, as well as the wider public benefit of providing a more equitable distribution of noise.'</p>	<p>For clarity</p>

<p>Additional Condition:</p> <p><i>'The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into operation unless in accordance with the specified supporting plans and/or documents:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easterly Alteration Infrastructure Project EIA Environmental Statement (October 2024) - Design and Access Statement (October 2024) - Flood Risk Assessment (November 2024) <p><i>Thereafter the development shall be retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence</i></p> <p>REASON</p> <p><i>To ensure the development complies with the provisions of Hillingdon Local Plan Parts 1 (November 2012) and 2 (January 2020) and the London Plan (2021).'</i></p>	<p>For completeness</p>
<p>Amended Condition 10 'Sustainable Water Management':</p> <p><i>Prior to commencement (except for demolition, ground and enabling work) of any relevant phase of this development, a scheme for the provision of sustainable water management shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the relevant stakeholders. The scheme shall clearly demonstrate how it manages water and demonstrate ways of controlling the surface water on site by providing information on:</i></p> <p>a) <i>Sustainable Drainage features:</i></p> <p>i. <i>Surface water discharge - the submitted drainage strategy must identify the proposed method and location of discharging collected surface water from the site in reference to the hierarchy set out in Policy SI 13 of the London Plan (2021). Where the proposal does not utilise the most sustainable solution, justification must be provided.</i></p> <p>ii. <i>SuDS - the submitted drainage strategy should incorporate Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) elements, where practicable.</i></p> <p>iii. <i>Exceedance routes - provide a plan showing the route surface water will take through the development for rainfall events exceeding the 1 in 100 year event. Where it is intended to store water on the ground surface, the maximum extent of overland flooding should be mapped and the depth of the flooding confirmed.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Long-term management and maintenance of the drainage system.</i></p>	<p>For completeness</p>

<p><i>i. Provide a Management and Maintenance Plan for the drainage system that includes clear plans showing all of the drainage network above and below ground, and identifies the responsibility of different parties for each component of the drainage network.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Include details of the necessary inspection regimes and maintenance frequencies.</i></p> <p><i>Thereafter the development shall be implemented and retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.</i></p> <p>REASON <i>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 DME1 9 and DME1 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020), Policies SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).</i></p>	
Item: 7	Location: 78 HighStreet
Amendments/Additional Information: <p>A follow up comment has been received from a Local Ward Councillor post publication of the Committee report.</p> <p>The comments raised concerns regarding the current tenant of the shop and flat above who has resided at the property since 1985. The net impact from this development would impact the livelihood and home of the tenant. A negotiated settlement should have been arrived at rather than eviction.</p>	Officer Comments: <p>Members will be aware that the planning system can only take account of material planning considerations. Matters relating to private leases, the length of a tenancy, or contractual agreements between a landlord and tenant lie outside the scope of planning control. Such issues cannot be determinative in the assessment of the planning merits of the proposal.</p> <p>As set out in the "Principle of Development" section of the Committee Report (paragraphs 7.4–7.14), the application has been assessed on its planning merits, including the provision of additional residential units and the implications of the loss of ancillary storage space. The scheme retains a functioning retail unit at ground-floor level which remains viable in terms of floor area, servicing and layout.</p>