



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8 and 9 November 2022

Site visit made on 10 November 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/22/3297192 (Appeal A)

Link Park, Thorney Mill Road, Iver UB7 7EZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Link Park Heathrow LLP against Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/21/4584, is dated 29 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is outline planning permission for demolition and redevelopment to comprise a data centre (Sui Generis (Data Centre)) of up to 55,000sqm (GEA) (excluding gantries) including ancillary offices, internal plant & equipment and substation (all matters reserved). In addition to the above the development may also include: car parking; provision of external plant and equipment and fuel storage; creation of servicing areas and provision of associated services, including waste, refuse, cycle storage and lighting; and for the laying out of the buildings; routes and open spaces within the development; all associated and ancillary works and operations including but not limited to: demolition; earthworks; provision of attenuation infrastructure, engineering operations.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3297194 (Appeal B)

Link Park, Thorney Mill Road, Iver UB7 7EZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Link Park Heathrow LLP against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73420/APP/2021/4388, is dated 29 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as outline planning permission for demolition and redevelopment to comprise a data centre (Sui Generis (Data Centre)) of up to 55,000sqm (GEA) (excluding gantries) including ancillary offices, internal plant & equipment and substation (all matters reserved). In addition to the above the development may also include: car parking; provision of external plant and equipment and fuel storage; creation of servicing areas and provision of associated services, including waste, refuse, cycle storage and lighting; and for the laying out of the buildings; routes and open spaces within the development; all associated and ancillary works and operations including but not limited to: demolition; earthworks; provision of attenuation infrastructure, engineering operations.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is dismissed, and planning permission is refused for outline planning permission for demolition and redevelopment to comprise a data centre (Sui Generis (Data Centre)) of up to 55,000sqm (GEA) (excluding gantries) including ancillary offices, internal plant & equipment and substation (all

matters reserved). In addition to the above the development may also include: car parking; provision of external plant and equipment and fuel storage; creation of servicing areas and provision of associated services, including waste, refuse, cycle storage and lighting; and for the laying out of the buildings; routes and open spaces within the development; all associated and ancillary works and operations including but not limited to: demolition; earthworks; provision of attenuation infrastructure, engineering operations.

2. **Appeal B** is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Procedural Matters

3. The applications were submitted in outline form, with all matters reserved for future consideration. However, the submitted documents reference the scale of the building. This includes indications of the proposed building's footprint and height. References to the building's scale are also included in the appellant's Statement of Case and the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
4. Scale is a reserved matter, but it was explained at the hearing that the building would be around the specified height and floor area, as shown on parameter plans, and therefore it was agreed that I should approach my assessment based on the parameters given.
5. Details that relate to all other reserved matters have also been provided on an indicative basis and I have had regard to them on this basis.
6. The appeal site crosses the administrative boundary between Buckinghamshire Council and the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. However, it was confirmed at the hearing that the proposed building would, most likely, be located within the area covered by Buckinghamshire Council.
7. Section 38 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) states that decisions should be made on the basis of the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 38 of the Act defines the relevant Development Plan as the one for that area. This means that as it is likely that the building will be sited in the area of Buckinghamshire, I have determined the appeal with reference to that Council's policies.
8. Nonetheless, insofar as they relate to matters such as siting and design, I have had regard to the policies from the Hillingdon Plans and the London Plan as material considerations in respect of the portion of the development that is sited in the area under the jurisdiction of Buckinghamshire Council.
9. Although the site crosses the administrative boundary between two councils, the works that are located within Hillingdon are intrinsically linked to the development in Buckinghamshire. This is because the indicative site plan and layout show that parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring areas to serve the data centre would be sited in Hillingdon. This means that the elements cannot be readily disaggregated from each other.
10. After the submission of the appeals, the Ivers Neighbourhood Plan has completed its examination, and a date for a referendum has been set. Although this plan is progressing, I cannot be certain as to the outcome of the referendum. In result, I have given this document a moderate amount of weight in my assessments.

11. Prior to the hearing commencing, the appellant submitted a response to the Statements of Case prepared by the Councils. Although late evidence, the main parties had the opportunity to consider this document before the hearing commenced. Therefore, it would not cause prejudice to determine these appeals with reference to this document.

Main Issues

12. The main issues relevant to both of these appeals are:

- whether the proposed development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt;
- the effect on the openness of the Green Belt.
- the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.
- whether the effects of the development would make sufficient provision for air quality mitigation and employment and training opportunities, with specific reference to the requirements of the Development Plan; and
- if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

13. The appeal site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. My attention has been drawn to Policy GB1 of the South Buckinghamshire District Local Plan (1999) (the Buckinghamshire Local Plan). Amongst other matters, this specifies the types of development that might not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed development would not meet one of these criteria.
14. As previously described, the portion of the development that is to be sited in the area under the jurisdiction of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon cannot be disaggregated from the portion of the development sited in Buckinghamshire.
15. Therefore, taking the development as a whole, the proposal would not conform with Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) (the Hillingdon Part 1 Plan) and Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan). Amongst other matters, these seek to assess development proposals against national and London Plan Policies; and protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. These policies do not provide direct support for the erection of data centres, and associated infrastructure, in the Green Belt.
16. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) regards the erection of new buildings in the Green Belt as generally being inappropriate. However, the Framework, at Paragraph 149, states that there are some exceptions to this.

17. The proposed development would result in an increase in built form and would be used for a commercial facility in the form of a data centre. Therefore, it would not meet any of the exceptions specified in Paragraph 149.
18. The proposal would not meet any of the exceptions identified in the Framework and would conflict with Policy GB1 of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan. It would also not conform with Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Part 1 Plan, and Policy G2 of the London Plan. Therefore, the proposal would constitute an inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Effect on openness

19. The appeal site has previously been developed and contains a large building. Whilst this has a notable height and footprint, the eaves of the building are relatively low. This means that given the predominantly open and less-developed character of the surrounding area, the existing building is reasonably harmonious with its surroundings. The remainder of the site includes ancillary structures, areas of hard standing and open-air storage.
20. The proposed developments would result in an increase in built form. In reaching this view I have had regard to the fact that, although the planning applications were submitted in outline form, the final building is likely to be of a level comparable to the indicative details before me.
21. Therefore, the proposed development would have a greater level of mass than the existing building. The proposed development would replace existing commercial facilities. However, the majority of these are of an open storage type. This means that the materials being stored may vary from time to time. This lack of permanence means that they do not have the same effect on openness as the appeal proposal would have.
22. In contrast, the proposal would be a permanent structure and will not feature any of these variations. This means that the proposed development would erode the spatial sense of openness that is a feature of the Green Belt.
23. Furthermore, the proposal would be viewed from a variety of residential properties that are generally arranged in a linear form and other recreational facilities in the surrounding area. This includes the nearby golf course and foot path. In consequence, the proposed development, by reason of its height and footprint, would be readily apparent in the surrounding area. Therefore, there would be a clear perception that more development had occurred, with the corresponding loss of openness.
24. Although there are several trees in the vicinity, the proposed development would be apparent over the height of these by reason of the proposed data centre's height. Furthermore, the topography of the vicinity of the appeal site is relatively level in nature. The consequence of this is that the proposed development would therefore be readily experienced by a significant number of people nearby owing to the lack of screening. In result, the proposed development would result in an erosion of the physical sense of openness of the Green Belt.
25. It has been suggested that the appeal site is not visible from a significant distance away. Whilst this may be the case; the scale and footprint of the development is likely to be such that they would still be an erosion of the

Green Belt's openness. Therefore, this suggestion does not overcome my previous concerns.

26. Paragraph 138 of the Framework specifies the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Amongst other matters, the Green Belt serves to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Whilst the proposal would be on land that is previously developed, the evidence before me is indicative that the scale of the overall new development would be significantly greater than the current level.
27. In result, the proposed development would create a significantly more urbanised appearance which would erode the rural and less developed character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would result in encroachment into the countryside. This means that the development would conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
28. The development, in this regard, would not conform with the requirements of Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Part 1 Plan; Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) (the Hillingdon Part 2 Plan); Policy G2 of the London Plan and Policy IV16 of the Ivers Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum version (2022)). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that developments do not have a greater impact on openness; and maintain the Green Belt.
29. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect upon the overall level of openness of the Green Belt. The development, in this regard, would conflict with the requirements of Policy GB1 of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan, and the Framework. Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that developments do not adversely affect the character of the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

30. The appeal site consists of various commercial facilities that comprise previously developed land. The immediate surroundings of the appeal site contain some trees, a railway, some residential accommodation, and recreation facilities. The most notable of these being a golf course. The appeal site is also near to some footpaths, which run through less developed land. From these, views of the appeal site are possible. Therefore, the surroundings of the appeal site are part of the urban fringe.
31. The appeal site features several buildings and structures. It can therefore be described as having a more built-up appearance. However, these are of a scale that harmonise with the surrounding area. The wider area has a differing characteristic insofar as development is relatively limited and generally arranged in a linear pattern. Furthermore, it is relatively flat, low-lying land.
32. Therefore, given the differing nature of the surrounding area and the notable number of people that may experience such change, in the form of occupiers of nearby dwellings, or users of recreation facilities in the surrounding area, such as the golf course, footpaths and the area of Thorney Mill Road near to the front of the appeal site, have a great level of sensitivity to change.
33. Owing to this level of sensitivity, the proposed development is likely to result in a significant change to the character of the wider area. This is because when viewed from areas such as the part of Thorney Mill Road, near to the front of the appeal site or the nearby golf course the proposed development would be

- readily perceptible. In particular, the great height of the proposed development and its footprint would create a significantly more urban appearance.
34. The surrounding area features buildings of generally limited heights. Therefore, a building akin to the height suggested within the appeal documentation would erode this character, for it would appear incongruous.
 35. This urban appearance would conflict with the more verdant and less developed surroundings of the wider area. In consequence, the urban fringe character of the vicinity would be eroded to a significant degree. By reason of the scale and siting of the proposed development, this could not be mitigated through items such as increased landscaping.
 36. In addition, views of the appeal proposal would be readily apparent from other viewpoints elsewhere in Thorney Mill Road. This is due to the pattern of development in the surrounding area. The overall effects would be smaller than that experienced in the previously described locations. However, the less developed character of this location would still be eroded by the development. This would create additional harm.
 37. These adverse effects would be discernible from locations in both Hillingdon and Buckinghamshire. The Framework places an importance upon ensuring that developments are sympathetic to local character. This objective would not be met by the proposed development as the skyline in the surrounding area would be punctuated by a significantly proportioned building.
 38. On my site visit, I viewed the nearby Thorney Mill building which is taller than many others nearby. However, it is still not of the height that the appeal proposal is likely to be. The building is also of a design that is generally expected for a type of building of this heritage. Therefore, it is not incongruous and does not have the same effects upon the character of the surrounding area as the appeal scheme would have.
 39. It has been suggested that the appeal site is relatively enclosed. Whilst this might mean that views of the development from significant distances away may not be possible, the fact remains that the proposed development within its immediate surroundings would be prominent and incongruous. Therefore, the absence of harm to the wider surrounding area does not allow me to disregard this adverse effect. Whilst the surrounding area is not a designated landscape, it does have a distinctive character, which would be eroded by the proposed development.
 40. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the fact that the development would not be readily perceptible from the nearby settlement of West Drayton. However, this matter is only one of all the points that must be considered and therefore does not outweigh the previously described adverse effects.
 41. The design of the development has been reserved for future consideration. However, the indicative details of the development are such that irrespective of this, there would be a significant erosion of the surrounding area's character.
 42. The development, in this regard, would not conform with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Part 1 Plan and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Part 2 Plan. Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that new developments achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations,

extensions and the public realm which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area; and harmonise with the local context.

43. I therefore conclude that the proposed developments would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would conflict with the requirements of Policy EP3 of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan; Policies CP8 and CP9 of the South Buckinghamshire Core Strategy (2011) (the Core Strategy); and the Framework. Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that developments are compatible with the adjoining development and the locality in general; make a positive contribution to the area's character; and conserve the landscape character.

Air Quality and Employment and Training opportunities

44. The proposed development would include generators to provide backup power for the intended data centre operator. In order to ensure that these remain operational in the event that mains power to the development is lost, there would need to be a regime of regular testing.
45. The planning application was submitted on the basis that such generators would be powered by diesel. However, at the hearing it was suggested that owing to changes in technology, such generators may be powered by hydrogen. Although this might be the case, I cannot be certain that, at the time that the development is implemented, such hydrogen powered generators are a viable option for the provision of backup power. Therefore, the use of diesel generators cannot, at this stage, be discounted.
46. In result, the operation of the generators has the potential to erode air quality within the surrounding area. In considering this appeal, I have been directed towards existing concerns regarding air quality within the surrounding area. This can be evidenced by the presence of air quality management areas nearby.
47. This adverse effect could be mitigated through the payment of a financial contribution to each of the respective councils. Such a contribution could be used to fund initiatives to improve air quality in the surrounding area. This would therefore reduce the effects arising from existing activities nearby and would therefore offset any increase in emissions from the proposed development. This would ensure that the development does not result in a net detrimental adverse effect.
48. I have been directed towards planning policies that seek to maintain air quality in the London Borough of Hillingdon. Although the data centre is likely to be located in the area under the jurisdiction of Buckinghamshire Council, the nature of air quality is that any adverse effects would be experienced on a cross boundary basis. Therefore, I have given weight to these policies in my determination.
49. This contribution has been phased in the submitted Unilateral Undertakings. Although this has been the subject of concerns raised by the Councils, it has not been demonstrated that there are projects that are ready to be funded should the payment be made in a single contribution. Therefore, the phasing of this payment would not delay the provision of the mitigation.

50. Furthermore, the air quality mitigation payment is intended to cover the lifetime of the proposed development. This means that some of the mitigation strategies may not take place until after the development has been operational for some time. Therefore, the phasing of this payment is reasonable within this context.
51. In addition, the evidence before me is indicative that the area under the jurisdiction of Buckinghamshire Council experiences residents migrating to other areas to undertake their employment. To mitigate this, the Council seeks the provision of employment and training opportunities on new developments in their area.
52. A planning obligation should run with the effected land. This means that should the land be transferred to a different owner, the obligations within the agreement would be enforceable against the future owners. Therefore, a legal agreement should be signed by all parties with an interest in the land. The Unilateral Undertakings, that have been submitted as part of the appeal proceedings, have been signed by the landowner and the mortgagee. However, the Unilateral Undertakings have not been signed by leaseholders that occupy parts of the site. This means that not all of those that have an interest in the land are parties to the Unilateral Undertakings.
53. Therefore, in the event of these Unilateral Undertakings being breached, the Councils cannot take enforcement action against the leaseholders. In consequence, I do not believe that the submitted Unilateral Undertakings provide me with sufficient certainty that the required mitigation would be provided.
54. I note that the Unilateral Undertakings have clauses that require that any leaseholds be surrendered prior to the development commencing and that a planning condition could be imposed that would ensure that prior to development commencing, the leasehold land is bound by a legal agreement consistent with the submitted Unilateral Undertakings.
55. However, layout of the development has been reserved for future consideration. Therefore, at this juncture, there is a possibility that the land that is covered by the current leases might be the first to be developed. In consequence, if there is not an agreement in place at this point, the respective Councils would not be able to take enforcement action against such a breach. Therefore, I must conclude that the development would not provide the required mitigation.
56. The appellant suggested that this approach has been taken previously on another site, outside of the jurisdiction of the Councils that are involved in this appeal. I do not have the full information regarding the planning circumstances of this, which means that I can only give this matter a limited amount of weight. Nonetheless, I do not believe that the circumstances of the appeal scheme, particularly given my previous conclusions, do not warrant diverging from the approach of having all interested parties signing the Unilateral Undertaking.
57. The submitted Unilateral Undertaking in respect of Appeal A includes an employment and skills contribution. At the hearing, Buckinghamshire Council confirmed that they do not have a project on which this contribution would be utilised and that there is no planning policy basis for seeking such a

contribution. Given that there is a likelihood that the contribution would not be utilised for its intended function, I do not believe that this contribution is necessary or reasonable.

58. Furthermore, the Unilateral Undertaking in respect of Appeal B includes obligations in respect of woodland management. However, the development would not result in the loss or a detrimental effect upon the nearby woodland. Although the woodland on the site reduces the effects of the development upon some areas of Hillingdon, there is a significant number of trees within this woodland. It therefore appears unlikely that the trees would be removed in sufficient quantity that this screening effect would no longer occur. Therefore, such obligations are not necessary and reasonable.
59. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would give rise to adverse effects, which would not be mitigated through the submitted legal agreements. The development, in this regard, would conflict with Policy CP6 of the Core Strategy; Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2; and the Hillingdon Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (2014). Amongst other matters, these require that infrastructure of all types supports development; and that infrastructure is delivered and maintained.

Other considerations

60. The proposed development would result in the provision of a new data centre which would have a significant capacity. The evidence before me is indicative that there is a notable need for such data centres within the locality and also the country as a whole.
61. In consequence, the proposed development would respond to this need which would assist in the generation of economic benefits through the supporting of business activities. This is particularly apparent due to the nature of the appeal site's location and its accessibility to infrastructure.
62. It has been suggested that data centres can be located outside of the Green Belt. Whilst this might be the case, the evidence before me is that the proposal would respond to a specific identified need both in the locality and the wider area. The appellant has considered alternative sites in the surrounding area and it is apparent that there are relatively few alternative options for the location of the proposed development. Furthermore, a proposal on the appeal site has the potential to operate at the speed required for the industry, is accessible and can access the data transfer infrastructure between London and New York.
63. In addition, it has been demonstrated that the proposed development could be serviced through the local power network. Although some improvements may be required, I have no reason to believe that these could not be delivered.
64. Furthermore, although the proposed development does not currently have an identified final occupier, the demand for data centres is such that I have no reason to believe that should the development proceed, it would not be put to a beneficial use.
65. The proposal would generate some economic benefits in the form of additional employment opportunities for workers in the data centre, the construction process and operation of the development would also support of other businesses elsewhere. These, in combination, would generate notable economic

benefits, even allowing for the loss of the existing business facilities. In result, I give the economic benefits arising from the proposed developments a significant amount of weight.

66. The proposed development would, as part of a land transfer, deliver opportunities for improved rail facilities associated with the distribution of aggregates. This would arise due to a more efficient arrangement of the aggregate business on site. Furthermore, this arrangement would also allow for a modal shift from vehicles to trains for the transportation of aggregates.
67. However, it has been established that planning policies, in the form of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2019) seeks to maintain the site for the carrying out of aggregate distribution. Therefore, such improvements are, in part, necessary in order to ensure that this policy is not breached by the proposed development. In result, I give these points a moderate amount of weight in my assessments.
68. The proposed development would also result in some biodiversity improvements. whilst the percentage increase would appear to be a sizable amount, the appeal site currently predominantly comprises areas for hard standing, open storage and various other structures. In result the overall level of biodiversity on site is currently likely to be limited. Therefore, such percentage increases would not necessarily arise from a significant amount of additional biodiversity. In result, I give this a limited amount of weight.
69. The development could potentially operate in a manner that would deliver improvements to the management of the on-site trees. However, these trees do not prevent the previously described adverse effects from occurring. I also have no evidence before me that is indicative that they are likely to be removed. I give this matter a limited amount of weight.
70. Although the proposal would result in the re-use of previously developed land, the benefits that can be ascribed to this are small given that the site is currently being used for commercial developments. Therefore, they can be only ascribed a limited amount of weight.
71. The proposed development would result in the cessation of lorry movements from the displaced uses. This has the potential to deliver air quality improvements in the surrounding area. However, the improvements to the rail network could potentially result in a greater number of lorry movements associated with the processing of aggregates. This would occur even though no objections have been received from the Local Highway Authorities. Therefore, any such improvements may not necessarily take place, or be of a large scale. I therefore attribute this matter a limited amount of weight.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

72. The development plan and Framework set out the general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. They explain that such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
73. I have concluded that the appeal scheme would be inappropriate development and would, by definition, harm the Green Belt. In so doing I have found harm

to the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 148 of the Framework requires substantial weight to be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

74. In addition, the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings and also some harm to the wider area. I give this matter a significant amount of weight.
75. Furthermore, given the absence of an appropriate legal agreement to secure appropriate mitigation, the development would also have an adverse effect upon the air quality levels in Buckinghamshire and Hillingdon and would not also provide appropriate employment opportunities for the occupiers of Buckinghamshire. This would also amount to a notable amount of harm, to which I ascribe a significant amount of weight.
76. The other considerations I have identified individually and collectively carry a limited to significant amount of weight in favour of the proposal. As such the harm to the Green Belt is not clearly outweighed by the other considerations identified either individually or in accumulation, and therefore the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.
77. The scheme within Appeal A would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate the decisions should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed, and planning permission refused.
78. Given the intrinsic links between the works that would be in Buckinghamshire and Hillingdon, it therefore follows that as Appeal A fails, Appeal B must also fail given that it would conflict with the relevant development plan and the Framework. There are also no other material considerations that indicate that an alternative decision should be made.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

For the appellant:

Rupert Warren KC	of Counsel
Stephen Beard	Knight Frank
Rupert Dyer	Rail Expertise
Greg Mahon	Barton Willmore, now Stantec
Emma McDonald	Town Legal
Paul Newton	Barton Willmore, now Stantec
Ian Roberts	Bellamy Roberts

For Buckinghamshire Council:

Elizabeth Aston	Buckinghamshire Council
-----------------	-------------------------

For the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon:

Brendan Brett	of Counsel
Michael Bringinshaw	Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon
Mark Butler	Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon
Ana Grossinho	Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon
Mandip Malhotra	Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon
Diana Miller	Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon

Interested Parties:

Cllr Paul Griffin	Buckinghamshire Council
Cllr Wendy Matthews	Buckinghamshire Council
Cllr Luisa Sullivan	Buckinghamshire Council
Cllr Graham Young	Ivers Parish Council
Rishikesh Trivedy	Local Resident

Evidence submitted at the Hearing:

CIL compliance schedule
Ivers Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum Version)
Legal Agreement updates
Network Rail support letter
Policies DMHB10 and DHMB11 of the Hillingdon Part 2 Plan

Evidence submitted after the Hearing closed:

Completed Unilateral Undertakings in respect of both Appeal A and Appeal B