

DELEGATED ADVERTISEMENT DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Date(s) of Amendments(s):

Date Application valid

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the public footway adjacent to 53-55 High Street, Ruislip, within Ruislip Town Centre and the designated Secondary Shopping Area. The site also lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The surrounding area is characterised by a mixed-use High Street environment comprising predominantly two- to three-storey buildings of inter-war origin constructed in brick, with commercial uses at ground floor level and residential accommodation above.

The immediate vicinity already contains a range of street furniture including an existing BT telephone kiosk, sign posts, parking meter, litter bin, cycle racks and street tree, as shown on the submitted elevation drawings.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Installation of 1No. BT Street Hub Unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit

1.3 Relevant Planning History

Installation of 1No. BT Street Hub Unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit

Comment on Planning History

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

The advertisement consent application was consulted on 27/01/2026 with a consultation expiry date of 17/02/2026. A total of 43 neighbouring properties and Ruislip Residents Association were notified of the proposal. No representations have been received from neighbouring occupiers or members of the public.

The following internal consultees were also consulted:

Conservation Officer:

Objects to the proposal on the basis that the introduction of internally illuminated digital advertising would harm the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The digital displays are considered bright, visually dominant and inappropriate within this historic High Street context.

Highways Officer:

No objection raised.

All consultation responses received have been taken into account in the assessment of the application.

4. UDP/LDF Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Polices:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMHB 13A	Advertisements and Shop Signage
NPPF16 -24	NPPF16 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

Pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007, the display of outdoor advertisements can only be controlled in the interests of 'amenity' and 'public safety'. These are the key issues in the assessment of this case.

Amenity:

The Advertisement Regulations advise that factors relevant to 'amenity' include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest, which would encompass listed buildings. Therefore, the effect on a conservation area or the setting of a listed building is of a relevant factor to the consideration of the effect on 'amenity'.

As the site is located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, the Local Planning Authority have also had regard to both Section 66 of the (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, as well as Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of "preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of a Conservation Area. This is a matter of considerable weight.

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF (2021) states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be).

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) stated that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) states that the Council will conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider

historic landscape, which includes the designated heritage assets such as statutorily Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that both enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials, is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all development to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) requires development to be well integrated with the surrounding area.

Policy DMHB 13A of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

A) In order to improve and maintain the quality of the public realm, advertisements, signs and hoardings will be required to demonstrate that:

- i) they complement the scale, form, materials and architectural composition of the individual buildings of which they form a part;
- ii) they complement the visual amenity and character of the site and surrounding area;
- iii) they enhance historic assets and their setting;
- iv) they do not have an adverse impact on public or highway safety;
- v) they do not lead to visual clutter;
- vi) they provide an appropriate type and level of illumination, suitable to the site and its surroundings; and
- vii) they enhance the visual amenity of vacant sites, building sites and the surrounding area during the construction period.

B) Shop signage will generally be limited to the strip above the shop window and below the upper floor, plus where appropriate one projecting sign. Proposals for further advertising additional to the shop name will be resisted.

C) Illumination to shopfronts must be sited and designed to avoid any visual intrusion from light pollution to adjoining or nearby residents. Flashing internal or external lighting and/or internally illuminated box lights will not be permitted.

Whilst advertisements are common in town centre locations, the character of this part of Ruislip High Street, within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, is defined by traditional shopfront signage with limited illumination. There are very few illuminated advertisements located on the footway itself, and most signage illumination along the High Street is modest or externally lit. The existing environment is therefore not characterised by large-scale digital displays or a heavily illuminated streetscape.

The proposed Street Hub would incorporate large internally illuminated digital screens on both sides

of a freestanding structure. These screens, by reason of their brightness, changing images and scale, would be visually dominant and would draw the eye in wider views along the High Street. They would compete with traditional shopfront signage, introduce an incongruous modern advertising feature, and create an incrementally harmful illuminated environment. The proposal would therefore fail to integrate successfully into its context and would appear overly prominent within the street scene.

The site already contains a concentration of street furniture, including an existing kiosk, parking meter, signage, cycle racks, litter bin, bus stop infrastructure and cafe seating. The introduction of an illuminated advertising structure in this constrained footway environment would exacerbate visual clutter and detract from the character and appearance of the High Street and the wider Conservation Area.

The advertisement would therefore, by reason of its illumination, scale, design and siting, result in an obtrusive and cluttered public realm detrimental to visual amenity and harmful to the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The harm identified is considered to amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. There are no public benefits arising specifically from the advertising element of the proposal which would outweigh this harm.

The Council's Conservation Officer has raised objection on this basis, advising that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Furthermore, it is noted that similar digital communication hub proposals within Hillingdon town centres have frequently been dismissed at appeal where Inspectors concluded that illuminated displays would add undue street clutter and harm visual amenity. The current proposal would result in comparable harm.

For these reasons, the proposed advertisements are contrary to Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 13A of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), and the amenity provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007.

Public Safety

The National Planning Practice Guidance recognises that all advertisements are intended to attract attention but may affect public safety where located in areas requiring particular driver or pedestrian awareness.

The proposed advertisements would comprise internally illuminated digital displays with sequential static images. While their luminance and visual prominence are harmful in amenity terms, subject to appropriate conditions controlling luminance levels, rate of image change and absence of animation, the proposal would be unlikely to unduly distract drivers or compromise highway safety. Highways have raised no objection.

The proposal therefore would not conflict with Policy DMHB 13A of the Hillingdon Local Plan in respect of public safety.

Conclusion

The proposed advertisements, by reason of their illumination, scale, design and siting within a sensitive High Street location in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, would harm visual amenity

and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. There are no public benefits associated with the advertising element that would outweigh this harm. Accordingly, the advertisement consent application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed advertisement, by reason of its scale, luminance, design and prominent siting, including the incorporation of a large digital LCD display, would appear visually intrusive and result in an obtrusive and cluttered public realm detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, resulting in harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 13A and DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), and Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

INFORMATIVES

Contact Officer:	Emilie Bateman	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	----------------	----------------------	--------------