

DELEGATED 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.	ADVERTISMENT 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

Item No.	Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control	
Address:	82-84 HIGH STREET RUISLIP	
Development:	Creation of 6no. self-contained flats with associated cycle and bin storage, following the change of use of first floor from office (Class E) to residential (Class C3), the erection of a two storey rear extension with balconies and terraces and alterations to rear building including an additional storey and terraces. Retention and reconfiguration of the Class E unit at ground floor level with alterations to fenestration.	
LBH Ref Nos:	78935/APP/2026/418	
Drawing Nos:	Air quality assessment Overheating Analysis Daylight or sunlight assessment BAT EMERGENCE SURVEY REPORT Heritage statement Planning Supporting Statement PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT Transport Statement Technical statement 3616 / L / 01 3616 / L / 02 3616 / P / 141 Rev A 3616 / P / 142 Rev B DAS.02.26	
Date Plans received:	19-02-26	Date(s) of Amendments(s):
Date Application valid	19-02-26	

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks permission for the creation of 6 self-contained residential units within an existing mixed-use building, involving the change of use of upper floors to residential, retention of a Class E unit at ground floor level, and a series of external alterations including substantial changes to the roof of the locally listed building, a two-storey rear extension, and the addition of a further storey to the rear building.

The site occupies a prominent corner position within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and comprises a locally listed building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the principle of residential use is acceptable and the proposal would

contribute towards housing supply in a sustainable town centre location, a fallback position exists under the extant permission for 5 residential units (net gain of 4), which was accepted on the basis that it would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the significance of the locally listed building.

In contrast, the current proposal introduces a significantly greater level of built form and is considered to result in overdevelopment, causing less than substantial harm, at the higher end of the scale, to the significance of the locally listed building and the Conservation Area, as well as additional harm to neighbouring residential amenity. Whilst the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, and the delivery of 6 units (net gain of 5) carries weight, the identified harms are considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Character and appearance

The proposed development, by reason of its cumulative scale, bulk and visual complexity, including extensive alterations to the roof of the locally listed building and the addition of a further storey to the rear building, would result in an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would materially alter the established proportions and roofscape, erode the legibility of the building's neo-Georgian design, and diminish the prominence of key features, resulting in a dominant and intrusive form of development that fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and harms the significance of the locally listed building. This represents a clear departure from the form of development previously found acceptable at appeal. The identified less than substantial harm is not outweighed by the limited public benefits of the proposal and is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020), Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

2. NON2 Impact on Neighbours Amenity

The proposed development, by reason of the additional storey to the rear building and associated increase in height and bulk, would result in an overbearing form of development that would cause an unacceptable loss of outlook and sense of enclosure to neighbouring occupiers, in particular the first-floor rear bedroom window at No. 80A High Street and No.2 Ickenham Rd. The proposal would therefore result in harm to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers, contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

INFORMATIVES

1. I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human

Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2. 174 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Refusing Consent)

This is a reminder that Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), should an application for appeal be allowed, the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development' and therefore liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012.

For more information on CIL matters please visit the planning portal page at:
www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan (2021) and national guidance.

DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMH 1	Safeguarding Existing Housing
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF14 -24	NPPF14 2024 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flood and coastal change
NPPF2 -24	NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5 -24	NPPF5 2024 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF9 -24	NPPF9 2024 - Promoting sustainable transport
DMH 2	Housing Mix

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP DF1	(2021) Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations
LPP D12	(2021) Fire safety
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LPP SD6	(2021) Town centres and high streets
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions

LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The building is located in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and is locally listed. It is a key landmark that contributes to the local character and the street scene. The 1920s three storey brick building is a prominent classically inspired composition. The bank is 5 windows wide, the 3 central bays are slightly recessed and framed with prominent down pipes with decorative hoppers. There are two similarly detailed asymmetrical wings on either side. The bank has robust vertical decorative brick detailing, Juliet balconies and a prominent stone fascia/band between the ground and first floors.

The site is located within the designated Town Centre and has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 4 (good).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the creation of 6 self-contained residential units, including the change of use of the first floor from Class E (commercial) to Class C3 (residential), together with associated cycle and refuse storage and the retention and reconfiguration of the ground floor commercial unit.

The proposal includes a number of alterations to the locally listed building. These comprise of alterations and extensions to the existing roof form through the infilling of the hipped roof between the two prominent chimney stacks, resulting in a form that reads as a double hip to gable arrangement with high party wall parapets. The scheme also introduces five front-facing dormer windows and a flat roof extension to the rear of the main roof, which presents a mansard-like appearance and incorporates a roof terrace with 1.8m high privacy screening. In addition, the proposal includes a two-storey flat roof rear extension and alterations to fenestration, including replacement of the front door.

To the rear of the site, the development includes further alterations to an existing building connected to the main building via a ground floor link. The roof of this link is proposed to be used as a communal terrace. The rear building currently two storey and permission is sought to extend this building upwards by one additional storey, incorporating a mansard-style roof and associated terrace, alongside alterations to the first floor including an infill extension and part demolition to provide external amenity space.

The proposed residential development would comprise 4 one-bedroom (1-person) units, 1 two-bedroom (4-person) duplex unit, and 1 two-bedroom (3-person) unit.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

78935/APP/2024/1992	82-84 HIGH STREET RUISLIP
---------------------	---------------------------

Extensions and alterations to ground, first and second floors with change of use of first floor from office (Class E) to residential (Class C3) to provide 4 x 1-bed flats and 1 x 2-bed flat with associated cycle and bin storage. Retention and reconfiguration of Class E unit at ground floor and alterations to fenestration.

Decision: 11-10-2024

Refusal

Appeal: 25-07-25 Dismissed

78935/APP/2026/477

82-84 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Details pursuant to the discharge of Conditions 4 (Materials), 5 (Construction Management Plan), 6 (Landscaping), and 10 (Fires Statement) of planning permission ref. 78935/APP/2025/2287, dated 16-01-26 (Creation of 5no. self-contained flats with associated cycle and bin storage, following the change of use of first floor from office (Class E) to residential (Class C3), the erection of a two storey rear extension and alterations to rear building at first floor level and the retention and reconfiguration of the Class E unit at ground floor level with alterations to fenestration.)

78935/APP/2026/483

82-84 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Details pursuant to the discharge of Conditions 7 (Overheating), 8 (Privacy Screen, upper landing), 9 (Flat 3 Terrace Screen), 11 (Entrance Door) and 12 (Water Consumption) ref. 78935/APP/2025/2287, dated 16-01-26 (Creation of 5no. self-contained flats with associated cycle and bin storage, following the change of use of first floor from office (Class E) to residential (Class C3), the erection of a two storey rear extension and alterations to rear building at first floor level and the retention and reconfiguration of the Class E unit at ground floor level with alterations to fenestration.)

78935/APP/2025/2287

82-84 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Creation of 5no. self-contained flats with associated cycle and bin storage, following the change of use of first floor from office (Class E) to residential (Class C3), the erection of a two storey rear extension and alterations to rear building at first floor level and the retention and reconfiguration of the Class E unit at ground floor level with alterations to fenestration.

Decision: 16-01-2026

Approval

Comment on Planning History

The application site has an extensive planning history relating to the conversion and extension of the building to residential use.

Planning permission was previously refused under application reference 78935/APP/2024/1992 for extensions and alterations including the change of use of the upper floors to residential. The refusal related, in part, to concerns regarding design, overdevelopment and impact on the character and appearance of the locally listed building and the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

That decision was subsequently dismissed at appeal (APP/R5510/W/24/3356952). The Inspector accepted that the building is a non-designated heritage asset which makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, noting its prominence within the street scene and its architectural interest. The Inspector concluded that the proposed development was acceptable in design and heritage

terms, primarily on the basis that the alterations were limited in scale, preserved the architectural interest of the principal elevation and would not result in a sense of overdevelopment. However, it was dismissed on amenity grounds.

Following the appeal, planning permission was granted under application reference 78935/APP/2025/2287 for a revised scheme comprising the conversion of the upper floors to residential use, a two-storey rear extension, and alterations to the rear building including the provision of a terrace. This scheme retained the existing roof form of the locally listed building and limited the extent of alterations, reflecting the parameters of development found acceptable by the Inspector.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: **1st April 2026**

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

Public Consultation

Neighbour consultation was carried out on 27-02-26, with an expiry date of 31-03-26. A total of 4 objections were received.

The objections raised the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment and excessive scale, particularly in comparison to the previously approved scheme
- Harm to the character of the area and impact on the locally listed building
- Loss of light, overbearing impact and sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties
- Overlooking and loss of privacy from balconies and terraces
- Noise and disturbance arising from additional residential use and terrace activity
- Increased pressure on parking, servicing and rear access arrangements
- Impact on local businesses and vitality of the High Street
- Refuse storage and collection issues within the rear service area

Concerns were also raised regarding the consultation process and property values.

These matters have been fully considered and are addressed within the relevant sections of this report, including character and appearance, residential amenity, highways and waste management.

Internal Consultees

Conservation Officer

The Conservation Officer raises an objection to the proposal. It is advised that the scheme would result in harm to the locally listed building and the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The existing hipped roof form and prominent chimney stacks are identified as key architectural features which contribute positively to the building's neo-Georgian character and its role as a landmark within the street scene.

The proposed alterations, including infilling of the roof, introduction of dormers and increased bulk,

are considered to significantly alter the roofscape and erode the building's architectural integrity. The resulting harm is identified as less than substantial, at the higher end of the spectrum in respect of the locally listed building, and moderate to low in respect of the Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer further notes that the previously approved scheme retained the existing roof form and resulted in a much lower level of harm. In contrast, the current proposal represents a clear intensification and increase in harm, which is not considered to be outweighed by any public benefits. Refusal is therefore recommended.

Access Officer

No objection is raised. It is advised that full compliance with accessible and adaptable dwelling standards (M4(2)) cannot reasonably be achieved due to the constraints of converting an existing building. In such circumstances, strict application of Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) is not required.

Highway Authority

No objection is raised. The proposal is presented on a car-free basis within a highly accessible location (PTAL 4) and within a Controlled Parking Zone. Whilst there is a theoretical shortfall in parking provision, this is considered marginal and unlikely to result in unacceptable impacts on the surrounding highway network or parking stress.

The Highway Authority notes that previous applications at the site, including the extant permission, were also considered acceptable on a car-free basis. Cycle parking provision is considered adequate, and trip generation is expected to be negligible. Refuse and servicing arrangements are acceptable, and a Construction Management Plan can be secured by condition.

6. Local Plan 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 Policies:

DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMH 1	Safeguarding Existing Housing
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land

NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF14 -24	NPPF14 2024 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flood and coastal change
NPPF2 -24	NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5 -24	NPPF5 2024 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF9 -24	NPPF9 2024 - Promoting sustainable transport
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP DF1	(2021) Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations
LPP D12	(2021) Fire safety
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LPP SD6	(2021) Town centres and high streets
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

In addition: Development Plan:

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) requires that development creates places that are safe, inclusive and accessible, promotes health and well-being, and secures a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) confirms that development must not adversely affect the amenity, daylight or sunlight of adjoining occupiers.

Paragraphs 5.38-5.41 of the Local Plan Part Two set expectations regarding privacy, separation distances, outlook and the avoidance of undue enclosure, with a minimum 21-metre separation generally required between facing habitable-room windows unless strong justification exists. These policies collectively require that new development avoids unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, noise or overbearing impacts.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) requires that development creates places that are safe, inclusive and accessible, promotes health and well-being, and secures a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) confirms that development must not adversely affect the amenity, daylight or sunlight of adjoining occupiers. Paragraphs 5.38-5.41 of the Local Plan Part Two set expectations regarding privacy, separation distances, outlook and the avoidance of undue enclosure, with a minimum 21-metre separation generally required between facing habitable room windows unless strong justification exists. These policies collectively require that development avoids unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, noise or overbearing impacts.

A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted in support of the current proposal and has been reviewed. The assessment considers the impact on neighbouring properties including Nos. 2 Ickenham Road, 8 Ickenham Road and 78-80 High Street, assessing a total of 17 windows. The

assessment has been undertaken in accordance with BRE guidance (Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022)) and focuses on the most sensitive windows serving habitable rooms. The results demonstrate that all assessed windows meet the BRE criteria, with all retaining in excess of 80% of their existing Vertical Sky Component values and maintaining appropriate levels of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. As such, the proposal would not result in a material loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring occupiers.

In terms of outlook and enclosure, the previous appeal identified concerns in relation to the relationship with the first-floor rear bedroom window at No. 80A, where the boundary treatment created a tunnelling effect. The current proposal has amended this relationship by increasing the setback of the boundary fence, thereby widening the visual corridor and improving outlook. The existing brick wall would be retained and the revised arrangement would remove the sense of enclosure previously identified.

Notwithstanding the improvements made to the boundary treatment in response to the previous appeal, concern remains in respect of the relationship with the first-floor rear bedroom window at No. 80A and introduce new concerns regarding No. 2 Ickenham Road. Whilst the increased setback of the boundary fence improves the immediate outlook and addresses the previously identified tunnelling effect with No.80a, similarly while the proposed rear extension and link element would be set off the mutual boundary with No. 2, the introduction of an additional storey to the rear building would result in a material increase in height and bulk in close proximity to these neighbouring properties. Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing relationship is already constrained, the cumulative impact of the additional storey, mansard roof form would introduce a more dominant and visually intrusive form of development when viewed from No. 2 and 80a. As such, the development would give rise to an overbearing relationship and an unacceptable loss of outlook.

With regard to privacy, the proposal includes roof terraces, balconies and an external staircase providing access to communal amenity space. It is acknowledged that the introduction of these elements has the potential to give rise to overlooking. However, mitigation measures are proposed, including 1.8m high privacy screening to terrace areas and at the upper landing of the external staircase, which would prevent direct views towards neighbouring properties. At lower levels, existing boundary treatments provide sufficient screening. Subject to conditions securing these measures, the development would not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.

Fenestration has been designed to avoid direct overlooking relationships, with windows positioned to avoid direct alignment with neighbouring habitable room windows. Where windows face towards nearby buildings, this occurs at oblique angles or is mitigated through screening and separation distances typical of a town centre environment. The proposal does not introduce new elevated or prominent openings that would result in harmful overlooking.

In terms of noise and disturbance, the site is located within a busy town centre where a degree of activity is expected. The introduction of residential use at upper floors would not result in a materially different pattern of activity from that typically associated with such development. The communal terrace, whilst introducing some level of outdoor activity, is limited in scale and serves a modest number of units. Its location within a rear courtyard environment further reduces its potential to cause disturbance. If recommended for approval, a condition would be secured to restrict amplified noise from terrace areas. Construction impacts would be temporary and can be controlled through a Construction Management Plan secured by condition.

Taking all matters into account, including the amendments made in response to the appeal decision, the BRE-compliant daylight and sunlight results, and the mitigation measures proposed, the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of surrounding

occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020), Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

CHARACTER, APPEARANCE AND HERITAGE

Section 72 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 conservation areas. Paragraphs 138 and 140 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) confirm that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, with harm requiring clear and convincing justification.

The application site comprises a locally listed building occupying a prominent corner position within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The building is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset and makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area. Its architectural interest is derived from its symmetrical neo-Georgian composition, including its principal elevation, hipped roof form and prominent chimney stacks, which contribute to its visual prominence and role within the wider townscape.

The significance of the building has been clearly established through the previous appeal decision, which is a material consideration in the assessment of the current proposal. The Inspector noted that the building is "on a prominent street corner" with "notable aesthetic interest", and further confirmed that it "contributes positively to the qualities of the CA." These findings reinforce the importance of preserving the building's architectural composition and its contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal comprises a series of alterations to the locally listed building, including substantial changes to the roof form through infilling of the hipped roof between the existing chimney stacks, with tall blank party wall parapets, the introduction of five front dormers, and the addition of a rear roof extension with a mansard-like form incorporating a roof terrace and 1.8m high privacy screening. These works are combined with a two-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration, including replacement of the front door. In addition, the scheme includes further development to the rear building, which is connected to the host building via a ground floor link, involving the addition of a further storey with a mansard roof and terrace.

Collectively, these works would materially alter the established form, proportions and composition of both the principal building and its rear element. The existing simple hipped roof of the locally listed building, which reads clearly in conjunction with the symmetrically positioned chimney stacks, would be significantly altered through infilling, dormers and additional bulk, resulting in a more complex and visually heavier roofscape. The rear roof extension, projecting across almost the full depth of the building and incorporating a terrace with 1.8m high screening, would give the appearance of an additional storey and would visually compete with and obscure the original roof form.

As a result, the proposal would disrupt the established proportions of the building, diminish the visual prominence of the chimney stacks, and erode the architectural integrity of the asset. Given the building's prominent corner location, these changes would be clearly perceptible in public views and would significantly diminish its contribution to the wider townscape and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In contrast, the previously approved scheme retained the existing roof form and limited alterations to the rear of the building, with no substantive changes to the principal elevation or overall

silhouette. The Inspector's acceptance of that scheme was explicitly based on its limited and subordinate nature, noting that "the proposal would include only minor alterations to the front of the main building" and that "the proposal would not cause a sense of overdevelopment as the extensions would be fairly small in scale." The Inspector also concluded that "the small extension and alterations to the windows and doors in the back building would not meaningfully change the appearance of the property."

The current proposal represents a clear and material departure from that position. The works can no longer be characterised as "fairly small in scale", nor can it be concluded that they "would not meaningfully change the appearance of the property". Instead, the proposal introduces a level of bulk, depth and visual complexity that results in a more dominant and intrusive form of development, giving rise to a sense of overdevelopment and conflicting directly with the reasoning set out in the appeal decision.

The design approach appears to draw reference from the adjacent property at No. 74 High Street, which incorporates a more complex roof form comprising front dormers and a mansard-style structure set behind the principal roof with high party wall parapets. However, the two buildings are not directly comparable in heritage or townscape terms. The application site at No. 82-84 is a locally listed building, recognised as a non-designated heritage asset, and is situated within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset and greater weight must be given to the preservation of the architectural integrity, roof form and overall composition. In contrast, No. 74 High Street does not benefit from local listing.

Whilst No. 74 exhibits a more complex roof form, this reflects a different architectural approach, whereby it forms part of a stepped terrace that reduces in scale and reads as a secondary or background element. In contrast, No. 82-84 has been designed as a prominent and more formal neo-Georgian corner building, with a clearly defined hipped roof and symmetrically arranged chimney stacks forming an integral part of its architectural composition. It is read as a distinct focal building within the street scene. The existing roof form remains legible and intact, allowing the building's original design intent and contribution to the Conservation Area to be clearly appreciated.

The proposed development, by introducing a comparable mansard-style form with dormers and increased bulk, would erode this legibility and undermine the building's architectural clarity. Applying a similar form of development to the corner building would disrupt the established hierarchy of the streetscape and diminish its role as a landmark within the Conservation Area.

The significant upward extension to the rear building, increases its height by approximately 3 metres to facilitate an additional storey in the form of a duplex unit. Whilst the existing approval includes alterations to the rear element, including a infill extension and terrace, the current proposal represents a clear intensification, introducing a mansard-style roof with a substantial flat roof element and terraces at both levels. The upper terrace would require 1.8m high privacy screening, which would appear as a visually bulky addition and further increase the perceived massing of the structure.

The rear building is currently read as a clearly subordinate and ancillary element to the principal locally listed building. However, the proposed increase in height and bulk would materially alter this relationship, resulting in a form of development that competes with, rather than defers to, the host building. The cumulative impact of the additional storey, crown roof form, terraces and privacy screening would result in a visually dominant, overbearing and overdeveloped form of development.

When viewed from the rear, including from the adjacent public car park and alleyway, the extension would appear as a substantial and intrusive addition, obscuring views of the locally listed building

and diminishing the legibility of its original form. In these views, the development would read as an excessive and dominant addition that disrupts the established hierarchy of the site. As such, the proposal would fail to remain subservient to the locally listed building and would result in further harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Taken together, the scale, depth and cumulative massing of the proposed roof alterations, rear extensions and additional storey would result in an overdevelopment of the site, whereby the quantum of built form exceeds that which can be accommodated without causing harm to the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area

The Council's Conservation Officer has raised an objection, advising that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the locally listed building at the higher end of the spectrum, and less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area at a moderate to low level. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF (2024), where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

In this instance, a fallback position exists in the form of the extant permission, which demonstrates that residential development can be delivered on the site with a significantly lower level of harm, including retention of the existing roof form and key architectural features. This is a material consideration which reduces the weight that can be attributed to the benefits of the current proposal.

The overall planning balance is set out in the section below.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

See below.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Highways and Transport

Policy DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021) seek to ensure that development does not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety, traffic generation or parking stress.

The application site is located within a highly accessible town centre location, with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 and close proximity to Ruislip Underground Station and a range of bus routes. The surrounding road network is subject to controlled parking restrictions, including pay and display bays and waiting restrictions, which limit opportunities for long-stay on-street parking.

The proposal is presented on a car-free basis. Whilst London Plan Policy T6.1 identifies a maximum parking provision, the absence of on-site parking is considered acceptable in this instance, having regard to the site's accessibility and the characteristics of the surrounding area. The Highway Authority has reviewed the proposal and raises no objection to the car-free approach, noting that any potential shortfall in parking provision would be marginal and unlikely to result in a demonstrable increase in parking stress or highway harm. This position is consistent with previous applications and appeal decisions at the site.

In terms of cycle parking, the proposal provides a cycle store to the rear accommodating 8 spaces, which meets the Council's requirements and is considered to be secure and accessible.

The scale of development is modest and, given the absence of on-site parking, the proposal is not expected to result in a material increase in vehicular trip generation. As such, no adverse impacts on the operation or safety of the local highway network are anticipated.

Refuse and servicing arrangements would be accommodated via the existing rear access, which is currently used by the commercial unit, and on-street loading facilities are available within the vicinity. These arrangements are considered acceptable.

A Construction Management Plan would be secured by condition to ensure that construction-related impacts are appropriately managed.

Overall, the proposal is not considered to give rise to unacceptable impacts on highway safety, parking provision or the operation of the local highway network, and is therefore compliant with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

INTERNAL AMENITY SPACE PROVISION:

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) sets out the requirements for the gross internal floor area (A) of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy. Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021) set out the same gross internal area space standards set out in the Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (2015). (C) Housing development should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and normally avoid the provision of single aspect dwellings. A single aspect dwelling should only be provided where it is considered a more appropriate design solution to meet the requirements of Part B in Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach than a dual aspect dwelling, and it can be demonstrated that it will have adequate passive ventilation, daylight and privacy, and avoid overheating. (D) The design of development should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, whilst avoiding overheating, minimising overshadowing and maximising the usability of outside amenity space. (E) Housing should be designed with adequate and easily accessible storage space that supports the separate collection of dry recyclables (for at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food waste as well as residual waste.

Policy DMHB 15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will require all new development to ensure safe and attractive public and private spaces by referring to the Council's latest guidance on Secured by Design principles.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space to provide an appropriate living environment. To achieve this all-residential development or conversions should:

- i) meet or exceed the most up to date internal space standards, as set out in Table 5.1; and
- ii) in the case of major developments, provide at least 10% of new housing to be accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

The proposed development comprises a mix of one- and two-bedroom units, including a duplex unit. All units meet or exceed the minimum Gross Internal Area (GIA) requirements. The one-bedroom units (1B/1P) exceed the minimum requirement of 37sqm, with proposed sizes ranging from 41.7sqm to 51.3sqm. The two-bedroom units also exceed the relevant standards, with Flat 3 (2B/4P duplex) providing 96.9sqm against a requirement of 79sqm, and Flat 6 (2B/3P) providing 64sqm against a requirement of 61sqm.

In terms of internal storage, all units meet or exceed the minimum requirements, with provision ranging from 1sqm to 3.9sqm, thereby complying with the London Plan standards.

Overall, the proposed units would provide an acceptable standard of internal accommodation in terms of space and storage provision and are compliant with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT, PRIVACY AND OUTLOOK:

The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment confirms that the proposed units would receive acceptable levels of daylight in accordance with relevant guidance. In addition, habitable rooms are generally served by windows with an acceptable outlook, and no units are considered to rely on poor quality or solely secondary outlook.

The scheme also incorporates measures to mitigate overheating, and the submitted assessment confirms compliance with relevant standards.

PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE:

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) require residential development to provide appropriate private or communal amenity space.

The previously approved scheme established a baseline whereby the majority of units relied on communal amenity space, with limited private provision. That approach was accepted on balance, having regard to the town centre location, site constraints and the quality of the communal terrace.

The current proposal follows a similar arrangement. Four of the units would not benefit from any private outdoor amenity space and would instead rely on access to the communal roof terrace. The remaining units would provide private terraces; however, these fall below the Council's quantitative requirements for two-bedroom units.

Whilst this represents a shortfall against Policy DMHB 18, the overall approach to amenity provision is comparable to that previously approved, with a similar quantum of development and reliance on communal space. As such, and having regard to the highly accessible town centre location, the provision is considered acceptable on balance in this instance.

ACCESS:

Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) sets requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings. The proposal relates to the conversion of the upper floors of an existing building, where full step-free and M4(2) compliance cannot reasonably be achieved without extensive structural alteration. The Access Officer has confirmed that, in such circumstances, strict application of D7 is not required. No objections are raised from an accessibility perspective.

FIRE SAFETY:

Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021) requires all development proposals to demonstrate that fire safety has been considered from the earliest stages of design. This is normally achieved through the submission of a Fire Statement prepared by a suitably competent assessor.

In this instance, no Fire Statement has been submitted as part of the application. However, given the scale and nature of the development, it is considered that this matter can be appropriately secured by condition. If recommended for approval, a condition would be secured requiring the

submission and approval of a Fire Statement prior to the commencement of above-ground works. This will ensure that the development achieves an appropriate standard of fire safety, including in relation to means of escape, firefighting access, and the mixed-use nature of the building and communal terrace.

Subject to this condition, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021).

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

The proposal seeks the creation of six self-contained residential units through the change of use of the upper floors of an existing mixed-use building located within the Ruislip Primary Shopping Area. The ground floor Class E unit would be retained and reconfigured. Policy H1 of the London Plan (2021) supports the optimisation of housing delivery on suitable sites, particularly within accessible town centre locations. The site benefits from a PTAL of 4 and is within walking distance of a wide range of services, employment opportunities and public transport. Residential accommodation on upper floors within town centres is well established and supported in principle, representing an efficient use of existing buildings in a sustainable location.

The recent Planning Appeal Decision (APP/R5510/W/24/3356952) is a material consideration and confirmed the acceptability of introducing residential use to the upper floors of the building. The Inspector did not raise concerns regarding the retention or viability of the ground floor commercial unit, noting that it would maintain an active frontage and continue to contribute to the vitality of the town centre.

The Inspector further concluded that, whilst the provision of ancillary residential accommodation to the rear would result in some loss of commercial floorspace, this would not harm the marketability of the retained ground floor unit or the wider function and vitality of the centre. The current proposal follows a similar approach, retaining the primary Class E unit at ground floor level with an active frontage. The areas proposed for residential use are located to the upper floors and rear, where they have limited commercial value and no direct customer access. As such, their loss is not considered to prejudice the viability or attractiveness of the retained commercial unit or the wider shopping parade.

In this context, the proposal accords with London Plan Policies SD6 and SD7, and Policies DMTC1 and DMTC2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020). Whilst there would be a reduction in the overall extent of Class E floorspace, the proposal would not result in the loss of the active commercial frontage and would not undermine the role or function of the Primary Shopping Area. The retention of the ground floor unit ensures continued commercial activity, and the introduction of residential use to the upper floors is supported by Policy DMH2, subject to the provision of an acceptable standard of accommodation and no adverse impact on the operation of the commercial use.

HOUSING MIX:

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF promotes the efficient use of land to meet housing needs. London Plan Policy GG4 seeks to ensure that more homes are delivered, whilst Policy H1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One provides that the Council will seek to meet and exceed its housing growth targets. Policy T1 directs development to the most appropriate and accessible locations in order to reduce reliance on the private car and promote sustainable modes of transport. In this instance, there is no objection in principle to the introduction of additional residential development to the upper floors and

rear of the site, particularly given its town centre location and good level of accessibility.

The proposed development would provide a mix of units comprising four one-bedroom, one-person units, one two-bedroom, four-person duplex unit, and one two-bedroom, three-person unit. The Council's evidence on housing need identifies a borough-wide requirement for larger family units, particularly three-bedroom accommodation. Whilst the proposed mix does not include larger family housing, the provision of smaller units is considered acceptable in this highly accessible town centre location, where such accommodation is typically appropriate. However, the absence of family-sized units weighs against the proposal, albeit with limited weight given the site's context and characteristics. On balance, the proposed housing mix is considered acceptable and in accordance with Policy DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021).

DENSITY LEVELS:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. Policy DMHB 17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all new residential development should take account of the Residential Density Matrix contained in Table 5.2.

Numerical density levels are considered to be more appropriate to larger sites and are not typically used in the assessment of schemes of less than 10 units. The key consideration is therefore whether the development would acceptably integrate with the character and appearance of the locality, and would respect residential amenity considerations. Please refer to the other sections of this report which assesses these planning considerations in further detail.

SUSTAINABILITY:

Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021) states residential development should achieve at least a 10% improvement beyond Building Regulations 2013.

Policy DMEI 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all developments to make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the 2016 London Plan targets.

Policy EM1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) sets out that the installation of renewable energy will be encouraged for all new developments.

The design of the development should incorporate renewable energy to reduce carbon emissions. No details of the sustainability credentials of the proposed development or the type of renewable technologies that would be utilised have been provided. However, it is considered that this matter could be resolved by the imposition of a planning condition, if planning permission were to be granted. Also, a condition would be secured requiring the proposed dwellings to achieve as a minimum, a water efficiency standard of no more than 105 litres per person per day, maximum water consumption.

Subject to the above conditions, the proposal would be compliant with Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMEI 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

FLOOD RISK:

The site is in Flood Zone 1. The proposal involves the conversion of the upper floors of an existing building to residential, and a rear extension to the first and second floor which does not increase site coverage. Therefore, there are no additional drainage or flooding concerns, beyond that which can be dealt with through the Building Regulations process. Therefore, the proposed development is not expected to increase flood risk on-site or elsewhere, in accordance with Policies DMEI 9 and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021).

AIR QUALITY:

Policy DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that proposals should demonstrate appropriate reductions in emissions. It adds that, development proposals should, as a minimum:

- i) be at least "air quality neutral";
- ii) include sufficient mitigation to ensure there is no unacceptable risk from air pollution to sensitive receptors, both existing and new; and
- iii) actively contribute towards the improvement of air quality, especially within the Air Quality Management Area.

The site is located within the Hillingdon Air Quality Focus Area and the Ruislip Town Centre NO2 Focus Area, where elevated pollutant levels and high levels of human exposure require careful consideration. Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMEI 14 of the Local Plan Part Two (2020) require development to minimise air quality impacts and avoid worsening local conditions.

An Air Quality Neutral Statement has been submitted in support of the application. The assessment confirms that the development, comprising six residential units, meets the Air Quality Neutral benchmarks for both transport and building emissions. The scheme is car-free, with no additional vehicle trips anticipated, and adopts an all-electric heating strategy, removing on-site combustion emissions. The inclusion of green roof coverage and cycle parking further contributes to on-site mitigation.

Whilst the introduction of an additional unit represents a modest intensification compared to the previously approved scheme, the overall scale of development remains limited and the assessment demonstrates that emissions remain within acceptable thresholds. The Council's Air Quality Officer has raised no objection, confirming that any residual impacts would be negligible.

Accordingly, subject to the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the development is considered acceptable in air quality terms and compliant with Policy DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and Policy SI1 of the London Plan (2021).

TREES, LANDSCAPING, BNG AND ECOLOGY:

The site comprises a fully built-up High Street plot with no on-site trees or vegetation of significance. The rear of the site is characterised by hardstanding and built form, offering very limited existing ecological value.

The proposed development includes the introduction of green roof areas and a communal roof terrace, which together would provide a degree of visual and environmental enhancement within this constrained urban context. Whilst limited in scale, these elements would contribute positively to urban greening and provide some biodiversity benefits. Full details of the green roof and terrace

landscaping, including planting specification and maintenance, would be secured by condition. Subject to this, the development is considered acceptable in landscaping terms and compliant with Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020).

In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain, the site comprises existing built form and hardstanding with negligible baseline habitat value. The proposal falls within the de minimis exemption, as it does not result in the loss of more than 25sqm of habitat or 5 metres of linear habitat. As such, the mandatory requirement to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain does not apply. Notwithstanding this, the provision of green roof planting represents a minor ecological enhancement over the existing baseline.

Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021) require development to protect and enhance biodiversity. The proposed development, whilst limited in ecological scope, would deliver small-scale enhancements appropriate to the urban setting and is therefore acceptable in ecological terms.

A Preliminary Roost Assessment and subsequent bat surveys confirm negligible bat roost potential and no evidence of bats within the building. The submitted ecological information demonstrates that the site does not support protected species and no further survey or mitigation is required. Compliance with the submitted ecological reports would be secured by condition.

On this basis, the proposal complies with Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020) and relevant wildlife legislation.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY:

Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that to ensure development is sustainable, planning permission will only be granted for development that clearly demonstrates there will be sufficient infrastructure of all types to support it. Infrastructure requirements will be predominantly addressed through the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The Council adopted its own Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 1st August 2014. The Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floor space. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per square metre. CIL rates are index linked. The proposal involves the erection of new dwellings and is therefore CIL liable if planning permission were to be granted.

PLANNING BALANCE:

In undertaking the planning balance, significant weight has been given to the fallback position established under planning permission ref. 78935/APP/2025/2287, which granted consent for the creation of five residential units at the site. That scheme was accepted on the basis that it preserved the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and did not result in harm to the significance of the locally listed building, with only limited and subordinate alterations proposed.

In contrast, the current proposal for six units introduces a materially greater level of built form, including substantial alterations to the roofscape of the locally listed building and the addition of a further storey to the rear building. As set out in this report, these changes result in a significantly increased level of harm to both the non-designated heritage asset and the Conservation Area, as well as additional harm to neighbouring amenity. The extant permission therefore demonstrates that residential development can be delivered on the site with a substantially lower level of harm, and

this reduces the weight that can be attributed to the benefits of the current proposal.

It is acknowledged that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (the most recent position statement published on 01/04/26 confirmed a 2.5 year supply). In accordance with Footnote 8 of the NPPF, the policies which are most important for determining the application are therefore considered out-of-date. Consequently, Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged, and the 'tilted balance' applies.

In this case, having regard to the provisions of NPPF Paragraph 11(d), it is considered that the application of Footnote 7 policies within the Framework provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed (in respect of the identified harm to the significance of the locally listed building, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and neighbouring residential amenity). Furthermore, the identified adverse impacts of the scheme are considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework (taken as a whole). In reaching this decision, significant positive weight has been afforded to the contribution that this proposal makes towards the Borough's housing land supply (net contribution of 5 residential units).

Accordingly, planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set out in this report, it is considered that the proposed development would conflict with national, regional and local planning policies and guidance. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused.

8. Reference Documents

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

The London Plan (March 2021)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)

Hillingdon Local Plan Accessible Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document (September 2017)

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System

Contact Officer:

Emilie Bateman

Telephone No:

01895 250230