

PLANNING STATEMENT

FOR THE

**ERECTION OF A FRONT BOUNDARY BRICK WALL AND ELECTRIC
VEHICULAR ACCESS GATES**

AT

51 KINGSEND,

RUISLIP

HA4 7DD

JULY 2026

1. The Application

The application is for a proposed front boundary brick wall and wrought iron vehicular access electric gates at the existing property.

2. Site Location & Background

The application is for a site on 51 Kingsend, Ruislip, HA4 7DD. The plot is approximately 1012m².

The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling situated on the south side of Kingsend and is used for a residential purpose for a single-family household. The property, like most on Kingsend, lies within a large plot and is set back from the highways frontage by 12 metres with a part landscaped and wide driveway.

The property is a two-storey detached dwelling built in the arts and crafts style, with the walls finished in a mixed red facing brick and the roof finished in a plain clay tile.

The property has recently been extended in line with the approved planning application ref: 3546/APP/2025/109. Works are largely completed with minor internal works remaining.

The property falls within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies (November 2012). The property does not contain a listed building within its curtilage. The property is within an area that is covered by TPO 477.

To align with the character of the area and with the guidelines set out by Ruislip Village Conservation Area, we have endeavoured to make our proposal sympathetic to and keeping with the existing property, the neighbouring properties as well as the surrounding area.

3. Duty Planning Advice

Our client had a discussion with the senior duty planning officer at Hillingdon Council in regards to the proposed front boundary brick wall and electric gates at the property. The duty planning officer suggested that the gates are set back from the highways by a minimum of 2 metres – this would then allow for a taller gate (1.8 metres) to be acceptable.

It was advised that any gate adjacent to the highways (footpath included) would need to be limited in height, but if it is set back from the highways, then a taller gate would be acceptable. The duty planning officer suggested that the materials used should match the main dwelling. Overall, the conversations with the duty planning officer were positive and it was suggested that the front boundary brick wall and the wrought iron gate set back from the highways would be acceptable in principle.

4. Design

The Proposal

The scheme involves a proposed brick wall, with brick piers to the front boundary, and a wrought iron electrical double gate for vehicular access, which is set back from the boundary.

Design

The design of the proposed front brick wall is formed with 4 piers (two the front and two to the rear) with a lower-level brick wall between the piers, and the wrought iron gate in between the second set of brick piers – which is set back 2 metres from the highways.

The brick piers are proposed at 1880mm high with a stone capping on the top. There are two to the front which are on the boundary – these are 4.22m apart from the inside of the piers.

Two further brick piers are set back – these are also at 1880mm high with a stone capping on top of each. Again, these are 4.22m apart internally.

In between the front and rear brick piers, there is a low-level brick wall with a maximum height of 1580mm which connects the front and back piers.

A double electric gate is proposed in between the two rear brick piers. The gate has a maximum height of 1.9 metres at the highest point, coming down to 1.7m at the piers. The gate is proposed as a double electric gate that is to open inwards. The gate is proposed as a wrought iron gate painted black.

The rest of the front boundary is to be retained as per the existing – which is a large hedge and planting to screen off the rest of the site.

Parking and Highways

As part of the proposal, we can confirm that there will be no material change to the layout of the front garden or the parking arrangements at the site. Currently, there is space for several parking spaces on site and a garage – all which will be retained.

With our gates set back from the highways, it will allow a car to safely turn in without obstructing the road. The gates will have sensors so that they will open ahead of the car entering or exiting and therefore there will not be a requirement for the car to sit and block the footpath.

Trees and Landscape

We can confirm that the proposal would not impact any hedges, landscaping or trees – there will be no removal or pruning of any hedges or trees and instead all existing landscaping will be maintained to preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

5. Gate Requirements

The gates are required to provide security to the owners – as without a gate, the application site is completely open to the public footpath.

As you will note from police records, there has been quite a number of break ins and cars stolen on Kingsend and the neighbouring roads over the last 12 months. There has been a significant increase in these incidents over the last 24 months – which can be seen for all in police records of the area.

The owners have very young family members and as such, safety and security is of the utmost importance. Protecting the family is very important and the gates would provide the extra security required. It would also help deter and thieves looking to steal cars – which also has been prevalent in the area.

As such, the importance of have the gates as a form of security and protection cannot be underestimated.

6. Heritage Consideration

We strongly believe that the wall and gate has been designed with Heritage Considerations in mind. The walls are finished in facing brickwork that matches the houses. The gate is to be finished in black painted wrought iron, which would match the Arts and Crafts nature of the property.

As such, we strongly believe that the overall design of the building and new architectural elements introduced have been selected to be sympathetic and in keeping with the guidelines while being considerate with the neighbouring properties.

7. Precedents

There are number of properties within the area that have similar front boundary walls and gates as per the ones being proposed. On Kingsend itself, there are ample examples of this, where precedent has been set. Please see some of the examples on Kingsend below:



No. 27 Kingsend – 1.5 metre high piers with similar height electrical sliding gate. The piers are rendered finish and therefore are more prominent than the brick piers we have proposed – especially as these do not match the main dwelling. The piers and the gate are on the property boundary – whilst our scheme proposed to set back the gate by 2 metres from the highway. This front boundary treatment extends the full width of the site, whilst our scheme proposed the piers only next to the gate with the rest being the existing hedging.



No. 42a Kingsend – 1.8 metre high brick piers, with a 1.5m high wall in between – this is the same as we have proposed. The gate is 2 metres high, which would be higher than our gate proposed. It is important to note that the gate is right on the boundary and is not set back, whilst ours proposes a 2 metre set back. It is also important to note that the brick wall above covers the whole frontage, whilst our piers and wall are only around the gate.



No. 50 Kingsend – 1.8 metre high brick piers, with a 1.2m high wall in between – this is the same as we have proposed. The gate is also 1.8 metres high. The wall and the gate are both on the boundary and not set back like our proposal. Furthermore, the brick wall on this example extends across the full frontage, whilst most of our frontage is covered by hedges and soft landscaping.

As you can see from the above examples – all properties which are within the vicinity of the application site. All the examples show the same size or taller boundary walls and gates as our proposal.

However, all the examples above show the boundary wall and gates right in the boundary adjacent to the footpath, whilst our scheme proposed the gates to be set back 2 metres. Furthermore, all the above show the wall spanning the whole frontage, whilst our piers are proposed simply for the gated area, with the rest being retained as the existing hedging.

There, we believe that our scheme is not only in line, but an improvement on the other examples on the road – and this is achieved whilst allowing the property to be protected and provide extra security as is much required.

8. Conclusion

The proposal is for a brick wall and vehicular access gates to the property, to provide the much needed security for the young family occupants, whilst also protecting the parked vehicles. This is much needed due to the increase of break ins and thefts in the area, which have been on a significant rise in particular over the last two years.

The design provides the security required for the application site, but we have ensured that it complies with the councils adopted policies, the Ruislip Village Conservation Area appraisal as well as the London Plan Policies. As such, we feel that the proposals are considered to be sympathetic to the original dwelling, the neighbouring properties and the wider Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the minimum aim is for development to preserve the character or appearance of a conservation area. The works are considered to meet the tests provided by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as the works will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

With regards to NPPF paragraph 196, the significance of the heritage asset will not be harmed and as such no public benefit is needed to overcome harm.

In regards to local policy as discussed above the proposal preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area; the design and materials of the proposal reflect the specifics of the host building as well as retaining its scale and relationship within the conservation area and local context; and it will also protect the trees and landscape features of the plot, so it is considered the proposal accord with adopted policies CP12 and DM3.

As mentioned above, there is precedent set for similar boundary walls in and around the area, including to neighbouring properties on Kingsend. However, our proposal does not extend the full frontage and is set back from the highways and as such, would be less of an impact to the street scene than existing examples.

As such, it is concluded that the proposed works would not be harmful or adversely impact on the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area.

In conclusion, the proposed development meets the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, the NPPF and local planning policies. It is therefore, requested that the proposed development be approved.

Thus, it is felt that the proposal at 51 Kingsend is of an acceptable standard, and we look forward to working with the planners on this scheme to facilitate a favourable decision.