

## 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

**REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL**

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

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

**CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS**

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>

**CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS**

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

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:**                      77-79 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

**Development:**                Construction of 4 dwellings with associated stair and lift enclosure and landscaping.

**LBH Ref Nos:**                52931/APP/2023/3536

**Drawing Nos:**                C246-01

C246-02

C246-03

C246-04

C246-05

C246-06

C246-07

C246-08

C246-09

C246-10

Design and access statement, 21 November 2023, LAPD Architects

Heritage Statement,AHC REF: PM/10220 Date: November 2023, Asset Heritage Consulting

Transport assessment - Parking Appraisal Note, 29th September 2023  
DN/SC/25293-01, DTA

**Date Plans received:**      05-12-23

**Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

**Date Application valid**    05-12-23

## 1. SUMMARY

The application proposes the erection of 4 dwellings with associated stair and lift enclosure and landscaping.

There are no changes proposed to the amenity areas or the second floor development at the front of the building. The changes relate to the new building at the rear of the site. The new building at the rear is proposed to have a brick facing exterior as opposed to render. Provided the brick is matching the existing building, the change in exterior materials of the new rear building would not harm the character and appearance of the building or wider conservation area.

In addition, the width of the bedrooms are proposed to be widened by reducing the set-ins from the side boundaries. Whilst this would increase the floor area for the new flat, due to the proximity of the primary windows to the side boundaries, there would be insufficient separation distance to provide suitable outlook and daylight.

Furthermore, by positioning the primary windows in close proximity to the side boundaries, the development proposal would impact on the ability of similar future developments to be carried out on the adjacent sites, which would likely be sought, now that the principle of development has been established.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

#### **1. NON2 Character and appearance**

The development, by reason of its design, scale, bulk, massing and materials, would result in an incongruous, disharmonious and visually intrusive form of development that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original building and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. No public benefits exist to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified. The development is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

#### **2. NON2 Residential Amenity**

The development, by virtue of its design, siting and proximity, would result in neighbouring occupiers experiencing loss of outlook, loss of daylight/sunlight, overlooking, loss of privacy and visual intrusion. The development would harm the residential amenity of the area and therefore conflicts with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

#### **3. NON2 Living conditions**

The development, by virtue of its siting, layout, proximity and design, would not provide future occupiers with adequate living accommodation, outlook, privacy, daylight/sunlight provision and useable amenity space. The development would result in substandard living conditions and amenity for future occupiers and therefore conflicts with the Housing quality and standards of Policies D3 and D6 of London Plan (2021), Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

#### **4. NON2 Accessibility**

The development, by virtue of its layout and lack of step free and level access and clear access zones would not align with the provisions set out in section 2.29 of Approved Document M, Volume 1 (2015 edition) and all other relevant M4(2) technical specifications, set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition). Due to the site confines it appears that the required access specifications could not be successfully achieved and it has not been demonstrated otherwise. The development would not achieve housing of an inclusive design and therefore conflicts with Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

## 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. I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

### 3. I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

### 4. I74 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](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil)

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

The site is located on the north-east side of the High Street within Ruislip Town Centre. It comprises a double-fronted shop unit which is configured over ground, first and second floors, with a mainly two-storey element at the rear which is accessed from a rear service road.

The site lies in the Secondary Shopping Area of Ruislip District Town Centre, the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, the Ruislip Town Centre Air Quality Focus Area and is in Flood Zone 1 with the southern, approximately 30% of the site being within a Critical Drainage Area. It has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4.

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application proposes the erection of 4 dwellings with associated stair and lift enclosure and landscaping.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

52931/ADV/2023/5                      77-79 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Installation of 5 no. vinyl logo signs to windows in bottom right hand corner, existing lettering removed. Dibond panel above front entrance with bullnose moulding in red with with direct fixed white Perspex letters. New graphics to canopy, Perspex dark grey letters direct fixed to grey painted panel painted match RAL7012. New signs to end on slimline aluminium trays on red with white Perspex letters surface fixed.

**Decision:** 06-03-2023              Approval

52931/APP/2022/2291                77-79 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Installation of 5G electronic communications equipment at rooftop level rooftop, including the installation of upgraded replacement antennas and associated support structures, the removal and replacement of an equipment cabinet at rooftop level and the installation of cabling.

**Decision:** 03-03-2023              Approval

52931/PRC/2022/155                77-79 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Construction of 5 residential dwellings and remodelling of retail unit

**Decision:** 23-09-2022              Objection

52931/APP/2019/2824                77-79, HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Proposed alterations to existing base station (Application under Part 16 of schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)

**Decision:** 15-10-2019              Approval

52931/APP/2015/563                77-79, HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Upgrade of existing site comprising, the installation of 3 antenna located on the 4m high stub tower to be installed on new long support poles fixed to the existing spine using 3 MAFI 3 sector antenna mounts, re-positioning of 3 existing antenna on new support poles using 3 MAFI antenna offset brackets and the installation of 1 BOB and 3 RRH's on new 1.4m long support pole fixed to steel support grillage at the foot of the stub tower

**Decision:** 10-04-2015              Approval

52931/APP/2012/2247                77-79, HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Replacement of 3 no. telecommunications antennae on existing mast, removal of 1 no. ancillary equipment cabinet and installation of 2 no, additional ancillary equipment cabinets.

**Decision:** 16-07-2013      Approval

52931/ADV/2005/119      77-79, HIGH STREET RUISLIP  
INSTALLATION OF UNDERLIT REPLACEMENT FASCIA SIGNAGE

**Decision:** 31-01-2006      Approval

52931/98/0970      77-79, HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Installation of three 2m dual polar antennas and three microwave dish antennas and equipment cabin at roof level (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995)

**Decision:** 11-03-1999      No Further  
Action(P)

### **Comment on Planning History**

There is no relevant planning history.

## **4. Advertisement and Site Notice**

**4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 31st January 2024**

**4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable**

## **5. Comments on Public Consult**

### **PUBLIC CONSULTATION:**

69 neighbours and Ruislip Residents Association were consulted by letter dated 22-12-23. An additional 4 neighbours were also consulted by letter dated 29-01-24. A site notice was posted outside the site on 05-01-24 and an advert placed on 10-01-24.

1 letter of support was received noting that the shop would be retained and new residential units would be provided. 8 letters of objection were received citing the following concerns:

- Design, materials, visually detract from setting of the area, impact on the Conservation Area
- Loss of privacy, overlooking, light, noise and nuisance
- Construction vehicles, traffic and parking
- Negative effect on property values

Hillingdon Friends of the Earth:

Comments received regarding energy efficiency, sustainability and ecology.

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

The comments made by residents and Friends of the Earth are noted. Character and appearance consideration are discussed in the 'Impact on Street Scene' section. The impact on neighbouring residential amenity is discussed in the 'Impact on Neighbours' section. Highway safety and parking are discussed in the 'Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety' and 'Carparking & Layout' sections, respectively. Property values are not a material planning consideration. Energy efficiency, sustainability and ecology are considered on a case-by-case basis depending on the scale of development and relevant site designations.

#### LBH CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

##### Access officer (summarised):

Unacceptable. It is deemed unlikely that the above specifications could be successfully achieved within the confines of the site. If deemed appropriate, a revised plan could be requested.

##### Conservation and design (summarised):

Whilst the proposed height of the development is broadly supported, there are concerns regarding the massing to the rear of the plot and the relationship with the neighbouring 29-31 South Drive. The proposed layout also lacks a clear and welcoming approach from the street to each apartment, blurring the lines between private and shared spaces, and potentially resulting in an excessive amount of separation screening. It fails to effectively utilise what ends up being residual private amenity areas, leading to potential privacy conflicts among residences. Furthermore, the entrance is unwelcoming and lacks legibility as seen from the street level. The proposed appearance is also visually cluttered and lacks aesthetic elegance, with an overly complex design that is incongruous and lacks a clear, overarching visual concept or idea. The applicant is highly encouraged to explore mews typology to inform the entrance design and the visual appearance of the scheme.

In its current form, the proposal is not supported and requires considerable reworking. The design needs to address the abovementioned issues comprehensively to ensure high quality appearance and layout.

##### Highway Authority (summarised):

The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) - Policy DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policy T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

## 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

#### Part 2 Policies:

DMH 2	Housing Mix
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
DMHB 15	Planning for Safer Places
DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP D11	(2021) Safety, security and resilience to emergency
LPP D12	(2021) Fire safety
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) (2023) 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

#### IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

Paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states Part D7) that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. The supporting text for this policy states that the Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

Guidance for Policy DMHB 11 states 'The Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties, schools or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain levels of privacy and to prevent the possibility of overlooking. In some locations where there is a significant difference in ground levels between dwellings, a greater separation distance may be necessary'.

Due to the juxtaposition of the unit 2 and its proximity, the development would breach the 45 degree line of sight measured from the rear windows of both adjoining neighbouring buildings at Nos. 73A and Flats 1-3 81-83 High Street. There are also two side windows in the neighbouring building Flats 1-3 81-83 High Street that have not been accounted for in the plans, which face directly towards the side elevation of Unit 4 and its amenity area. As a result, levels of privacy for both the neighbour and future occupiers would be severely affected. The development would negatively affect the outlook of these neighbouring window and levels of sunlight/daylight provision.

Unit 1 would be located on the north-eastern edge of the building, which is noted to be 4 metres to the rear boundaries of Nos. 29-31 South Drive. There would be three primary windows facing towards the rear garden areas of these neighbouring dwellings. Whilst the separation distance between the development and the rear elevations measures 27metres, the neighbouring occupiers would experience an acute sense of visual intrusion and loss of privacy of their private amenity areas.

Consequently, the scheme would harm the amenity of the neighbouring amenity by reason of loss

of outlook, loss of privacy, overlooking and visual intrusion. The development therefore conflicts with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

## 7.2 Impact on Street Scene

### IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA:

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that - In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that: Development proposals should: D1) enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) states - C) 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 BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that 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 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states A) The Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states 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.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including:

- i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding: · scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; · building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; · building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment.
- ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes;
- iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities;
- iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets, designated and un-designated, and their settings; and
- v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Ruislip High Street is a vibrant suburban District Centre that has evolved from a small 9th-century

village while retaining elements of its historical roots, particularly evident in the high street area. The street layout, predominantly linear, follows the original medieval village pattern. The urban fabric along the high street features a blend of traditional and modern 2-3 storey retail and shopping buildings, including residential dwellings which are typically incorporated at upper floors, roof level or to rear of plots.

While various architectural styles contribute to the historical charm and overall architectural quality of the high street, there is also a noticeable sense of consistency and cohesion. The elements which contribute to this visual unity include:

- prevalent use of red brick
- consistent building height complemented by a playful varied roofline
- ornate architectural features and intricate detailing, which includes celebrated window openings, gable ends, ad hoc dormers, roof chimneys and other

Each building possesses its own identity, reflecting the historical era they belong to, while also forming an integral part of the high street's larger narrative.

Notably, Ruislip High Street forms part of the wider Ruislip Village Conservation Area, with the Midcroft, Ruislip Area of Special Character also located to its East.

Due to its location along the high street, which serves as an intersection of key traffic routes in the wider area, the site of the proposal is exposed to varying degrees of air and noise pollution. It is important that any negative effects are positively addressed and mitigated in the final proposal.

The overall strategy of retaining the front of the proposal as existing while distributing the additional massing across the site, up to a maximum of 3 storeys high, is broadly regarded as acceptable in principle. This approach preserves the valued character along the high street while optimising the use of the well-connected site. However, there are concerns regarding the added bulk to the rear of the plot. This part of the extension is excessively visually dominant and negatively impacts the privacy of the rear gardens at 29-31 South Drive, especially during winter when the vegetation at the boundary is less dense. Whilst some of the trees on that edge appear to be coniferous evergreens, there appear to be some smaller and deciduous trees which contribute towards a visual gap through which a potential 3 storeys may look excessive. This is especially concerning considering that the proposed dwellings rely on aspect towards the neighbouring private amenity.

The layout of the site does not appear to optimally utilise the available space. By placing the proposed dwellings apart in a standalone way, it results in what appears to be residual amenity space which lacks privacy and may require excessive separation screening. Similarly, the submitted elevations indicate tall glass perimeter balustrades to the north. This excessive screening, while aimed at mitigating privacy issues, has detrimental impact on the visual and experiential quality of the proposed amenity and quality of accommodation in the scheme.

The proposed appearance is not supported as it is visually cluttered, lacks in aesthetic elegance, and is overly complex. The design fails to convey an overarching visual concept or idea, resulting in an incongruous appearance.

The proposed entrance is unwelcoming and lacks legibility, currently resembling something more akin a service door rather than a main entrance. Furthermore, the bike and bin storages dominate the entrance and are poorly integrated, requiring redesign and potential relocation to a more suitable place within the scheme.

The circulation core is bulky, lacks any form of articulation and is blank in appearance, which makes it visually unattractive and poorly integrated. It is also a missed opportunity to create a distinctive feature that could 'announce' the entrance, adding both aesthetic value and functionality.

Given the proximity of another potential rear extension along the same alleyway, the area appears to be gradually shifting from being a back-of-house service towards a more residential-led use and character.

The proposed materiality palette is not supported. There is an excessive amount of closely located starkly contrasting materials in the proposed scheme which only contribute towards the visual clutter and the visual complexity of what should otherwise be a very simple back-of-house residential scheme. Cladding large areas in render, especially the primary entrance, is not supported in principle due to its lack of visual appeal, durability, and contextual relevance.

Due to the overall excessive scale and incongruous design and unsympathetic materials, the development does not integrate sensitively with the host building and consequently it is therefore considered the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building which lies within the Ruislip village conservation area. The level of harm on the heritage asset is considered to fall into the category of 'less than substantial' harm.

Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states - 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

In this instance, the development is speculative and relates to the provision of 4no residential flats. It should be noted that the Council is currently able to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As such, the "tilted balance" as set out in Paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) is not engaged. It is therefore considered that there are no public benefits to outweigh the harm identified.

In view of the above, the development is considered not to preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area and would harm the character and appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the wider street scene. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

### **7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety**

HIGHWAY SAFETY:

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

With regards to Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety considerations, the highway authority provide the following comments:

The application site is a commercial building that forms part of a 1930's district shopping centre on the High Street (designated as 'classified' in the council's highway network hierarchy) in Ruislip. It is

situated in relative proximity of Ruislip LU station and exhibits a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 4 which is considered as 'good' but is not fully reflective of the 'real world' exemplary public transport provision which is exemplified by the plethora of bus service availability and the positioning of the adjacent LU station. The locality is extensively covered by all day parking controls including 'Pay & Display' provisions located within the High Street (albeit with minor variation to operational hours).

It is proposed to provide an additional floor to accommodate 4 flats (2x3 & 2x2 bedroom flats) on a 'car-free' basis.

Given the scale and car-free nature of the proposal, there are no specific concerns raised in regard to any generated vehicular activity which is likely to be imperceptible on the local network.

The development therefore accords with Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

## **7.4 Carparking & Layout**

### **CAR PARKING:**

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the car parking standards set out in Appendix C, Table 1 unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

London Plan (2021): Policy T6.1 (Residential Parking) requires that new residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards as set out in table 10.3.

With regards to Parking Provision, the highway authority provide the following comments:

The overriding regional parking standard demands a maximum parking requirement in the order of up to 2-3 on-plot spaces hence this 'car-free' scheme technically falls within but is below this maximum standard.

The regional standard only recommends a car-free option where a site registers a PTAL level of 5 or higher which is not the case for this particular address. However, it is acknowledged that the site envelope is located in relative proximity to Ruislip LU station with access to a plethora of bus routes which indicates a potential anomaly in the PTAL calculation. An argument for an elevated rating may therefore carry some merit.

To assist in justifying this 'car-free' proposal, the applicant has undertaken parking stress surveys within the locality in order to catalogue the levels of parking demand in all roads within a walking distance of 200m of the site. Industry recognised methodology has been applied and the findings indicate that during the recommended surveyed periods there appears to be an acceptable level of spare on-street parking capacity which can be legitimately used on the surrounding roadways. As there is no evidence to the contrary as confirmed by the Highway Authority, the findings are considered robust and relevant and therefore supportive of a 'car-free' scheme.

### **CYCLE PARKING:**

Policy DMT 5 Part A of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states - Development proposals will be required to ensure that safe, direct and inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists is provided on the site connecting it to the wider network.

In terms of cycle parking there should be a provision of 2 secure and accessible spaces for each flat in-line with the regional cycle parking standard. In total, 10 communal spaces are proposed located within an enclosed area in proximity of the building entrance which is considered an acceptable arrangement in terms of placement & quantum.

## CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN (CMP)

A full and detailed CMP is a requirement given the constraints and sensitivities of the local road network in order to avoid/minimise potential detriment to the public realm. A suitable planning condition is therefore required.

Subject to the above condition, the development therefore accords with Policies DMT 5 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy T6.1 of the London Plan (2021).

## 7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

### ACCESS:

Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) states - To provide suitable housing and genuine choice for London's diverse population, including disabled people and families with young children, all residential development should include at least 10 per cent of dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' and all other dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.

The Council's access officer has reviewed and provides the following comments:

This proposal seeks to construct four dwellings with an enclosed stair and lift core at the rear of the existing building dating back to circa 1940. No changes are proposed to the retail space and elevation fronting High Street. In assessing this application reference has been made to the 2021 London Plan and its contained policies D5 and D7.

The 2021 London Plan and its contained policy D7 requires all new housing, as a minimum standard, to be designed and constructed as accessible and adaptable in accordance with M4(2) as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition). The supporting Design & Access Statement states that accessibility to all units would be via a lift, with level access thresholds provided at all points of entry. This suggests that all four units would be accessible to all users, however the plans indicate otherwise, raising the following accessibility concerns:

1. The approach and entry into units 3 & 4 on the Block Plan and Floor Plans Document are shown to be stepped.
2. The bathrooms shown within all four units do not meet the technical requirements of diagram 2.5 and 2.7 or otherwise meet the provisions set out in section 2.29 of Approved Document M, Volume 1 (2015 edition). Particular attention should be paid to the layout of the toilet pan, hand basin, and level access shower required to meet the above policy requirements.
3. Particular attention should be paid to the clear access zones and the spatial requirements within the bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchen areas. Floor plans at a scale of 1:100 should be submitted to show the clear access zones in context to typical furniture items within the said rooms.
4. The plans need to be amended to align with all other M4(2) technical specifications (as relevant), set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition).

CONCLUSION: unacceptable. It is deemed unlikely that the above specifications could be successfully achieved within the confines of the site. If deemed appropriate, a revised plan could be requested.

In view of the access officer's objection, the development would not achieve housing of an inclusive design and would therefore conflict with Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

#### CARBON REDUCTION:

Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021) states that 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 London Plan targets.

An Energy statement has not been submitted in support of the application. In the event of an approval, a condition would be secured requiring implementation of the energy efficient measures detailed in the report and the proposed dwellings achieving an energy efficiency standard of at least 10% CO2 improvement over Building Regulations requirements Part L 2013 (TER Baseline).

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

#### DRAINAGE:

Policy SI 13 of the London Plan (2021) Part B) states - Development proposals should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible. There should also be a preference for green over grey features, in line with the following drainage hierarchy:

- 1) rainwater use as a resource (for example rainwater harvesting, blue roofs for irrigation)
- 2) rainwater infiltration to ground at or close to source
- 3) rainwater attenuation in green infrastructure features for gradual release (for example green roofs, rain gardens)
- 4) rainwater discharge direct to a watercourse (unless not appropriate)
- 5) controlled rainwater discharge to a surface water sewer or drain
- 6) controlled rainwater discharge to a combined sewer.

Policy DMEI 10 part E) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that proposals that would fail to make adequate provision for the control and reduction of surface water run-off rates will be refused.

According to the Council's GIS mapping system, the site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). In the event of this application being recommended for approval, a sustainable urban drainage scheme would have been secured by a suitable condition. Further, an informative would be attached with further guidance on how the applicant can reduce the surface water from the site entering the sewers.

Subject to the above conditions and informative, it is considered that the proposal would not

significantly increase the risk of surface water flooding at the site or elsewhere in compliance with Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy SI 13 of the London Plan (2021).

#### LANDSCAPING:

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states:

A) All development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including:  
v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states:

C) Where space for ground level planting is limited, such as high rise buildings, the inclusion of living walls and roofs will be expected where feasible.

The current layout doesn't provide the required green roofs and high quality usable private amenity spaces.

A scheme of Landscaping could have been secured by condition in the event of the application being recommended for approval. This would detail any green roofs, enclosures and surfaces.

Subject to the above mentioned condition, the development could provide landscaping within the site in accordance with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

#### LIVING CONDITIONS:

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) states that housing development should be of high quality design and provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures.

Table 3.1 of Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) states that: A single storey 2bed 4 person dwelling and a single storey 3bed 6 person dwelling should be provided with a Gross Internal Floor area (GIA) of at least 70sq. metres and 95sq. metres respectively.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment.

The development would provide the following accommodation:

- Unit 1 : 3bed 6p - 80sq.metres GIA
- Unit 2 : 3bed 6p - 82sq.metres GIA
- Unit 3 : 2bed 4p - 72sq.metres GIA
- Unit 4 : 2bed 4p - 71sq.metres GIA

Whilst the 2bed 4person units would exceed the 70sq.metre requirement, both 3bed 6person units would have a significant shortfall in overall floor area. The development would therefore not provide adequate living conditions for occupiers of the 3bed units.

There are also other qualitative aspects relating to outlook that negatively impact both the future occupiers and neighbours.

The separation distances provided would not be appropriate for the scale of development being proposed and as a result of the close proximity between the units and their amenity space enclosures, the development would impact on the amenity of future occupiers with regards to material loss of privacy, overlooking and loss of outlook.

Units 1 and 2 are separated by only 4metres and the smaller amenity space of Unit 2 would be in proximity of the entrance to Unit 1.

Units 2 and 3 are separated by just 5metres and the living room window of Unit 2 and one of the bedrooms in Unit 3 would be facing towards one another resulting in indivisibility and loss of privacy.

As a result of the proximity of the proposed buildings to one another and the neighbouring buildings, and the extensive use of fenced enclosures which are within proximity to habitable rooms, the residential units would not be provided with adequate outlook and levels of sunlight/daylight would be diminished.

In the absence of a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment in compliance with the BRE's "Site Layout Planning for daylight and sunlight, a Guide to good practice" (2022) it has not been demonstrated that future occupiers would be provided with adequate daylight/sunlight.

In this regard, the development would not provide high quality living conditions for future occupiers. The development fails to comply with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

#### PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE:

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all new residential development to provide good quality and useable private amenity space. In accordance with Table 5.3 flats with 2 and 3+ bedrooms are required to have at least 20 and 25 square metres of private outdoor amenity space, respectively.

Unit 1 has two amenity spaces, measuring 22.7sq.meters and 10.9sq.metres. The larger amenity space is accessed through two of the bedrooms.

Unit 2 has two amenity spaces, measuring 38sq.meters and 7sq.metres. Both of these spaces are very narrow and are accessed through two of the bedrooms.

Unit 3 has an amenity space of 20.5sq.metres and Unit 4 has an amenity space of 36.5sq.metres. Both of these both amenity spaces are located in front of these units.

Whilst the quantity of private amenity space would be provided in accordance with policy requirements, the quality and usability of all the spaces are considered to be poor. This is due to their locations to the side or front of units and narrow sizes which results in a significant amount of unusable space. Due to the proximity to other units and neighbouring windows, this results in the amenity spaces not being private and being overlooked. In addition, the development as a whole appears very cramped and it has not been demonstrated that the amenity areas would be provided with adequate daylight/sunlight provision.

In this regard, the development would not provide high quality living conditions for future occupiers. The development fails to comply with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

#### REFUSE:

Policies SI 7 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) require developments to be designed with adequate, flexible, and easily accessible storage space and collection systems that support, as a minimum, the separate collection of dry recyclables (at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food.

Refuse collection would be undertaken from the private rear service road leading from a neighbouring residential road - 'Midcroft'. Accepted 'waste distance' collection standards encourage waste collection distances to be within 10m from the point of collection by refuse vehicle. Also carrying distances from each flat to the bin storage area should not exceed the recommended standard of 30m. Both distance parameters appear achievable hence there are no further observations.

It is considered that the development would accord with Policies D6 and SI 7 of the London Plan (2021).

#### SECURED BY DESIGN:

Policy DMHB 15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (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. Where relevant, these should be included in the Design and Access Statement. Development will be required to comprise good design and create inclusive environments whilst improving safety and security by incorporating the following specific measures:

- i) providing entrances in visible, safe and accessible locations;
- ii) maximising natural surveillance;
- iii) ensuring adequate defensible space is provided;
- iv) providing clear delineations between public and private spaces; and
- v) providing appropriate lighting and CCTV.

Any grant of planning permission would be subject to a secure by design condition to achieve appropriate accreditation. Based on the above condition, the development would accord with Policy DMHB 15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

## 7.6 Other Issues

#### PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

Paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states - Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land.

Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states - Planning policies and decisions should:

- c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;
- d) promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively.

Policy GG2 of the London Plan (2021) states to create successful sustainable mixed-use places that make the best use of land, those involved in planning and development must: enable the development of brownfield land, prioritise sites which are well-connected by existing or planned public transport and proactively explore the potential to intensify the use of land to support additional homes and workspaces, promoting higher density development, particularly in locations that are well connected to jobs, services, infrastructure and amenities.

Policy SD6 of the London Plan (2021) states - C) The potential for new housing within and on the edges of town centres should be realised through mixed-use or residential development that makes best use of land, capitalising on the availability of services within walking and cycling distance, and their current and future accessibility by public transport.

Policy SD7 of the London Plan (2021) states - Development plans should 6) identify sites suitable for higher density mixed-use residential intensification capitalising on the availability of services within walking and cycling distance and current and future public transport provision including, for example: d) delivering residential above existing commercial, social infrastructure and transport infrastructure uses or re-providing these uses as part of a mixed-use development.

The site is designated as part of the Town centre, however the scheme would retain the existing commercial frontage onto the High Street. There would be a minimal impact on the continued vitality of the Ruislip town centre and secondary shopping area.

In recognising that the site is located within a sustainable town centre location, it is considered that the principle of residential development and retaining the ground floor commercial unit would be acceptable. The development therefore accords with Policies GG2 , SD6 and SD7 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraphs 123 and 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

#### HOUSING MIX:

Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021) states that schemes should generally consist of a range of unit sizes and sets out a number of factors which should be considered when determining the appropriate housing mix on a particular scheme. This includes local evidence of need.

Policy DMH 2 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires the provision of a mix of housing units of different sizes in schemes of residential development to reflect the Council's latest information on housing need. Paragraph 4.6 outlines that there is a substantial borough-wide requirement for larger affordable and private market units, particularly three-bedroom properties.

Policy DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states - The Council will require the provision of a mix of housing units of different sizes in schemes of residential development to reflect the Council's latest information on housing need.

Policy DMHB 17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all new residential development should take account of the Residential Density Matrix

contained in Table 5.2.

In accordance with Table 5.2, the site location would fall into the category of a town centre with a PTAL 4. Table 5.2 identifies a density range of between 80 - 170 units per hectare as being an acceptable for flatted developments in these locations.

The site area measures 0.0753 hectares and 4 no. units are proposed. As such, the development would have a density of 53 units per hectare. The proposed density falls outside the lower point of the range, however it is considered that numerical density levels are considered to be more appropriate to larger sites and are not typically used in the assessment of smaller schemes.

The development would provide 2no 2bed and 2no 3bed flats. The housing mix is considered to be appropriate and in accordance with Policy DMH 2 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021).

#### COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL):

Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states: A) 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 August 1st 2014 and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per sq metre. The proposed development would be CIL liable.

A relevant informative would be attached in the event of an approval pointing to these obligations. In this regard, the development accords with the aims of Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010).

#### IMPACT ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE:

It is unclear whether there are risks from the development given the location in such close proximity to the existing roof mounted telecoms antenna. Additionally, given the services and telecoms terminating at the roof, it is unclear whether there a requirement for riser space which hasn't been accommodated in the floor plan below.

It is also noted that planning permission was recently granted for the installation of 5G electronic communications equipment at rooftop level under ref: 52931/APP/2022/2291. It is unclear how the development relates to the recent telecoms permission.

## 8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)

London Plan (2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

**Contact Officer:**

Christos Chrysanthou

**Telephone No:**

01895 250230