

PLANNING STATEMENT

On behalf of Perl Equity (Ruislip) 4 Limited

In support of a planning application proposing the erection of a ground floor rear extension and a three-storey extension (with the top floor set-in) above an existing single storey commercial parade to provide 7 residential units (2 x 1-bedroom, 2-person units, 4 x 2-bedroom, 3-person units and 1 x 3-bedroom, 5-person unit), incorporating private amenity space to all proposed residential units and alterations to the existing ground floor commercial premises at no. 17 to create a new self-contained residential access from Victoria Road, on land at ;

**11-17 Victoria Road
Ruislip
HA4 9AA**

BPC ref. : AB2501/Planning Statement
Date : March 2026

CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Description of Application Site and Surroundings
- 3 Relevant Planning History of Application Site and Surroundings
- 4 The Proposed Development
- 5 Planning Policies and Government Guidance
- 6 Planning Assessment
- 7 Conclusions

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This planning statement has been prepared by Beamish Planning Consultancy on behalf of Perl Equity (Ruislip) 4 Limited and forms part of a full planning application being submitted to the London Borough of Hillingdon (the LPA) in respect of land at 11-17 Victoria Road, Ruislip, HA4 9AA.
- 1.2 This planning application seeks planning permission for the erection of extensions to the existing single storey commercial parade, with the extensions comprising both a ground floor rear extension and a three-storey extension above the existing parade, to provide 7 residential units, incorporating private amenity space to all proposed residential units and alterations to the existing ground floor commercial premises at no. 17 to create a new self-contained residential access from Victoria Road.
- 1.3 The revised proposals that are the subject of this planning application follow the LPA's refusal, in June 2025, of planning application ref. 72104/APP/2025/1096, and the subsequent (November 2025) dismissal of an appeal (Planning Inspectorate ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257) against that refusal.
- 1.4 The revisions proposed by way of this further planning application both address and overcome the 2 reasons (namely design and access to the proposed residential units from the Victoria Road frontage of the site) for the LPA's refusal of the previous planning application which the Inspector agreed with, whereas the other 3 reasons for the LPA's refusal of the previous planning application were not supported by the Inspector.
- 1.5 This planning statement is submitted in support of these revised proposals and should be read in conjunction with the drawings and the other technical reports that comprise the planning application submission.
- 1.6 This statement details the nature of the application site and the surrounding area, the site history, and relevant development plan policies and associated guidance, followed by an assessment of the proposals against those policies, guidance and any other material planning considerations, in particular the content of the Inspector's decision notice relating to planning appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257.
- 1.7 It concludes that the revised development now proposed accords with the adopted development plan and therefore, also taking into account all other material planning considerations, planning permission should be granted by the LPA, subject to the imposition of necessary, appropriate and reasonable conditions.

2.0 Description of Application Site and Surroundings

- 2.1 The application site comprises a roughly rectangular shaped area of land, which is currently occupied by a single storey parade (incorporating a tall brick parapet) of four commercial units (nos. 11, 13, 15 and 17) fronting onto Victoria Road to the west.
- 2.2 The application site slopes down from north to south by approximately 1.2 metres, and the rear (easternmost) part of the site is more than 2.3 metres high than its Victoria Road frontage, with the commercial units serviced from the rear by way of a series of staircases located within lightwells leading from the rear yard area of the site (which also includes an ancillary storage structure associated with no. 11).
- 2.3 The rear of the site is accessed via a service road which wraps around the side and rear of the neighbouring building to the north (which comprises nos. 69-83 Park Way and nos. 1-11 Victoria Road) and joins Park Way to the north-west.
- 2.4 2 existing trees, comprising a sycamore and silver birch tree (both falling within category C1), are located within the curtilage of the application site, whilst there are 5 individual trees and a group of trees within the immediate surroundings.
- 2.5 The commercial units which the application site comprises form part of the secondary shopping area of the designated 'Minor Town Centre' of Ruislip Manor, and the immediate locality is characterised by ground floor commercial uses with either ancillary or standalone commercial floorspace, or residential units, above.
- 2.6 The single storey height of the existing building at the application site is at odds with the majority of the buildings within the immediate surroundings, which range from 2 to 4 storeys in height. The neighbouring building to the north (which comprises nos. 69-83 Park Way and nos. 1-11 Victoria Road) benefits from a commenced (but not completed) planning permission for a new recessed third floor and associated extension, as detailed within the subsequent section of this planning statement.
- 2.7 To the south of the application site is the part single, part two and part three storey Ruislip Manor London Underground Station, which is locally listed and the LPA's statement of significance/reason for designation describes that locally listed building as ;
- 'Architectural: Metropolitan Line Station by Charles Holden. 1938. Excellent detailing although the elevated bridge divides the overall composition. Three storey in brick, flat roof with parapet and stone coping. Metal windows, with cill details. Townscape: Key landmark, contributes to local character and street scene.'*
- 2.8 It should be noted that the map which forms part of the local listing entry excludes the single storey commercial unit (no. 19) which is sited between the application site and the station buildings.
- 2.9 There are no other either statutorily or locally listed buildings within the immediate surroundings (although the Heritage Statement which forms part of the planning application does identify a listed building within 250 metres of the application site) and nor is the application site or its immediate surroundings within a Conservation Area (although again the accompanying Heritage Statement references Ruislip Manor Conservation Area, the boundaries of which are within 250 metres of the site).
- 2.10 The application site benefits from a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 (on a scale of 0 (worst) and 6b (best)), with the aforementioned Ruislip Manor underground station, less than 50 metres from the site, served by both Metropolitan and Piccadilly line services, and there are also bus stops ranging from 25 metres to 150 metres walking distance of the site on Victoria Road, Park Way, Windmill Road and Pembroke Road, served by local bus services travelling in a variety of directions.

- 2.11 There is no on-site vehicle parking available, whilst there are on-street pay and display bays on Victoria Road to the front of the site (with payment required between the hours of 06:00 to 18:30 on weekdays, and a maximum stay of 2 hours duration permitted). The immediate surroundings are not within a Controlled Parking Zone.
- 2.12 The application site is not located within a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), being approximately 1.9 kilometres from the boundaries of the nearest AQMA. However, the site is located within the boundaries of the Ruislip Town Centre Air Quality Focus Area (AQFA) as defined by the LPA.
- 2.13 There are 2 trees within the application site, a silver birch tree and a sycamore tree, both of which have been assessed as being in 'fair' (category C1) condition, but of low arboricultural quality and limited landscape value. Additionally, there are 5 trees and group of trees located outside of, but within the vicinity of, the application site.

3.0 Relevant Planning History of Application Site and Surroundings

3.1 In April 2025, a planning application (LPA ref. 72104/APP/2025/1096) was submitted to the LPA proposing the following development to the application site ;

'Erection of a ground floor rear extension and a three storey extension above an existing commercial parade to provide 7 residential units (2 x 1-bed, 2 person units, 4 x 2-bed, 3 person units and 1 x 3-bed, 5 person unit)'

3.2 In late May 2025 the LPA Case Officer advised that the LPA's Conservation and Design Officer had several concerns, and the applicant was invited to either withdraw the application or to have it determined (with no opportunity provided to respond to the comments or amend the proposals), and, as the applicant wished for the application to be determined, a short extension of time was agreed with the LPA to enable the Officer delegated report to be written up and the decision notice issued.

3.3 That decision notice was subsequently issued on 20th June 2025, with the LPA refusing planning application ref. 72014/APP/2025/1096 for the following reasons ;

- 1) *The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, massing, and poor overall design, would result in a discordant and unsympathetic form of development that fails to respect the setting, character, and architectural integrity of the existing and attached building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012); Policies DMHB 11, and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020); Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021); and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).*
- 2) *The proposal, by virtue of its bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers at 9a Victoria Road by reason of loss of outlook and sense of enclosure. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).*
- 3) *The application fails to provide an Arboricultural Impact Assessment or Tree Survey in accordance with BS5837:2012 standards to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing tree identified for retention. In the absence of this information, the proposal has not demonstrated that the development would safeguard the long-term health and structural integrity of the tree or the site's contribution to local green infrastructure. As such, the application fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy G1 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One (2012), and Policies DMHB 14 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020).*
- 4) *The proposed access arrangement to the residential development, located to the rear of the existing street frontage, is considered unacceptable due to concerns relating to the safety and security of future occupants. The access route lacks appropriate levels of natural surveillance and fails to provide a clearly defined, well-lit, and secure approach to the residential units. This creates an environment that may foster crime and antisocial behaviour, to the detriment of residential amenity and community safety. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the principles of "Secured by Design" and is contrary to Policy D11 of the London Plan (2021), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), and the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).*

5) *The proposed development is located within the LBH Air Quality Management Area, and within the Ruislip Town Centre Focus Area. No appropriate mitigation was offered by the applicant and therefore the proposed development is contrary to local and regional policies, Policy DMEI 14: Air Quality, London Borough of Hillingdon Air Quality Action Plan and the London Plan, Policy SI1.*

- 3.4 A copy of the decision notice relating to planning application ref. 72104/APP/2025/1096 is attached as Appendix 1.
- 3.5 An appeal (progressing by way of the written representations procedure) against that refusal was subsequently made in July 2025, with the Planning Inspectorate giving that appeal the reference no. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257).
- 3.6 That appeal was subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, and a copy of that appeal decision is attached as Appendix 2. Crucially, it is evident from the content of that appeal decision that the Inspector only dismissed that appeal on design grounds (relating to the fenestration pattern and solid to void ratio within the front elevation of the proposed development), and movement and safety grounds (specially the fact that access into/egress from the proposed development was only via the existing service yard to the rear of the site). In all other respects the Inspector found the proposed development to be acceptable in planning terms.
- 3.7 Turning to other planning history relating to the application site, in April 2025 the LPA granted planning permission (application ref. 79290/APP/2025/389) for the installation of a replacement shopfront to the existing commercial premises at 17 Victoria Road. That permission is yet to be implemented.
- 3.8 There is no other recent planning history relating to the application site.
- 3.9 In regard to the immediate surroundings, in May 2017 planning permission (application ref. 72040/APP/2016/2531) was granted by the LPA for the following development on the neighbouring site at 69-83 Park Way and 1-11 Victoria Road ;

'Enlargement of the roof, including raising of the ridge and eaves height to provide new recessed third floor, erection of a third-floor extension to the rear of Nos. 69 to 81 Park Way, including the installation of rooflights, rebuilding of chimneys and new emergency external stairs to the rear of No. 9 Victoria Road, to allow for the provision of 9 new flats.'

- 3.10 Pre—commencement conditions 6, 9 and 10 were subsequently discharged by the LPA by way of discharge of conditions application refs. 72040/APP/2017/2549 and 72040/APP/2017/2465, both of which were approved in September 2017, and in May 2020 the LPA issued a Certificate of Existing Lawful Development (application ref. 72040/APP/2020/1293) confirming that the development approved by way of the granting of planning application ref. 72040/APP/2016/2531 had been lawfully commenced.

4.0 The Proposed Development

- 4.1 The planning application to which this planning statement relates proposes the erection of extensions to the existing single storey commercial parade to provide 7 residential units above the existing ground floor commercial units.
- 4.2 At ground floor level a rear extension is proposed to provide both refuse (including general waste and recyclable material) and cycle storage (for 16 bicycles) for the proposed residential units and to provide both a staircase and lift enabling circulation between the different floor levels. That rear extension will be accessed by way of a new self-contained residential access within the Victoria Road frontage of the site, necessitating the reduction in the floorspace of the existing commercial unit at no. 17.
- 4.3 It should be emphasised however that neither the LPA nor the Planning Inspectorate, in determining the previous proposals relating to the application site, raised an objection to the loss of a modest amount of existing commercial floorspace to facilitate residential access from the Victoria Road frontage of the side, and indeed encouraged the provision of such access so that access from the service yard area to the rear would not be required.
- 4.4 A three storey extension above the extended ground floor is also proposed, with the top floor of that extension set-in from the front and side elevations of the extended building.
- 4.5 The 7 residential units proposed would comprise 2 x 1-bedroom, 2-person units, 4 x 2-bedroom, 3-person units and 1 x 3-bedroom, 5-person unit. Both the gross internal areas and the bedroom dimensions of all proposed residential units, as well as floor to ceiling heights, will meet (and in the case of 5 of the 7 proposed units exceed) the requirements set out within the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).
- 4.6 All but 1 residential unit will benefit from generously proportioned private amenity space (comprising balconies and roof terraces), and the cumulative provision of private amenity space (totalling 155 square metres) will significantly exceed London Plan requirements. All proposed residential units will also be dual aspect.
- 4.7 As detailed within the accompanying Design and Access Statement prepared by Wave Architects, the design of the proposals has evolved by way of a comprehensive appraisal of both constraints and opportunities associated with the application site, with the revised scheme, including the proposed palette of materials, responding to the content of the appeal decision relating to the previous proposals relating to the Victoria Road elevation/façade.
- 4.8 Acknowledging that the neighbouring Ruislip Manor London Underground Station is a locally listed building, the planning application submission includes a Heritage Assessment prepared by Gareth Jones Heritage Planning, with that assessment also detailing how the revised proposals both reflect and address the content of the recent appeal decision.
- 4.9 A Daylight & Sunlight Study (prepared by Fortress Assessments) forms part of the planning application submission and demonstrates that the proposed development will not negatively impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring building to the north, whilst future occupiers of the proposed development will benefit from highly satisfactory levels of daylight and sunlight.
- 4.10 As detailed on accompanying drawing no. 1117VR-PP2-07 (proposed roof plan) prepared by Wave Architects, a green (sedum) roof is proposed along with solar photovoltaic roof panels and heat pumps.

- 4.11 The planning application submission also includes a Fire Statement prepared by Accendo Fire Safety Services having regard to the provisions of London Plan policy D12 (Fire Safety), and a Drainage Strategy Report (prepared by Nimbus Engineering Consultants Ltd.) detailing how foul and surface water run-off arising from the proposals would be managed.
- 4.12 As there are two trees within the curtilage of the application site and a number of other trees within the vicinity of the application site, a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, prepared by ROAVR Group, forms part of the planning application submission.
- 4.13 Finally, the planning application submission also includes an Air Quality Assessment prepared by Aether UK, in recognition of the fact that the application site, whilst outside the boundaries of an Air Quality Management Area, is within the boundaries of the Ruislip Town Centre Air Quality Focus Area (AQFA) as defined by the LPA.

5.0 Planning Policies and Government Guidance

- 5.1 At local level, the currently adopted Development Plan comprises the Local Plan Part 1 (Strategic Policies), which was adopted in November 2012, and the Local Plan Part 2 (Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations), which was adopted in January 2020.
- 5.2 The LPA completed the first stage of consultation relating to a Local Plan review in June 2024. In January 2026 a programme relating to the progression of the Local Plan review was approved at a Full Council meeting, with a public consultation on the emerging draft plan anticipated to take place in summer/autumn 2026, followed by subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
- 5.3 Therefore, given the current preliminary stage of the Local Plan review, full weight must continue to be attached to the adopted Development Plan, as long as the relevant policies accord with the more up-to-date development plan at regional level and national planning policy.
- 5.4 Also of relevance at local level is the LPA's 'Accessible Hillingdon' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which was adopted in September 2017.
- 5.5 At regional level, the Development Plan comprises the London Plan, which was published by the GLA in March 2021 following independent Examination in Public and subsequent review by the Secretary of State. Also of relevance at regional level is the Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance (published June 2023), which brings together, and helps to interpret, the housing-related design guidance and policies within the London Plan.
- 5.6 At national level, the latest update to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published by the Government in February 2025 and streamlines previous national planning policy into a consolidated set of priorities, to ensure that planning decisions reflect genuine national objectives, with the principle of sustainable development permeating the framework.
- 5.7 The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) was first published by the Government in March 2014 and is regularly updated, and also streamlines previously published national guidance, which had taken the form of planning policy guidance notes and planning policy statements, into a single document.
- 5.8 Finally, also of relevance to the proposals which are the subject of this pre-application advice request is the 'Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards', first published by the Department of Communities and Local Government in March 2015, which sets out technical requirements for the gross internal (floor) area of new dwellings, including bedrooms and storage space.

6.0 Planning Assessment

- 6.1 The starting point for determining any planning application is set out in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which states that “where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”
- 6.2 Accordingly, this section of this supporting planning statement now proceeds to appraise the proposals having regard to the development plan and all other material planning considerations, including specifically the content of the decision notice relating to recent appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257.

Principle of development

- 6.3 The LPA’s Core Strategy policy H1 (Housing Growth), adopted London Plan policy H1 (Increasing Housing Supply) and Section 5 (Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) all seek to significantly boost the supply of homes within both the Borough of Hillingdon and the capital as a whole.
- 6.4 Additionally, both London Plan policy H2 (Small Sites) and paragraph 73 of the NPPF emphasise the important contribution which small sites, such as the application site, can make towards meeting the housing requirements of an area, and paragraph 90(f) of the NPPF also acknowledges the important role residential development can often play in ensuring the vitality of designated centres.
- 6.5 Similarly, paragraph 125 of the NPPF stresses the substantial weight that should be attached to using suitable brownfield land within settlements, the support that should be given to the development of under-utilised land and buildings, and the use of airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes, to make the most efficient use of land, reflecting also the thrust of adopted Core Strategy policy H1.
- 6.6 Having regard to the development plan policies and associated guidance referenced above, the application site, which comprises a ‘small site’ (i.e. less than 0.25 hectares), is located within the designated ‘Minor Town Centre’ of Ruislip Manor, and currently consists of a single-storey commercial parade, which is at odds with the predominantly 3 or 4 storey character of its surroundings.
- 6.7 Although policy DMTC 1 (Town Centre Developments) of the adopted Local Plan Part 2 seeks to avoid residential uses at ground floor level within designated primary and secondary shopping areas (noting that the site falls within the designated shopping area of Ruislip Manor Town Centre), as part of its recent determination of previous planning application ref. 72014/APP/2025/0196) the LPA indicated that it would not oppose the loss of a small area of existing commercial floorspace/frontage in order for a self-contained residential access to be created from Victoria Road. This position is also set out within paragraph 10 of the decision notice relating to recent appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257.
- 6.8 Accordingly, whilst it is acknowledged that the revised proposals which are the subject of this revised application would result in the loss of 45 square metres (or 20.64%) of existing commercial floorspace, including the loss of a narrow (approximately 1.8 metres) length of the existing commercial frontage of no. 17, the overall benefits of the revised proposals, including how the proposed residential units will be accessed directed from Victoria Road rather than via the rear service yard, reduce the modest harm arising from the loss of both a relatively small area of existing commercial floorspace and narrow length of existing commercial frontage.
- 6.9 Accordingly, when assessed in its totality, the principle of the development of the application site by way of residential units on new upper floors, served by a self-contained residential access point from Victoria Road, whilst also retaining 4 appropriately sized commercial units at ground floor level, accords with the development plan at both local and regional level, as well as national planning policy as set out in the NPPF.

- 6.10 Additionally, the proposed resulting building, and its density, would reflect both the scale of development and the predominant usage character of the immediate locality, with ground floor commercial units and residential units above, complying with adopted Development Management Policies policy DMHB 16 (Residential Density).

Proposed Housing Mix and Quality of Accommodation

- 6.11 The residential element of the proposed development would provide 7 new residential units ranging from 1-bedroom, 2-person units to 3-bedroom, 5-person units, with 5 of the proposed units fully complying with M4(2) Building Regulations requirements.
- 6.12 The LPA's most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment was published in October 2018 and concluded that, in terms of market housing, the greatest requirement is for 3-bedroom units and the least requirement is for 1-bedroom units. Adopted Development Management Policies policy DMH 2 (Housing Mix), which postdates the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment, requires residential developments to provide a mix of housing units in different sizes to reflect the LPA's latest information on housing need.
- 6.13 Whilst it is acknowledged that 1 (or 14.29%) of the proposed residential units would be a 3-bedroom unit, the majority (57.14%) of the proposed units would be 2-bedroom units, and therefore not only is a broad mix of residential units proposed but also only 28.57% of the proposed units would comprise 1-bedroom units.
- 6.14 Furthermore, significant weight must be attached to the high-density town centre location of the application site, and both local, regional and national planning policy directs higher density residential development to both town centre and highly accessible locations, such as the application site.
- 6.15 Consequently, a redevelopment of the site to provide a mix of housing which was dominated by larger (3-bedroom plus) units would conflict with such policies, failing to maximise the development potential of the site, whereas the proposed housing mix of reflects the characteristics and location of the application site and its surroundings.
- 6.16 All of the proposed residential units would, at the very least, meet the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), both in terms of the total floor space of each unit and the area and dimensions of the bedrooms within those units. Indeed, as demonstrated by the table within drawing no. 1117VR-PP2-09 prepared by Wave Architects, 5 of the 7 proposed units would exceed those standards (by between 1 and 12 square metres), and the floor to ceiling height of the proposed residential floorspace would be 2.5 metres across at least 75% of the gross internal area.
- 6.15 Accordingly, the proposals are fully NDSS complaint, as well as also accordingly with London Plan requirements (London Plan policy H6), the LPA's Development Management Policies policy DMHB 16 (Housing Standards) and the LPA's 'Accessible Hillingdon' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 6.16 Furthermore, all the proposed residential units would be dual aspect, with no north-facing fenestration proposed, thereby ensuring effective cross-ventilation and allowing for improved indoor air quality and passive cooling, assisting in overall sustainability and comfort within the living environment.
- 6.17 The planning application submission includes a Daylight & Sunlight Study (prepared by Fortress Assessments) which demonstrates that, in addition to the proposed development not negatively impacting upon the residential amenities of both existing and future occupiers of the neighbouring building to the north, future occupiers of the proposed development would also benefit from highly satisfactory levels of daylight and sunlight, thereby according with BRE requirements.

- 6.18 All but 1 of the proposed residential units would benefit from private amenity space, in the form of both balconies and roof terraces, with the private amenity area for those flats ranging from between 8 square metres to 79 square metres. In total, 155 square metres of private amenity space is proposed, almost quadruple more than the 43 square metres of private amenity space required by the London Plan.
- 6.19 It is acknowledged that adopted Development Management Policies policy DMHB 18 (Private Outdoor Amenity Space) seeks the provision of at least 20 square metres of private outdoor amenity space (for studio and 1-bedroom units), and only the 3-bedroom unit provides a level of private outdoor amenity space which meets the requirements of local policy DMHB 18.
- 6.20 However, having regard to the town centre location of the application site, the emphasis placed on making the most efficient use of land (especially previously developed land within designated centres) and how the amount of private amenity space provided is substantially greater than that required by the London Plan, the proposal is acceptable on its planning merits.
- 6.21 We would also stress that the proposed development, whilst making the most efficient use of the application site, falls below the threshold for either the provision of on-site affordable housing or a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing as set out in Core Strategy policy H2 (Affordable Housing) and paragraph 65 of the NPPF.
- 6.22 Finally, it is also important to emphasise that, in both the LPA's determination of the previous planning application and the Planning Inspectorate's determination of appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257, neither the LPA nor the Inspector raised any concerns relating to either the proposed housing mix or the quality of accommodation.

Scale, Design and Appearance of Proposed Development

- 6.23 This section of this supporting planning statement should be read in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement prepared by the scheme architects, Wave Architects.
- 6.24 That Design and Access Statement details how the proposals have evolved to respond to contextual, technical and regulatory considerations, resulting in a development which integrates effectively into, and harmonises with, its surroundings, whilst addressing and overcoming practical constraints and compliance requirements.
- 6.25 The proposed extended building would comprise three storeys, with an additional recessed fourth storey, incorporating a flat roof. The modern design of the proposed extended building reduces the visual impact of the proposal in terms of both its mass and height from street level whilst blending well with the varied architectural styles present within the immediate surroundings, and the eaves height of the proposed extended building aligns with that of the adjoining building to the north, to achieve seamless integration, whilst a stepped down approach towards the locally listed underground building to the south is also proposed.
- 6.26 The significant variation in levels between the front and rear of the application site has enabled the proposals to incorporate ancillary facilities, including refuse and bicycle storage, for the new residential units, and the revised proposals now incorporate a self-contained residential access point directly from Victoria Road.
- 6.27 The front (west facing) elevation of the additional upper floors would be set back from the front elevation of the adjoining building to the north, facilitating the provision of private amenity space, and the mass of the proposed extended building is further recessed at the southern part of the site, assisting further in ensuring that the proposed development is respectful of the locally listed building to the south.

6.25 To the rear, the proposed extended building is set out in relating to the 45-degree line drawn from the nearest window serving a habitable room within the neighbouring building to the north, thereby minimising overshadowing and ensuring that the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers are not unacceptably impacted (as also demonstrated by way of the Daylight & Sunlight Study).

6.26 Indeed, we would point out that whilst the LPA's second reason for refusal of previous planning application ref. 72104/APP/2025/1096 cited alleged harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers of no. 9A Victoria Road by reason of loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, the Inspector appointed to determine appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257 concluded that ;

'Living conditions of neighbouring occupants at 9a Victoria Road would therefore be satisfactory and there would be no conflict with Local Plan Policies BE1 and DMHB 11 or the Framework.'

6.27 The recessed and flat roof design of the top floor of the proposed extended building contributes to a more refined and contemporary architectural expression, whilst respectful the varied architectural character of the surroundings, and the flat roof also enables both a green roof system and the integration of renewable energy technologies, such as photovoltaic panels and/or air source heat pumps, to be incorporated into the building, as well as providing for relevant essential building services to meet fire safety requirements (as detailed within the Fire Statement prepared by Accendo Fire Safety Services).

6.28 In dismissing appeal ref. APP/R5510/W/25/3370257, the Inspector raised no issues or concerns relating to the scale of the previously proposed development. Indeed, the only specific issues/concerns raised by the Inspector relating to the scale, design and appearance of the previously proposed development (other than the absence of direct access to the residential core from Victoria Road) are set out within paragraph 7 of the appeal decision, which states ;

'However, the adjacent terrace has a strong, vertical emphasis accentuated using stone quoins and a repeating pattern of tall narrow windows set close together. By contrast, the front elevation of the proposed development would feature several wide windows interspersed by smaller openings set within sizeable expanses of solid brick wall. This fenestration pattern and solid-void ratio would create a jarring horizontal emphasis out of keeping with the architectural rhythm and balance of the neighbouring building.'

6.29 In light of the above, the design of the front elevation/façade of the proposed development has been extensively revised to provide stronger vertical emphasis by way of regularly spaced out tall, narrow fenestration and the use of stone quoins, as well as vertical shadow gaps within the brickwork and cast-stone detailing to corners and coping, and the use of red bricks.

6.30 As a result of the proposed revised design and appearance of the front elevation/façade of the proposed development, it preserves the established rhythm and character of the streetscene, which also delivering a contemporary addition that complements its surroundings.

6.31 Accordingly, the scale, design and appearance of the proposed development complies with adopted Core Strategy policies BE1 (Built Environment) and EM1 (Climate Change Adaption and Mitigation), policies DMHB 11 (Design of New Development), DMEI 1 (Living Walls and Roofs and Onsite Vegetation) and DMEI 2 (Reducing Carbon Emissions) of the adopted Development Management Policies, as well as the 'Accessible Hillingdon' SPD, whilst, from a fire safety perspective, the proposals accord with London Plan policy D12 (Fire Safety).

Heritage Matters

- 6.32 The planning application submission includes a Heritage Assessment prepared by Gareth Jones Heritage Consultancy, which sets out the heritage context of the application site, assesses the heritage significance of the heritage assets within the immediate surroundings, and then assesses the proposed development and its effect on the heritage significance of those assets, having regard to local, regional and national planning policies and associated guidance.
- 6.33 The heritage assessment predominantly focuses upon the locally listed building of Ruislip Manor London Underground Station to the south of the application site (whilst noting that the retail unit between the site and the station is not part of the locally listed building), whilst also appraising the revised proposals in light of both the LPA's refusal of the previous planning application and the content of the subsequent appeal decision.
- 6.34 The assessment concludes that the proposed development would have a neutral impact on the setting of that listed building, and will relate positively to its context, in accordance with adopted Core Strategy policy HE1 (Heritage), policies DMHB 1 (Heritage Assets) and DMHB 3 (Locally Listed Buildings) of the adopted Development Management Policies, and policy HC1 (Heritage Conservation and Growth) of the London Plan, as well as relevant national planning policy and guidance as set out in both the NPPF and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Transport and Highways Matters

- 6.35 The proposed development incorporates the provision of 16 cycle parking spaces (double the level of provision required at local level) within the proposed ground rear floor rear extension, thereby enabling future occupiers to store cycles within a covered and secure environment.
- 6.36 Additionally, as detailed by way of drawing no. 1117VR-PP2-03, the floorspace within the proposed rear extension would provide sufficient bin storage to meet/exceed the requirements of the proposed residential development in terms of general waste, recyclable material and garden waste, with servicing able to be undertaken from the Victoria Road frontage of the site.
- 6.37 In light of the highly sustainable town centre location of the application site, no on-site vehicle parking is proposed, and it is noted that the area does not fall within a Controlled Parking Zone. It is also noted that the previous planning application was not refused by the LPA on transport and highways matters
- 6.38 Therefore, the proposals accord with policies DMT 1 (Managing Transport Impacts), DMT 5 (Pedestrians and Cyclists) and DMT 6 (Vehicle Parking) of the adopted Development Management Policies, policies T4 (Assessing and Mitigating Transport Impacts), T5 (Cycling), T6 (Car Parking) and T6.1 (Residential Parking) of the London Plan, as well as paragraph 116 of the NPPF, which advises that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there here would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Other Matters

- 6.39 The planning application submission incorporates a Drainage Strategy prepared by Nimbus Engineering Consultants Ltd., with that strategy assessing the existing and proposed surface run-off at the application site and proposing a suitable SuDS strategy, as well as detailing the proposed foul water strategy.
- 6.40 The accompanying Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, prepared by ROAVR Group, concludes that the loss of the 2 existing category C1 trees within the application site would not be unacceptable, and that the proposed development can be implemented within minimal and acceptable arboricultural impact.

6.41 Indeed, it must be stressed that, in determining the recent appeal, the Inspector concurred with those conclusions, commenting that ;

'Therefore, despite the loss of two low quality trees, it would be feasible for the scheme to achieve modest green infrastructure gains in terms of landscaping and biodiversity and thus satisfy the expectations of Policies BE1 and DMHB 14 of the Local Plan and Policy G1 of the London Plan.'

6.42 Similarly, the Air Quality Assessment prepared by Aether UK concludes that there are no air quality constraints to the proposed development, and that the proposed development would be air quality neutral for transport and building emissions. Again, those conclusions were supported by the Inspector who, in determining the recent appeal, concluded that, the proposals would satisfy the requirements of policy DMEI 14 (Air Quality) of the adopted Development Management policies and also London Plan policy SI1 (Improving Air Quality)

7.0 Conclusions

- 7.1 For the reasons set out within this supporting planning statement and within all the other supporting documentation which comprises the planning application submission, the revised proposals fully address and overcome the two reasons why the Inspector dismissed the recent appeal against the LPA's refusal of previous planning application ref. 72104/APP/2025/1096, and accordingly accord with the development plan at local, regional and national level, with no other material planning considerations which would outweigh that compliance with the development plan.
- 7.2 The proposals represent an effective and sustainable use of this highly sustainable, underdeveloped brownfield site, maximising its development potential whilst not harming the amenity of neighbouring residents, the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the setting of the locally listed building to the south.
- 7.3 Consequently planning permission should be granted for the proposed development, subject to the imposition of appropriate, reasonable and necessary conditions.