



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2025

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3361277**

**12 Great Central Avenue, Ruislip HA4 6UD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
- The appeal is made by Mavadia Estate Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 78809/APP/2024/2976.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and ancillary building and erection of a residential development comprising between 2 and 4 units.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission in principle is granted for demolition of existing bungalow and ancillary building and erection of a residential development comprising between 2 and 4 units at 12 Great Central Avenue, Ruislip HA4 6UD in accordance with the terms of application Ref 78809/APP/2024/2976.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice for the application leading to this appeal indicates that planning permission is refused. However, the application seeks permission in principle and not planning permission. The grant of permission in principle does not grant planning permission as this only comes into effect in the event of technical details consent being approved. Also, the scope of permission in principle is limited to the location, land use and amount of development and my assessment focuses solely on these matters.
3. As well as this appeal, I have also determined a separate appeal (reference number APP/R5510/W/25/3359178). This relates to the same site but it seeks outline planning permission for demolition of the existing bungalow and ancillary building and erection of a detached 2-storey dwelling and separate apartment block containing 4 units. This is the subject of a separate decision notice.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are whether the location, the scale and the residential land use of the development would be acceptable having regard to its effects on (i) the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) housing mix.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance of the area.*

5. The existing bungalow faces Great Central Avenue with a side boundary next to the pavement on Primrose Gardens. The surrounding area comprises a mix of

dwellings of various types and sizes. As such, the proposed development would reflect the general residential character of the area.

6. Policy DMH6 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies adopted January 2020 (LP2) says there is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. The proposed development would lead to 1, 2 or 3 more dwellings on the appeal site compared to the existing situation. However, this is not bound to lead to the loss of garden land as it would seem a 2 storey building containing up to 4 dwellings could be developed on the front part of the site following demolition of the bungalow. Alternatively, I envisage a scheme could be designed to ensure that any encroachment onto garden land is offset through the demolition of existing buildings on the site. These are matters that could be appropriately assessed through the technical details consent process.
7. Furthermore, the provision of up to 4 units on the site is not bound to appear uncharacteristically cramped as local dwellings are built at different densities. Therefore, I conclude the location and the scale of the proposed residential development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In these respects, it would accord with LP2 policies DMH6 and DMHB11, policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 adopted 2012 (LP1) and policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (LonP). Amongst other things, these policies look to ensure development harmonises with the local context and responds to local distinctiveness. The Council's refusal reason also refers to LonP policy H2 but this contains no provisions relevant to this issue.

*Housing mix.*

8. The Council is concerned the redevelopment of the site would include flats. Accordingly, it contends the development would conflict with part (i) of LP2 policy DMH4, as already more than 10% of properties on Great Central Avenue and Primrose Gardens are flats. However, the type of units to be provided is a design matter that would be considered at technical detail stage. It is inappropriate for me to assume the development would include blocks of flats even though it would increase the number of residences on the site. Therefore, from the information available, I find the proposal is not bound to be contrary to policy DMH4 of LP2.
9. Moreover, LonP policy H2 supports the provision of new homes on small sites to help diversify the type of housing supply. The redevelopment of the site as proposed clearly provides an opportunity to help meet this aim. There is little information before me to indicate the loss of the bungalow would have a negative impact on meeting local housing need. Also, I see no reason why the proposal could not include a unit that provides 2 bedrooms as per the existing dwelling. As such, I conclude the location and the scale of the development would have an acceptable effect on local housing mix and so in these regards it would be supported by LonP policy H2. LP1 policy BE1 and LonP policy D3 are referred to but these contain no provisions relevant to this issue.

*Other concerns.*

10. The Council and other interested parties have raised other concerns with the proposal. The development would increase the number of units on the site and so it could lead to more parking. However, residents and visitors to the development would not be reliant on private car travel given that the site is only a short distance

away from South Ruislip Station and bus stops on Station Approach. In any event, there is no substantive evidence to show that any parking associated with the proposal would cause unacceptable congestion or any other ill-effects on the public highway. The Council will be able to secure appropriate parking provision through the technical details consent process.

11. Moreover, the proposed increase in residences on the site is not bound to cause unacceptable effects on living conditions at nearby dwellings. The technical details consent process will enable the Council to ensure the development avoids unacceptable loss of privacy, light or views and that construction works are managed to prevent inappropriate disturbance due to noise and traffic.
12. The above factors do not provide justifiable reasons to refuse permission in principle. As such, they do not affect my overall conclusion.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons, I find the location, the scale and the residential nature of the development would be acceptable when assessed against the policies of the development plan. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be allowed. It should be noted that planning conditions cannot be attached to a grant of permission in principle.

*Jonathan Edwards*

INSPECTOR