
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2025

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3358788

21 Green Lane, Uxbridge UB8 3ED

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Harun Mehra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 49724/APP/2024/2345, dated 27 August 2024, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2024.
 - The development proposed is a change of use from Class C3 (dwellinghouse) to a short term holiday let (sui generis).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of the development as this is more accurate. The Council indicates that the use has already commenced and has submitted on-line listings and photographs to support this. The submissions variously refer to the property having 7 or 8 lettable rooms. The submitted drawings indicate 8 bedrooms and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are: the effects of the loss of a single dwellinghouse; the effects on neighbours and; the effects of the change of use in relation to parking.

Reasons

Loss of a single dwelling

4. Policy DMH 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (DMP) resists the loss of self-contained housing. In addition, the Council indicates that there is a need in the Borough for family sized homes, particularly with 3 bedrooms. The appellant does not seek to contradict or comment on these matters.
5. It is clear that the change in the use of the property has resulted in the loss of a single dwelling and one for which there is a particular demand locally. Therefore, the appeal scheme is contrary to Policy DMH 1.

Effects on Neighbours

6. The information submitted shows that 7 or 8 rooms are independently let for short-term use and are advertised on short break or holiday related websites. I consider that such a use is very likely to be occupied by more people than would be the case if it were used as a single dwelling. Rooms which would otherwise be used as living or reception rooms and dining rooms have been now changed to lettable rooms. In addition, it seems likely that the existing use would also need to be serviced/cleaned regularly, adding to the activity at the site. I consider that this would represent a significant difference in the likely level of comings and goings at the property.
7. In addition, as people use the property for recreational/holiday purposes, I consider that there is a greater likelihood that they would arrive or leave at unsocial hours. In my judgement, they may also be likely to generate greater levels of noise and activity as they enjoy themselves whilst on a break.
8. The property is within a suburban residential area where other homes are close-by. I consider that the significantly higher levels of activity that the use would be likely to generate would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of neighbours. The appellant indicates that the lettings could be undertaken on the basis that no disturbance is caused and that such a restriction could be included on the website listings. I consider that this would be very difficult to enforce and, in any event, could only occur after the event. Additionally, there appears to be no facility for on-site management.
9. Taking all of these matters into consideration, I conclude that the change of use would be very likely to give rise to an unacceptable level of disturbance to the neighbouring residents, contrary to Policy DMBH 11 of the DMP.

Car Parking

10. The frontage of the property is hard-surfaced and can accommodate vehicles. The appellant indicates that 3 cars can be parked here. I note the Council's comments in this respect and I agree that if 3 were parked here, it is unlikely that they could all be given independent access. This would be impractical in this situation where the rooms are let independently and could give rise to cars being blocked in. It seems to me that only 2 cars could practically be accommodated here.
11. The property is not within an accessible location and has a PTAL rating of 2 which is viewed as relatively poor by the Council. There are no parking restrictions on the road close to the appeal site, although the number of crossovers to individual properties means that it would be impractical to park along parts of it. Taking into account the nature of the use and the relative inaccessibility by public transport, I consider it likely that people would arrive by car when using the property. Taking account of the limited parking on the site, this would be likely to result in cars parking on the surrounding streets.
12. This part of Green Lane is quite narrow and, as noted above contains a number of crossover points serving individual properties. The use of the appeal site would mean that visitors arriving by car would wish to park on the site or, if unable to do so, as close as possible in order to gain convenient access with luggage etc. In my judgement this could lead to injudicious parking whereby existing access to other properties could be compromised, parking partially on

the pavement may result or parking opposite another parked vehicle where the road is of insufficient width to safely do so. These occurrences, along with any associated disturbance to neighbours, would have an unacceptable effect on the safety of drivers and pedestrians in the area, as well as the convenience and living conditions of neighbours. This is contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the DMP.

Conclusions

13. The proposal would give rise to unacceptable effects on neighbours, highway safety and in relation to the loss of family accommodation for which there is a stated need. Whilst it provides for additional visitor accommodation to the area, it is a relatively inaccessible location, not in the town centres as encouraged by the Council and so results in reliance on cars to access and use the site. I have taken account of all matters raised in the representations but find that these are insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
14. As a consequence of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR