



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2025

by **K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3366328

32 Springvale Avenue, Brentford, Hounslow TW8 9QH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Vimal Thakkar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application reference is P/2025/0358.
- The development proposed is the change of use from C4 small-scale HMO (6 people) to Sui generis HMO (7-person).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the change of use from C4 small-scale HMO (6 people) to Sui generis HMO (7-person) at 32 Springvale Avenue, Brentford, Hounslow, TW8 9QH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/0358, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the supply of family homes;
 - Whether the development would be consistent with local policies relating to the location of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) having regard to accessibility to public transport and local services; and
 - The provision of adequate cycle parking facilities.

Reasons

Supply of family homes

3. Policy SC10 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015 - 2030 (HLP) sets out that Houses in Multiple Occupation are part of a responsive and flexible range of housing provision necessary to meet the needs of individuals and families within the borough. Proposals will be supported in appropriate locations where they help meet housing need and comply with the required standards.
4. HLP Policy SC10 (e) states that only properties with an original floor area of more than 130 square metres are suitable for conversion to HMOs. The reason given for this is that properties in HMO use are likely to cause adverse impacts on the residential amenity and character of the surrounding area. The appeal property is

currently lawfully in use as a 6-person HMO¹ and I saw that the property is in use as an HMO. As such the appeal property is not presently in use as a family home. The introduction of an Article 4 direction removing permitted development rights for the change of use of dwellings to HMOs subsequently has no bearing on the lawfulness of the current use.

5. Whilst I accept that the floor area of the property as originally built is less than the 130 square metres stated in the policy as suitable for conversion, the property is already lawfully in use as an HMO. Consequently, the proposal would not result in the loss of a family sized home which the policy seeks to protect.
6. Moreover, the property would comply with internal space standards required for this type of accommodation and I noted on site that there was adequate external amenity space in the form of a rear garden which would be available for the use of occupiers. Furthermore, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence that the use of the property as an HMO with one additional occupant would be likely to cause harm to the character of the surrounding area or to living conditions of neighbouring occupiers through any cumulative impact of the proposal from other similar developments in the area.
7. Therefore, there is no conflict with Hounslow Local Plan Policy SC10 (e) in this respect which recognises that HMOs are necessary to meet the needs of individuals and families with the borough. The development would consequently comply with the overall objective of the policy. There would also be no conflict with London Plan Policies H9 and H10 in this respect.

Accessibility to public transport and local services

8. The appeal property is located on the end of a short terrace of two storey properties, and within a cul-de-sac of similar properties within an established residential area close to the Great West Road Chiswick flyover.
9. HLP Policy SC10 supports the proposals for larger HMOs in appropriate locations specifically where they are located within convenient walking distance of town centre facilities and good public transport links. The supporting text to HLP Policy SC10 suggests that a reasonable walking distance is considered to be 400 metres.
10. I have not been provided with any precise distances either to public transport or town centre facilities by either party, although the Council state that it is over half a mile to the nearest neighbourhood centre and town centre. From my own observations bus stops which directly serve local facilities and further afield are located on South Ealing Road and Great West Road and are a short walk from the appeal property. Additionally, facilities which would be expected to be found within a town centre on South Ealing Road are within a reasonable distance via a flat route.
11. Therefore, whilst the distance to shops and services may exceed the suggested 400 metres, the distances involved to both bus stops and local facilities are not so great as to be inconvenient to occupiers of the property. Consequently, there would be no material conflict with HLP Policies EC2 and SC10 which aim to ensure that HMOs are located within convenient walking distance of town centre facilities and

¹ Local Authority ref: P/2023/1302 – Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Use for change of use of a dwelling (Use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4) granted 10/07/2023

good public transport links. There would also be no conflict with London Plan Policy T3 which is concerned with transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding.

Cycle Parking

12. Lockable cycle parking for 6 cycles is indicated to the side and rear of the building although no specific details of the type of storage facility are provided. The Council states that as the proposal is for 7 bedrooms cycle parking for 7 cycles is required.
13. Adequate space either at the side or rear of the property is available for the provision of one additional cycle parking facility and therefore I can see no reason why the location and specification of the storage facilities could not be secured through a planning condition.
14. Therefore, there is no conflict with HLP Policy EC2 which requires developments to provide a minimum number of cycle parking spaces consistent with London Plan Policy T5.

Conditions

15. The Council have not suggested any planning conditions. In the circumstances, I have imposed a suite of conditions informed by the evidence before me and in the light of the tests for the imposition of conditions set out within the National Planning Policy Framework and the content of the Planning Practice Guidance. None of these conditions should come as a surprise to either party.
16. In addition to the statutory time limit, a plans condition is necessary and reasonable in the interests of certainty. Details of the provision of cycle storage are also necessary in the interests of sustainable travel options in accordance with the requirements of HLP Policy HC2. A condition relating to car parking permits is also necessary to comply with HLP and London Plan policies in relation to car-free housing and would ensure that the development does not cause highway safety issues.
17. It would also be prudent for an HMO management plan to be agreed with the local planning authority in order that the property is managed and occupied appropriately.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (unreferenced); V/591/01 Existing Ground Floor Plan; V/591/02 Existing First Floor Plan; V/591/03 Proposed Ground Floor Plan; V591/04 Proposed First Floor Plan; V/591/05 Site Plan; V/591/06 Elevations.
- 3) Notwithstanding details shown on plans V/591/03 and V/591/05 no development shall take place until details of the cycle parking for 7 cycles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) The Development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until arrangements have been made to secure the development as a car-free development in accordance with a detailed scheme or agreement which shall have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved scheme or agreement shall ensure that:
 - i. no occupiers of the approved development shall apply for, obtain or hold an on-street parking permit to park a vehicle on the public highway within the administrative district of the local planning authority (other than a disabled person's badge issued pursuant to section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 or similar legislation); and
 - ii. any occupiers of the approved development shall surrender any such permit wrongly issued or held. Such scheme or agreement shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be retained and operated for so long as the use hereby permitted continues.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until an HMO Management Plan, has been submitted in writing to, and approved by, the local planning authority. The development shall be operated and managed in accordance with the approved HMO Management Plan at all times.

****End of Schedule****