



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3367814**

**33 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow TW3 4NH**

- 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 Purushothama Ramakrishnappa of Sai Divij Solutions Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref is P/2025/06267.
  - The development proposed is described as in seek of full planning permissions required to make current single dwelling house to HMO, in compliance to HMO License for this 4 bed house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the development has not begun, however the appeal form states that the application is retrospective. Based upon my site visit and on the evidence before me, I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place.
3. The Council has referred to a Local Plan Review and highlights that it expects the emerging Hounslow Local Plan 2020-2041 to be adopted in 2026. I have not been provided with the emerging Local Plan and given it is at a relatively early stage, I have determined this appeal with reference to policies from the existing adopted development plan.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
  - whether the appeal site is a suitable location for a house in multiple occupancy (HMO) having regard to local policy;
  - whether 33 Vicarage Farm Road is a suitable dwelling for a HMO with regard to local policy;
  - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to noise and disturbance; and
  - whether the development provides adequate waste and recycling facilities.

## Reasons

### *Suitable Location*

5. Number 33 Vicarage Farm Road (No 33) is a mid-terrace dwelling located in a predominantly residential area.
6. Policy SC1 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (the HLP) seeks to maximise the supply of housing in the Borough to meet housing need with sustainable development principles. This is further supported by Policy SC10 of the HLP and the guidance contained within the London Borough of Hounslow Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD). They highlight that HMO's should be located within convenient walking distance of town centre facilities (approximately 400 metres) and good public transport links.
7. Regarding public transport links, the appeal site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 and therefore has reasonably good access to public transport. Notably, it is approximately 160 metres from Hounslow West Station.
8. Hounslow Town Centre is approximately 1500 metres from the appeal site and there is a small neighbourhood centre roughly 270 metres from No 33 as well as a large neighbourhood centre 170 metres from the appeal site. However, there is limited substantive evidence before me to adequately demonstrate that the neighbourhood centres provide the equivalent of town centre facilities. Whilst occupants may be able to use public transport to access town centre facilities, it remains, to my mind, that the location of No 33, is an unsuitable location given it is not within a convenient walking distance of town centre facilities.
9. I acknowledge that the appellant refers to both the Planning Register and HMO Register. However, there is limited substantive evidence before me regarding the number of HMO's and possible stress within the surrounding area. Therefore, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the location of No 33 is suitable for a HMO. Thus, it conflicts with the general aims of the SPD regarding the suitable location of HMO's.
10. In conclusion, the appeal site is not a suitable location for a HMO. It therefore conflicts with Policy SC10 of the HLP insofar as it seeks to ensure HMOs are located in suitable locations. It is for the same reasons that it fails to accord with the SPD.

### *Suitable Dwelling*

11. Policy SC10 of the HLP outlines, amongst other things, an approach to housing in multiple occupancy. It requires that the original floor area of the dwelling should be greater than 130m<sup>2</sup> to be suitable for a conversion into a non-family HMO.
12. The supporting text of Policy SC10 of the HLP highlights that the creation of larger HMO's (6 occupiers or more) is of a scale that can bring about material change and impacts on the surrounding area. Thus, the overconcentration of HMO's should be resisted. Nevertheless, an Article 4 Direction came into force in September 2023 which removed permitted development rights regarding small HMO's, like the proposed development subject of this appeal. Consequently, the Council has identified that the conversion of family dwellings to small HMO's

needs to be controlled. Accordingly, the requirements of Policy SC10 of the HLP are relevant to the appeal.

13. I have identified above that there is limited substantive evidence before me to adequately demonstrate that the appeal scheme does not lead to an overconcentration or cluster of HMO's in the surrounding area.
14. Additionally, whilst the appellant currently resides at No 33 and lets the spare bedrooms, thereby responding to a form of housing need, it remains that there is limited substantive evidence before me to adequately demonstrate that the original floor area was greater than 130m<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, even if the number of HMO's in the surrounding area were to be acceptable, the appeal scheme remains in conflict with Policy SC10.
15. In conclusion, No 33 is not an appropriate dwelling for conversion to a HMO and thus conflicts with Policy SC10 of the HLP insofar as it seeks to ensure the suitable conversion of dwellinghouses to HMO's. It is for the same reasons that it fails to accord with the SPD.

#### *Noise and Disturbance*

16. Policy CC2 of the HLP outlines, amongst other things, that developments should avoid harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants including noise and disturbance. The SPD highlights, that when considering the effect of a HMO upon the amenity of neighbouring dwellings consideration should be given to, amongst other things, whether the HMO would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in the locality.
17. The appeal scheme is a four bed HMO. I acknowledge that it retains a single access at the front door of the dwelling. However, it remains, to my mind, that the development likely increases the coming and goings above those expected from a single-family dwelling house given that residents in an HMO live as separate households.
18. Furthermore, I have identified above that there is limited substantive evidence before me regarding the number of HMO's and possible overconcentration within the surrounding area. Consequently, I cannot be certain that the appeal scheme does not contribute to an overconcentration or cluster of HMO's in the area and as a result does not unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupants regarding coming and goings.
19. Additionally, there is limited substantive evidence before me to adequately demonstrate satisfactory management of the development to ensure that it does not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residents and the locality.
20. Given all of the above, in my judgement, the appeal scheme results in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings regarding noise and disturbance. It therefore conflicts with Policies CC2 and SC10 of the HLP insofar as they seek to ensure that developments including HMO's do not result in unacceptable harm to their surrounding residential amenity areas. It is for the same reasons that it fails to accord with the SPD.

### *Waste and Recycling*

21. The SPD requires that the adequate provision of waste and recycling facilities to ensure developments would not cause unacceptable accumulative harm to the character of the surrounding area when considered in conjunction with similar development in the locality.
22. There is limited substantive evidence before me to adequately demonstrate that the appeal scheme provides sufficient waste and recycling facilities and does not result in harm to the character of the surrounding area. The SPD requires that proposals for the conversion of a dwelling to a HMO should demonstrate appropriate provision has been made for the storage of bins and their collection.
23. The appellant highlights that a condition could be imposed requiring the submission of details and implementation of an approved waste and recycling scheme. However, given that there is an absence of an adequate management statement for the HMO, I cannot be certain that the required facilities can be appropriately provided. Consequently, I am not satisfied that a condition would be sufficient to overcome the relevant concerns.
24. In conclusion, the appeal scheme does not provide adequate waste and recycling facilities and therefore conflicts with Policies SC10 and EQ7 of the HLP insofar as they seek to ensure developments incorporate suitable arrangements for the storage and collection of waste as well as recycling. It is for the same reasons that it fails to accord with the SPD.

### **Other Matters**

25. The appeal scheme contributes to the mix of housing tenure in the Borough. However, given its scale I attach modest weight to this benefit.
26. In its officer report the Council raised concerns about outlook and privacy. Had I been determining the main issues differently these would have been matters I would have needed to investigate further.

### **Conclusion**

27. The development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*B Astley-Serougi*

INSPECTOR