
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

by **H Marriott MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3371946

A D Williams Limited, Eskdale Road, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB8 2RT

- 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 Chaudhry Sindhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 62947/APP/2025/622.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective change of use from car workshop (Use Class B2) to car sales showroom and ancillary offices (Use Class Sui Generis)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form confirms that the development has already commenced. The address in the banner heading above is taken directly from the application form. However, during my site visit I observed signage referring to a company named Ecomotive.
3. The appellant's statement indicates that the current use of the site includes some industrial activities, such as car repairs and servicing. Nevertheless, the description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form and refers only to a car sales showroom and ancillary offices. This description aligns with the submitted plans. I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the use applied for. It is not within the scope of this appeal to amend or broaden the proposals. Any such changes should be pursued through the submission of a revised planning application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the change of use on the availability of strategic industrial land in the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the Uxbridge Industrial Estate Strategic Industrial Location (SIL). Policy DME1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (LP) states that employment proposals in SILs will be supported in accordance with the relevant policies in The London Plan (2021) (TLP).
6. Policy E4 of the TLP seeks to ensure a sufficient supply of land and premises in different parts of London to meet current and future demands for industrial and related functions, taking into account strategic and local employment land reviews, industrial land audits and the potential for intensification, co-location and substitution. This aligns with Paragraph 85 and 86 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which

require significant weight to be given to supporting economic growth and productivity and for planning policies to identify strategic sites to meet anticipated needs over the plan period.

7. The use of the appeal site as a car sales showroom with ancillary offices (Use Class Sui Generis)¹ is generally regarded as the sale of goods rather than an industrial-type activity or a service. It does not fall within any of the uses listed in Policy E4 of TLP, or those identified as suitable for SILs in the justification to Policy DME1 of the LP, which include general industrial, light industrial, storage and distribution and waste management. While the appellant refers to the reference made to sui generis uses in Policy DEM1 B), this related to potential acceptable uses within Local Significance Employment Locations (LSELs), not SILs.
8. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that there is no realistic prospect of the land being used for such industrial-type activities; or that the site has been vacant and consistently marketed for a period of 2 years with no success, as required by Policy DME1 D) i) and ii) of the LP. Consequently, even if the proposal were to comply with other policies and objectives of the LP in line with Policy DME1 D) iii), it would nevertheless conflict with Policy DME1 when read as a whole. It is acknowledged that the use of the site as a car sales showroom provides employment and generates sales revenue, contributing to the local economy. However, the evidence does not demonstrate that there is no demand for industrial-type uses on the site.
9. I conclude that the change of use has resulted in a negative effect on the availability of strategic industrial land in the area. In this regard, the proposal conflicts with Policy DME1 of the LP and Policies E4 and E5 of the TLP which seek to sustain SILs for uses that support the functioning of London's economy and for the reasons set out above.

Other Matters

10. The appellant states that the Council advised them to apply for a Sui Generis use and that they were unaware of, and had no opportunity to respond to, the Council's outstanding concerns prior to the determination of the application. However, the Council's handling of the application is not a determinative matter in this appeal, which has been considered on the evidence before me. While I acknowledge the appellant's efforts to regularise the use of the site, this does not alter my decision, which is based on the planning merits of the case and assessed against the policies of the development plan.
11. The Council has identified no other harm including in relation to living conditions, character and appearance, parking, highway safety or flood risk. These matters are neutral factors and do not alter my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. The proposal 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.

H Marriott

INSPECTOR

¹ *Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).*