



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3374479

239 Bath Road, Hounslow TW3 3DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Gunjal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/0564.
 - The development proposed is Change of use from single dwelling to HMO.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. I understand from the document entitled Evidence Report Article 4 Direction for small HMO's September 2021 before me that the Council undertook measures to withdraw the permitted development rights of a dwelling to remove the ability to change its use from a C3 use class (dwellinghouse) to a C4 use class (house in multiple occupation (HMO)) without the need to apply for planning permission.
3. The Evidence Report Article 4 Direction for small HMO's September 2021, Policy SC10 of the Hounslow Local Plan and Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (HMO SPD) all applies to this proposal. Their overarching aims are to protect the borough's stock of smaller family homes (original dwelling 130 sqm or less), to locate HMOs in areas of good public transport accessibility and access to town centre facilities, to ensure good standards of accommodation and facilities, to ensure an appropriate standard of refuse and recycling management, and to prevent detrimental impacts of HMOs on local amenity, amongst other things.

Main Issues

4. The main issues with regards to this appeal are whether or not:
 - The site is within a sustainable location in terms of access to public transport and local amenities;
 - It would have an adverse effect on existing stock of small family homes; and
 - The proposal would lead to adverse living conditions to local residents by way of noise and disturbance,

Reasons

Whether or not a sustainable location

5. The site is an extended semi-detached dwelling within a residential area and located on a main arterial route and lies on the northern side of Bath Road. There are bus services stopping along both sides of Bath Road as well as local convenience shops located within a short parade on the same side as the appeal site. These provide some essential services to the community. I could see that these are both a short walk from the appeal site and the local shops serve the local community for essential food provisions and other minor services.
6. I note that public transport for future occupants is an option to the centre of Hounslow as well as Aldwych. By far the larger service centre close by is that of Hounslow West with Hounslow West Station (London Underground station) for myself to walk to was a maximum of ten minutes. In any case, there was frequent bus services in that direction from St Paul's Church bus stop a few minutes walk from the site.
7. Hounslow West may not be an allocated town centre but I could see the shops and facilities there that include a Sainsbury's local, cafes, drinking establishments and restaurants would meet the functional needs of future occupants. Also, Hounslow West is within easy walking distance from the appeal site in a straight line along the main Bath Road that is well lit along the footway with houses flanking both sides of the road.
8. These things considered, I am of the view that even if the site is located in a sustainable location with regards to access to public transport and local amenities for future occupants of the appeal site.
9. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would comply with policy SC10 of the Local Plan that aims to secure good access to services and the Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (HMO SPD) with its same aims.

Effect on smaller dwellings

10. Turning my attention to the wording of Policy SC10 for development proposals to require a minimum 'original' floor area greater than 130sqm, the original dwelling is accepted by the parties to have been below this figure. The Supplementary Planning Document Houses in Multiple Occupation expressly identifies that HMO proposals for planning permission should be in compliance with the following guidance: Have a minimum 'original' floor area of greater than 130sqm (to enable the Council to protect the existing stock of smaller family houses).
11. The dwelling has been enlarged from its original size, and even if this is some time ago, the local plan policy is adopted policy and afforded full weight and reinforced by other evidence in order to protect smaller housing stock within the Borough.
12. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would be contrary to Policy SC10 of the Local Plan and the HMO SPD that aims to safeguard smaller housing stock.

Living Conditions – neighbouring occupants

13. The appeal site is located within a residential context with other dwellings in very close quarters. The dwelling as a family home will inevitably generate noise and disturbance from the comings and goings of its occupants as well as a level of internal noise associated with normal living conditions within a typical residential home.
14. However, the Council have imposed an Article 4 Direction on the local area. According to the evidence presented by the Council, this indicates that the level of HMO conversions has reached the point where it is causing detrimental impact on local amenity and wellbeing. The Council's policy SC10 requires the appellant to demonstrate that this proposal together with other similar development in the surrounding area will not have a serious harmful cumulative impact on the character and residential amenity of the area.
15. Four individuals living within an HMO would be a materially different character to a family home as four unrelated people would reside together sharing communal facilities and would not live as a family unit. This is a change from a typical C3 use. Therefore, without evidence to satisfy the policy to demonstrate there would be no adverse cumulative effects when taken with other local HMO's, I cannot be certain that the living conditions of local occupants would be accepted. This is further reinforced by the fact this is a residential area where dwellings are densely located and no management plan to comply with HMO guidance has been forthcoming by the appellant. I also apply significant weight to the fact that an Article 4 Direction is in place to protect living conditions of residents and the requirements of local policy.
16. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, as it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would comply with policies CC2 in so far as the effects of the proposal on amenity, and SC10 that of the Local Plan, and the HMO SPG.

Balance and Conclusion

17. In my findings I have concluded that the appeal site is within an acceptable distance to local amenities and to public transport options for the future occupants. However, on balance this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in the other main issues I have considered.
18. On this basis, the proposed development would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

