



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3372543

47 Hanover Circle, Hayes UB3 2TJ

- 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 Mundae against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref. is 51063/APP/2025/1399.
 - The development proposed is internal alterations to convert a single dwelling (Class C3) to 5 bedroom, 8 person HMO (Sui Generis use).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Both the address and description of development on the decision notice differ from those on the application form. The appeal form uses those on the decision notice, which are more accurate with respect to the location and drawings, so I have used those in the banner heading above and determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - parking capacity and highway safety;
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - the supply of family dwellings in the Borough; and
 - the living conditions of occupiers and neighbours with regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Parking and highway safety

4. The footway on the corner outside the site is one of few lengths nearby that is not crossed by vehicles to reach a driveway, whether informally or via a dropped kerb. During my site visit, just after midday on a weekday in school term, I saw several vehicles, including large vans, parked partly on the footway nearby. This appeared necessary on an adjacent section to allow vehicles to pass, but I saw that the road was still blocked during some parking manoeuvres.

5. Whilst the parking survey carried out on behalf of the appellant found that spaces remained available during peak periods, it counted spaces where vehicles were parked on the footway, where the road appears too narrow, or close to junctions. Footway parking makes the footway difficult and more dangerous for pedestrians to use. Relying upon it for parking capacity risks creating or compounding a highway safety issue.
6. Whilst the appellant and the Council's highways officers both report that the site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2, the appellant suggests that this does not account for recent bus service improvements. However, I have no better evidence as to what the PTAL now is. Furthermore, the PTALs of examples from the TRICS database used in the Transport Statement are not stated and so I cannot be sure that they reflect the likely level of car use.
7. The proposal would result in the garage and part of the surfaced area becoming inaccessible to vehicles. It is not clear whether the garage is used to park cars, but the appellant states that it would still be possible to manoeuvre and park two cars on the remaining surfaced area. I have no tracking diagram to demonstrate this or evidence to show that pedestrians on the site or adjacent footway would be visible to and safe from reversing vehicles during such manoeuvres.
8. Even assuming two cars could be parked on the site, the appellant assesses that three more may need to be parked on the surrounding streets. As I have found, I cannot be sure this would be possible nearby without increasing risks to pedestrian safety. In any event, the proposal would not meet all the parking demand it would create on site. Consequently, the proposal would not provide adequate parking and would further compromise highway safety in the vicinity of the site.
9. This would be contrary to HLP2 Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6, which require safe access to be provided to assessed standards, and London Plan (LP) Policies T4 and T6, which require development not to increase road danger and to provide parking to standard. I have no reason to believe that adequate cycle storage could not be secured by way of a condition were I minded to allow the appeal and I therefore find no conflict with LP Policy T5 in this regard.

Character and appearance

10. The appeal site is a wedge-shaped corner plot. It contains a six-bedroom semi-detached house with two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions. The front and side garden is mostly surfaced for parking, and the rear garden contains a double-length detached garage. Both semi-detached houses to the right as seen from the street are houses in multiple occupation (HMOs). The wider area contains similar streets of semi-detached houses, many with surfaced front gardens.
11. The proposal could be occupied by up to five households. Each is likely to have individual and different schedules for arrivals, visitors, and deliveries. This would have a very different, far more intensive character than a family home, significantly increasing potential for disturbance of neighbouring occupiers and heavily at odds with the established character of this residential area. I have no evidence that the site is covered by an Article 4 Direction for HMOs or that concentration thresholds would be exceeded, but these are not necessary for harm to occur.
12. The corner location and proximity of other HMOs mean that additional infrastructure and activity would be prominent and cumulative effects on neighbours would harm

the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Part A of Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) (HLP2). As subdivision is not proposed and I have no concentration threshold evidence, I find no conflict with HLP2 Policy DMH 1 or Policy DMH 5 Part B.

Family dwellings

13. The Council states that the proposal would conflict with its strategic housing goal of safeguarding family dwellings. However, neither policy cited by the Council refers to family dwellings. Rather, HLP2 Policy DMH 1 refers to self-contained housing and HLP2 Policy DMH 5 refers to proposals for HMOs.
14. The proposal would replace self-contained housing with an equivalent amount of residential floorspace but would not subdivide it. The supporting text to Policy DMH 1 states that, for the purposes of that policy, residential accommodation should include HMOs. As I have no evidence of a family housing shortage in the Borough, the proposal would not unacceptably harm the supply of family housing or conflict with HLP2 Policies DMH 1 or DMH 5.

Living conditions

15. As I have found, the proposal would likely be occupied by up to five households with different schedules, increasing activity and disturbance compared to a single-family home. Both semi-detached houses to the right as seen from the street are in use as small HMOs and nearby residents report problems with parking, noise and disturbance related to more intensive residential uses within the area.
16. The appeal site is on a corner near a junction, so that the additional comings-and-goings would be more obvious to a greater number of neighbours. Compared to the wider neighbourhood, the site also has a small and narrow rear garden, a large part of which is occupied by a garage, so that the remaining part would be likely to see more intensive use, particularly during the summer months.
17. These effects would also impact the future residents of the HMO and, whilst the management plan would assist in reducing or dealing with some these impacts, I am not convinced that it would result in adequate living conditions for neighbours or occupiers. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to HLP2 Policies DMH 5 and DMHB 11, LP Policies D3 and D13.
18. These policies require proposals for large HMOs to provide satisfactory living conditions for occupiers, to not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring properties, to prevent or mitigate noise impacts and to achieve comfortable environments. The proposed alterations to windows would not result in harm and I find no conflict with HLP2 Policy DMHD 1 in that respect.

Other Matters

19. The Transport Statement refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, I have found that the proposal does not accord with the development plan and there is no evidence that the most important policies for determining the appeal are out-of-date. Therefore, the presumption does not apply in this case.
20. Whilst the provision of a large HMO would contribute to the supply of cheaper accommodation, a strategically important housing resource and labour market

flexibility, all of which would be benefits, I have found harms in respect of character and appearance, parking and living conditions that outweigh this and those benefits do not amount to reasons to make a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR