

DELEGATED DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control**

Address: 47 HANOVER CIRCLE HAYES

Development: Proposed internal alterations to convert a single dwelling (Class C3) to 5 bedroom, 8 person HMO (Sui Generis use)

LBH Ref Nos: 51063/APP/2025/1399

Drawing Nos: S02
 S01
 Design and Access statement
 D02
 D01
 D03
 D04
 S03
 S04
 S05

Date Plans received: 19-05-25 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 19-05-25

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for internal alterations to convert a single dwelling (Class C3) to 5 bedroom, 8 person HMO (Sui Generis use). The proposal is a revision to application ref. 51063/APP/2024/2609 which was refused in November 2024.

The proposed development includes no alterations to the height, depth, width or design of the host dwelling. It is considered that the potential use of the property of up to 8 separate occupants would result in harm to residential amenities to occupants of surrounding residential properties. There are also concerns that the proposal results in substandard on site parking which would lead to undue on-street parking displacement to the detriment of parking capacity and safety on the local public highway. Moreover, there would be an unjustified loss of the existing family unit.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The development, by virtue of the loss of the existing family dwelling, would conflict with the Borough's strategic housing goal of safeguarding family dwellings and the proposed change of use to a Large House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would be harmful to the area's character. Consequently, the principle of development is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies DMH 1 and DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

2. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal has failed to demonstrate that sufficient off-street parking and secure cycle storage would be provided, as required by the local parking standard for the proposed occupancy level. The proposal has the potential to lead to undue on-street parking displacement to the detriment of parking capacity and safety on the local public highway, contrary to Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Plan (2020) - Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 (Appendix C) and Policy T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

3. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal and the high number of potential occupants would not result in noise and general disturbance to neighbouring properties alongside a harmful over-intensification of the use of the site (through additional comings and goings generated by the additional occupants), detrimental to both the occupiers and neighbouring properties and the residential amenity of the area. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies DMH 5, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D13 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

INFORMATIVES

1. I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two-storey, semi-detached house extended by a two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension located on the northwest of Hanover Circle on a prominent corner plot. The building has a pebbledash render with a concrete tiled roof and hardstanding for off-street parking. To the rear lies a wedge-shaped garden with an existing detached garage. The area is residential in character and appearance and comprises semi-detached houses.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for internal alterations to convert a single dwelling (Class C3) to 5 bedroom, 8 person HMO (Sui Generis use)

Room 1 = 14.1m² plus 2.7m² en-suite
Room 2 = 11m² plus 2.7m² en-suite
29m² communal kitchen living and dining room

Room 3 = 10m² plus 2.6m² en-suite
Room 4 = 13.5m² plus 2.3m² en-suite
Room 5 = 10.5m² plus 2m² en-suite
Laundry Room = 5m²

Officer note: The scheme differs from that which was previously refused by the Council in terms of it's internal layout which originally proposed the following accommodation:

Communal kitchen - 7.75 square metres
Room 1 - 12.25 square metres plus en-suite 3.15 square metres
Room 2 - 12.2 square metres plus en-suite 3 square metres
Room 3 - 7 square metres plus en-suite 2 square metres
Room 4 - 5.4 square metres plus en-suite 2.75 square metres
Room 5 - 12.45 square metres plus en-suite 2.5 square metres
Room 6 - 9.25 square metres plus en-suite 2.25 square metres
Room 7 - 9 square metres plus en-suite 2 square metres
Room 8 - 7 square metres
Communal shower room

3.3 Relevant Planning History

51063/APP/2024/2609	47 HANOVER CIRCLE HAYES
Change of use from Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) to an 8-bedrom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis).	
Decision: 25-11-2024	Refusal
51063/B/98/1095	47 HANOVER CIRCLE HAYES
Erection of a two storey side and part single storey, part two storey rear extension	
Decision: 31-07-1998	Approval
51063/A/96/1767	47 HANOVER CIRCLE HAYES
Erection of a part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension	
Decision: 08-04-1997	Refusal
51063/96/1051	47 HANOVER CIRCLE HAYES
Erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension	
Decision: 03-09-1996	Refusal

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above. Officers note that planning application reference 51063/APP/2024/2609 for the Change of use from Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) to an 8-bedrom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis) was recently refused for the following reasons:

1. The development, by virtue of the loss of the existing family dwelling, would conflict with the Borough's strategic housing goal of safeguarding family dwellings and the proposed change of use to a Large House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would be harmful to the area's character. Consequently, the principle of development is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies DMH 1 and DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
2. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that sufficient off-street parking and secure cycle storage would be provided, as required by the local parking standard for the proposed occupancy level. The proposal has the potential to lead to undue on-street parking displacement to the detriment of parking capacity and safety on the local public highway, contrary to Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Plan (2020) - Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 (Appendix C) and Policy T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).
3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal and the high number of potential occupants would not result in noise and general disturbance to neighbouring properties alongside a harmful over-intensification of the use of the site (through additional comings and goings generated by the additional occupants), detrimental to both the occupiers and neighbouring properties and the residential amenity of the area. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies DMH 5, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D13 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
4. The proposed HMO use would provide inadequate internal communal space to accommodate the proposed increase in occupants, coupled with an inadequately sized kitchen. Moreover, the application fails to demonstrate that noise transfer between the communal kitchen and ground floor HMO rooms could be adequately controlled to provide a suitable level of acoustic amenity for the future occupant(s), together with two rooms failing to provide adequate floor area for single occupancy. Collectively, these issues would result in a substandard form of accommodation for future occupants, contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies D6 and D14 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DMH 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

- 4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable
- 4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

6 letters of objection have been received raising concerns about:

- Over-intensification of use of the property resulting in anti-social behaviour, noise and disturbance
- out of keeping with residential character of the area
- parking stress
- loss of family housing and over-concentration of HMO uses

Highways

The HA raises an objection because the proposals are contrary to the following:

- The London Plan Policy T2: Healthy Streets, Policy T4 Assessing and Mitigating Transport Impacts, Policy T5 Cycling and Policy T6: Car Parking,
- London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies Policy DMT 1: Managing Transport Impacts, Policy DMT 2: Highways Impacts, Policy DMT 5: Pedestrians and Cyclists and Policy DMT 6: Vehicle Parking.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.H1	(2012) Housing Growth
PT1.EM8	(2012) Land, Water, Air and Noise

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 1	Safeguarding Existing Housing
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMH 5	Houses in Multiple Occupation
H10	Proposals for hostels or other accommodation for people in need of care
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF15 -24	NPPF15 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF2 -24	NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5 -24	NPPF5 2024 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF8 -24	NPPF8 2024 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
NPPF9 -24	NPPF9 2024 - Promoting sustainable transport

In addition: Development Plan

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021) requires that proposals minimise noise pollution and Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) promotes the maximum possible reduction in noise levels and seeks to ensure that noise impacts can be adequately controlled and mitigated.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and

sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

A) In all parts of the Borough Proposals for the provision of large HMOs, residential hostels, student accommodation and secure accommodation will be required to demonstrate that:

- i) there is good accessibility to local amenities and public transport;
- ii) they accord with the Accessible Homes standards and provide satisfactory living conditions for the intended occupiers; and
- iii) there will be no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or the character of the area.

The supporting text to Policy DMH 5 also states - "intensive occupation of former family dwellings such as those used for student accommodation or as a HMO can have negative impacts on residential amenity within an area through increases in onstreet and off-street parking, loss of front gardens, reductions in levels of privacy, alterations to the exterior of buildings and increased generation of refuse".

The proposed development includes no changes to the bulk, size, height or position of the existing building and no external changes are proposed to its fenestrations. The existing building provides 6 bedrooms (2 double and 4 x single). (8 persons).

The submitted plans indicate that the HMO would be occupied by up to 8 persons. This is similar to the potential occupation as a single private dwelling. Given the nature of the proposed occupation of the property however, this would result in a greatly increased number of comings and goings from the site. This would likely include movements on foot and by car throughout the day and night and it is considered that the over-intensification of the site would be to the detriment of the neighbouring properties along this quiet residential street, through the resulting additional levels of noise and disturbance.

A recent planning appeal decision (Ref APP/R5510/W/23/3327485 -131 York Avenue) for a conversion of small HMO to large scale HMO was dismissed on several grounds including the impact on the amenity of nearby residents. Within this decision, the Inspectorate stated:

"It is likely that each occupant of the HMO would have their own routine, as well as visitors and deliveries. Even given the amount of accommodation provided by the existing use, the larger HMO would have a distinctly different nature and intensity compared to other dwellings in this road. The intensity of use and increased movements to and from the site would lead to unacceptable increase in noise and disturbance to nearby residents".

Based on the proposed layout of the large HMO and the provision of double bedrooms, the property potentially could be occupied by up to 8 persons at any one time. Similar to the appeal decision above, each person is likely to have their own routine with additional visitors and deliveries. Given the very nature of the road which is characterised by family sized household units, the alteration to form a large scale HMO would fundamentally change the level of activity on site to the detriment on adjoining and wider residents overall amenity through comings/going leading to noise and disturbance.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the number of residents proposed within the building would be substantially more than if a large family were to occupy the dwelling and therefore the impact on neighbouring occupiers, in terms of vehicle movements, movements of residents at all times of the day and night and consequently noise and disturbance would be greater than could

reasonably be expected if the property were occupied by a family and thus the proposal is considered, on balance to have an unacceptable and undue impact on existing residential amenity in terms of noise and disturbance and the proposal would therefore be contrary with Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part 1: Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMH5 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D14 of the London 2021.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that: Development proposals should: D1) enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design.

Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area.

The alterations are internal and as such, the proposed development would not impact on the appearance of the building and would have an acceptable impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area. Nevertheless, the pressure for additional parking, refuse, cycle and other external provisions, the change of use has not been demonstrated as able to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the building and streetscene.

As there is no material change in the appearance of the building, the development is considered to be acceptable with regards to its impact on the street scene. Further consideration regarding the impact of the change of use to a Large HMO on the character of the area is discussed in the 'principle of development' section (see 'Other Issues' at 7.6).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policy DMT 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals will be required to meet the transport needs of the development and address its transport impacts in a sustainable manner.

Policy DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must ensure that:

- i) safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards;
- ii) they do not contribute to the deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety of all road users and residents;
- iii) safe, secure and convenient access and facilities for cyclists and pedestrian are satisfactorily accommodated in the design of highway and traffic management schemes;
- iv) impacts on local amenity and congestion are minimised by routing through traffic by the most direct means to the strategic road network, avoiding local distributor and access roads; and
- v) there are suitable mitigation measures to address any traffic impacts in terms of capacity and functions of existing and committed roads, including along roads or through junctions which are at capacity.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity.

For a HMO with up to 6 occupants: 1 space per 2 occupants. For HMOs over 6 occupants, car parking requirements will be assessed through a transport appraisal and travel plan.

There are no specific parking requirements for HMO's set out in the London Plan (2021).

The Highways Authority have reviewed the Transport Statement (TS) and the plans submitted and has advised that in the TS it is stated that the proposal involves the converting of the existing property into a 5 bedroom House of Multiple Occupation (HMO). The site will retain the existing 2 off-street car parking spaces and 4 cycle parking spaces provided to the east of the building, however on the proposed ground floor plan metal bicycle lockers to accommodate 8 no. bicycles is shown.

The application site has a PTAL ranking of 2, indicating access to public transport is very poor suggesting that there would be a strong reliance on the private car for trip making.

The TS states "whilst two car parking spaces are to be maintained on site. Therefore, it is considered possible that three cars could be parked on the surrounding streets."

To support their position the applicant has undertaken an on-street car parking survey, that found sufficient spare capacity exists to accommodate the overspill of 3 car parking spaces, given the site has existing 2 on-site car parking spaces.

Whilst the applicant has stated there are 2 existing on-site car parking spaces, that may be the case under the existing conditions, however under the proposals the layout is changed with the placing of fencing reducing the scope of a vehicle being parked further in which would allow the second vehicle parked parallel with the highway can enter and egress easily, under the proposed layout this is not possible and may require numerous manoeuvring, leading to perpendicular to the highway vehicle having to be removed before the other (parallel) can enter or egress. which is not acceptable on practical and safety grounds. Therefore, only 1 car parking space on site can be considered.

Heavy and inconsiderate footway parking takes place around the vicinity of the site, given most people prefer to park in front or as close to their dwellings, the proposal could result in overspill of 4 or more cars parking onto the public highway leading to inconsiderate and illegal parking, creating nuisance and stress to local users parking demand, particularly in a location with a sharp bend in the road opposite a junction, prejudicial to highway safety due to all the conflict points. With the property being occupied by up to 8 persons, it would be possible that all occupiers may own a vehicle in an area where no on-street parking controls exist to prevent significant overspill parking from occurring.

Whilst the applicant has used the Lambeth parking survey methodology however given the site-specific highway conditions that exist combined with the current level of parking stress, any overspill impact from the proposed development will exacerbate existing highway safety concerns.

The HA would acknowledge with NPPF "Sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location" unfortunately this type of use at

this location given the site specific conditions (corner/junction) does not meet this criteria, to meet the above criteria such type of developments should be in high PTAL locations and/or where extensive parking controls exist to deter car travel / parking.

The Highway Authority therefore raises an objection because the proposals are contrary to The London Plan Policy T2, T4 T5 and T6: and London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies Policy DMT 1, DMT 2; DMT 5: and DMT 6; as well as Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF 2024.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) states that housing development should be of high quality design and provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose. The policy states - Part F 3) A one bedspace single bedroom must have a floor area of at least 7.5 sq.m. and be at least 2.15m wide; and 4) A two bedspace double (or twin) bedroom must have a floor area of at least 11.5 sq.m.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment.

The submitted plans confirm the following accommodation:

Room 1 = 14.1m² plus 2.7m² en-suite
Room 2 = 11m² plus 2.7m² en-suite
29m² communal kitchen living and dining room

Room 3 = 10m² plus 2.6m² en-suite
Room 4 = 13.5m² plus 2.3m² en-suite
Room 5 = 10.5m² plus 2m² en-suite
Laundry Room = 5m²

All rooms would meet the London Plan Standards and sufficient communal facilities would be provided. The submitted plans also indicate sufficient separation between the communal areas and bedrooms. The fourth reason for refusal in the previous decision is therefore considered to have been addressed with this revised scheme.

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

Policy DMH 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states:

- A) The net loss of existing self-contained housing, including affordable housing, will be resisted unless the housing is replaced with at least equivalent residential floorspace.
- B) The Council will grant planning permission for the subdivision of dwellings only if:
 - i) car parking standards can be met within the curtilage of the site without being detrimental to the street scene;
 - ii) all units are self contained with exclusive use of sanitary and kitchen facilities and provided with individual entrances and internal staircases to serve units above ground floor level;
 - iii) adequate amenity space is provided for the benefit of residents; and iv) adequate living space standards are met.

The supporting Paragraph for Policy DMH 2 (Housing Mix) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states: 'The Council's current information on housing need indicates a substantial borough-wide requirement for larger affordable and private market units, particularly three bedroom properties'.

Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states:

A) Proposals for the provision of large HMOs, residential hostels, student accommodation and secure accommodation will be required to demonstrate that:

- i) there is good accessibility to local amenities and public transport;
- ii) they accord with the Accessible Homes standards and provide satisfactory living conditions for the intended occupiers; and
- iii) there will be no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or the character of the area.

Both Numbers 49 and 51 Hanover Circle are registered small HMO's (up to 6 residents). The proposal would therefore result in an over-concentration of HMO or sui-generis uses in the immediate area. the development would result in the loss of the 6 bedroom family home, which conflicts with the Borough's strategic housing goal of safeguarding and provided family dwellings. The change of use of the family homes is also considered to be harmful to the character of the area which is characterised by family dwellings.

In addition, as discussed in the 'Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety', 'Urban Design/Access & Security' and 'Impact on Neighbours' sections above, the large HMO would provide poor living conditions for future occupiers and give rise to neighbour amenity and highway safety issues.

Given the above, the principle of development is considered to be unacceptable, The development therefore conflicts with Policies DMH 1 and DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

8. Reference Documents

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)

The London Plan (2021)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021)

Contact Officer:	Nicola Taplin	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------