

## **APPEAL STATEMENT**

Prepared by: Dale Venn Architects Ltd, High House, Harlington Road, Hillingdon UB8 3HX

Date: 16.04.2026

### **Application Details**

Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon

Application Reference: 49724/APP/2025/3002

Decision Date: 17 March 2026

### **Description of Development:**

Change of use of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) for 5 occupants (Use Class C4).

### **Application Site Address:**

21 Green Lane, Uxbridge, UB8 3ED

### **Schedule of supporting documentation**

- Planning Application Form
- Drawings
  - o Location Plan
  - o 6027-1 Existing Site Plan and Elevations
  - o 6027-2 Existing Plans
  - o 6027-3 Proposed Site Plan and Elevations
  - o 6027-4 Proposed Plans
- Reports and Statements
  - o 6027 Transport Statement for 21 Green Lane (January 2026)
  - o 6027 Noise Impact Assessment for 21 Green Lane (January 2026)
  - o 6027 Management Plan for 21 Green Lane (January 2026)
  - o 6027 Planning Statement for 21 Green Lane (November 2025)

#### **Decision Documents**

- o Officer Report (Delegated Report)
- o Decision Notice

## **Grounds of Appeal**

This Appeal is submitted in respect of the refusal by the London Borough of Hillingdon to grant planning permission for the change of use of the existing dwellinghouse at 21 Green Lane, Hillingdon from Use Class C3 to a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4) for up to 5 occupants, together with associated minor external works including widening of the existing vehicular crossover and localised alterations to the front boundary treatment.

The application reference is 49724/APP/2025/3002, dated 17 March 2026.

The proposal represents a modest and proportionate form of residential intensification within an existing dwellinghouse, with no extension to the building envelope and no material alteration to its built form or residential character.

Planning permission was refused on a single ground relating to alleged noise, general disturbance, and over-intensification of the use, resulting in harm to residential amenity.

The Appellant does not agree with this conclusion.

## **The Proposed Development**

The proposal seeks the change of use of an existing dwelling to a small House in Multiple Occupation (C4) for up to five unrelated occupants.

The building remains entirely residential in nature.

No external enlargement is proposed. The only external works relate to the widening of the existing vehicular access and minor boundary adjustments to facilitate safe and practical access.

Internally, the property continues to function as residential accommodation, providing individual bedrooms and shared kitchen and living facilities appropriate to a small HMO.

The property also benefits from an existing private rear garden and terrace area, which remain unchanged.

**Response to the Reason for Refusal****Noise, Disturbance and Over-Intensification**

The Council's refusal is based on the assumption that the introduction of up to five occupants would inevitably result in increased noise, disturbance and harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

This conclusion is not supported by evidence.

The proposal remains wholly residential in nature, and there are no proposed commercial uses, external plant, or activities that would generate unusual or elevated noise levels.

It is accepted that HMOs accommodate multiple unrelated occupants; however, this is an inherent and recognised form of residential occupation within planning policy.

Some variation in daily routines, comings and goings, and household activity is a normal and expected characteristic of both HMOs and larger family dwellings. This does not constitute planning harm.

The proposal is for a small HMO of up to five occupants, which is a modest level of residential intensification and remains comparable in scale and activity to a typical family household.

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment confirms that:

- the use remains residential in character,
- no significant increase in noise is expected,
- vehicle movements are comparable to a family dwelling,
- and no unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity are identified.

No technical evidence has been provided by the Council to demonstrate that the proposal would result in noise levels beyond acceptable residential thresholds.

The Council's assessment is therefore based on a generalised assumption that increased occupation equates to harm, rather than evidence of actual adverse impact.

### **Comparison with appeal decision at 47 Hanover Circle**

The officer report places reliance on a dismissed appeal at 47 Hanover Circle (APP/R5510/W/25/3372543). However, this comparison is not directly applicable to the current proposal.

The Inspector's conclusions in that case were based on materially different circumstances, including:

- presence of multiple existing HMOs in close proximity
- evidence of cumulative impacts
- recorded complaints from local residents
- a corner plot with greater exposure to activity

In contrast, for 21 Green Lane:

- the Council confirms there is no overconcentration of HMOs
- there is no evidence of cumulative impacts
- no neighbour objections have been recorded in relation to this proposal
- the site is a typical residential plot without exceptional sensitivity

Accordingly, the reliance placed on that appeal decision is not directly comparable and does not provide a determinative or persuasive basis for refusal in this case.

### **Planning Policy Context**

Policy DMH5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) confirms that HMOs are an acceptable form of residential development subject to criteria relating to amenity and character.

The policy framework does not prevent HMOs but requires that they do not result in unacceptable harm.

The introduction of the Article 4 Direction does not alter this position. It simply ensures that proposals are assessed on their planning merits.

It is therefore clear that:

- HMOs are an established residential use,
- small HMOs are routinely accepted in residential areas,
- and the key test is whether demonstrable harm arises.
- In this case, no such harm has been evidenced.

### **Residential Character and Intensity**

The surrounding area is characterised by residential dwellings of a similar scale.

The proposed change of use does not alter the physical form of the building or introduce any additional massing, bulk or external visual impact.

The level of residential occupation proposed remains within normal expectations for a dwelling of this size.

The planning system does not draw a clear distinction in principle between a single large household and a small HMO in terms of residential intensity, provided that amenity impacts remain acceptable.

There is no policy basis which states that five occupants within a dwelling automatically results in unacceptable intensification.

### **Parking, Access and Movement**

The proposal provides on-site parking and retains existing residential access arrangements.

The submitted Transport Statement demonstrates that:

- vehicle movements are comparable to a family dwelling,
- the site retains adequate parking provision,
- and there are no highway safety objections.

The Council's Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal.

The minor crossover widening works improve access and safety and do not result in any harmful impact on the street scene or highway network.

### **External Amenity Space**

The property benefits from an existing private rear garden and terrace area. These areas remain unchanged and continue to serve the needs of future occupiers. There is no loss of amenity space and no change to the external residential environment.

### **Overconcentration of HMOs**

The Council confirms within the officer report that the proposal would not result in an overconcentration of HMOs in the area. This is a clear and positive planning finding.

It confirms that the proposal does not conflict with the spatial objectives of Policy DMH5 in relation to HMO distribution.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed development represents a small-scale and proportionate residential change of use within an existing dwelling.

The key material considerations demonstrate that:

- the use remains residential in nature,
- no unacceptable noise or disturbance has been evidenced,
- the level of occupation is modest and typical of residential use,
- parking and access arrangements are acceptable,
- and there is no overconcentration of HMOs.

The Council's refusal is based on assumed rather than evidenced harm arising from residential intensification.

There is no policy conflict which justifies refusal, and no demonstrable adverse impact on residential amenity.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed and planning permission granted.