

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: 11 WOODVILLE GARDENS RUISLIP

Development: Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to small House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4), including conversion of garage space to habitable space and amendments to fenestration.

LBH Ref Nos: **75895/APP/2026/164**

Drawing Nos: Proposed Site Plan Rev. 1
 Proposed Elevation Rev. 1
 01029752-A591A6
 2523 _ Stef & Philips _ AD101
 2523 _ Stef & Philips _ AD102
 2523 _ Stef & Philips _ AD103
 2523 _ Stef & Philips _ AD104
 2523 _ Stef & Philips _ AD105

Date Plans received: 20-01-26 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 20-01-26

1. SUMMARY

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of the property from a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a four-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation ('HMO', Use Class C4).

It is considered that the proposed development would provide a substandard internal living environment for future occupiers, owing to the limited communal accommodation proposed. Furthermore, the intensified nature of the use would be materially out of keeping with the established residential character of the area and would result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers through increased levels of activity, noise and disturbance.

Taken as a whole, the proposal is therefore considered unacceptable and is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Substandard Living Conditions for Future Occupiers

The proposed development would provide a substandard and unsatisfactory internal living

environment for future occupiers by reason of the limited and inadequate communal accommodation proposed, including the absence of sufficient internal communal living or recreational space. The proposal would therefore fail to provide a comfortable, functional and fit-for-purpose living environment for future occupiers, contrary to Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies DMH 5 and DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020).

2. NON2 Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposed change of use from a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a four-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4) would result in an over-intensive form of occupation that would materially increase levels of activity, comings and goings, noise and disturbance, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the established residential character of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One (2012), Policies DMH 5, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020), Policies D3 and D14 of the London Plan (2021), and paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

3. NON2 Impact on Character of the Area

The intensified nature of the proposed House in Multiple Occupation use, including the increased residential and servicing activity associated with occupation by multiple unrelated individuals, would be out of keeping with the established character of the area, which is predominantly characterised by single family occupation. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020), and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1. I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan (2021) and national guidance.

NPPF12 -24 NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places

NPPF15 -24 NPPF15 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

LPP D14 (2021) Noise

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 T6	(2021) Car parking
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMH 5	Houses in Multiple Occupation
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached single-storey bungalow located on the southwestern side of Woodville Gardens, Ruislip. The property is finished in facing brickwork beneath a hipped tiled roof and includes a single-storey rear projection and front gabled bay feature. The dwelling benefits from front and rear private amenity space and an area of hardstanding to the front providing off-street parking for two vehicles.

The surrounding area is residential in character and is predominantly characterised by modest single and two-storey dwellings, including bungalows and semi-detached family houses set within relatively spacious plots. The application site is bounded by No. 11A Woodville Gardens, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, to the southwest, and No. 9 Woodville Gardens, a detached bungalow, to the northeast.

Since 11 December 2025, the Borough has been subject to an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights for the change of use from dwellinghouses to small HMOs. Planning permission is therefore required for such changes of use.

The site does not fall within a Conservation Area, Area of Special Local Character or any other heritage designation. The front part of the site lies within Flood Zone 2.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the change of use of the existing dwellinghouse to a small HMO, for occupation by up to four persons. The proposal also includes the conversion of the existing garage to habitable accommodation, alterations to fenestration, and the installation of an access ramp to the front of the property.

The proposed HMO would comprise four single bedrooms, each served by an individual en-suite bathroom, together with a shared kitchen facility. Externally, the existing front parking area would be retained, providing two off-street car parking spaces. The existing rear garden would also be retained as communal outdoor amenity space for future occupiers, with direct access from one of the bedrooms and additional access provided via the side passage.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

75895/APP/2021/219 11 WOODVILLE GARDENS RUISLIP

Single storey attached garage to side

Decision: 10-03-2021 Approval

75895/APP/2020/2987 11 WOODVILLE GARDENS RUISLIP

Single storey rear extension, outbuilding, landscaping and driveway to side/front involving demolition of existing rear element (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision: 10-11-2020 Approval

Comment on Planning History

Planning permission was granted on 10 March 2021 for the erection of a single-storey side extension to form an attached garage. In addition, a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development was granted on 10 November 2020 for a single-storey rear extension, outbuilding, landscaping works and alterations to the front and side driveway areas, involving the demolition of an existing rear element.

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

10 neighbouring properties and the Ruislip Residents Association were consulted on 2nd February 2026. The consultation period expired on 23rd February 2026. A total of 13 neighbour objections and 1 ward councillor objection were received in response to the consultation.

Objections are raised on the following grounds:

- Overconcentration of HMOs / impact on character - concern that an additional HMO would erode

the family character of the street and harm community cohesion.

- Residential amenity - increase in noise, disturbance, anti-social behaviour and general comings and goings.
- Parking and highways - increased parking pressure and congestion on an already constrained road, particularly near a school.
- Waste management - concerns regarding increased refuse, poor storage and vermin.
- Suitability of property - the host bungalow is considered too small and unsuitable for HMO use.
- Retrospective works / compliance - concerns that works commenced prior to permission and may not comply with planning or building regulations (separate enforcement/control matters).
- Design / external changes - frontage alterations considered out of keeping with the surrounding area.
- Other matters - concerns regarding property values and safety (not material planning considerations).

Ward Councillor Objection

The ward councillor objects on the basis of the retrospective nature of the works, concerns regarding HMO concentration and character, and requests that the full extent of works and compliance issues are properly investigated and assessed.

Officer Response:

Matters relating to the impact on the character of the area, residential amenity, parking, refuse and the suitability of the accommodation have been assessed within the main body of this report.

Whilst there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would result in a harmful overconcentration of HMOs in policy terms, concerns are acknowledged regarding the intensified nature of the use, the resulting impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, and the substandard quality of accommodation proposed for future occupiers.

Concerns relating to building works undertaken prior to the determination of the application, Building Regulations compliance and structural matters are separate matters dealt with under Planning Enforcement and Building Control legislation where relevant. Property values and general concerns regarding future occupants are not material planning considerations.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Highway Authority: No objection, subject to conditions requiring details of cycle parking provision and EV charging points.

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.EM7 | (2012) Biodiversity and Geological Conservation |

PT1.EM8 (2012) Land, Water, Air and Noise

Part 2 Policies:

NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF15 -24	NPPF15 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
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 T6	(2021) Car parking
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMH 5	Houses in Multiple Occupation
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking

In addition: 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:

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 London Plan (2021)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance. The proposed development has been assessed against development plan policies and all relevant material considerations.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 requires development proposals to maintain a satisfactory

relationship with adjoining occupiers and avoid unacceptable impacts on residential amenity. Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF, together with Policy D3 of the London Plan, seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 similarly requires that development does not result in unacceptable impacts in terms of privacy, outlook, noise, disturbance or general amenity.

Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan specifically relates to HMOs within areas covered by an Article 4 Direction and states that proposals for the change of use from a dwellinghouse to an HMO will only be permitted where they would not result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers. The supporting text to the policy recognises that the intensive occupation of former family dwellings can result in adverse impacts through increased activity levels, parking demand, servicing activity and refuse generation.

The proposal would not involve any significant external alterations beyond minor fenestration changes, including replacement of the garage door with a window. The principal planning considerations therefore relate to the intensified nature of the proposed use and its likely impact on neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal seeks to convert the existing dwelling into a four-bedroom HMO occupied by up to four unrelated individuals. Whilst modest in scale when compared to larger HMO proposals, the occupation of the property by unrelated individuals would nevertheless materially alter the pattern and intensity of activity associated with the site when compared to a typical family dwellinghouse. Each occupant would be likely to maintain separate daily routines, visitors and deliveries, resulting in increased movements to and from the site throughout the day and evening.

The surrounding area is characterised by modest family dwellings and bungalows within a quiet residential environment. In this context, it is considered that the intensified nature of the proposed use would introduce a materially greater level of activity, comings and goings, and associated noise and disturbance than would reasonably be expected from the lawful use of the property as a single dwellinghouse. This harm would be experienced not only through increased pedestrian and vehicular movements, but also through the cumulative impacts associated with intensified occupation, including servicing and general residential activity.

In reaching this conclusion, regard has been had to recent appeal decisions within the Borough relating to HMOs, including appeals at 131 York Avenue (APP/R5510/W/23/3327485) and 47 Hanover Circle (APP/R5510/W/25/3372543), where Inspectors identified that the occupation of HMOs by unrelated individuals can result in materially different and more intensive patterns of activity, leading to unacceptable levels of disturbance to neighbouring occupiers and harm to the established residential character of an area. Whilst those schemes were of a greater scale, the same underlying considerations are considered applicable in this instance.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would result in an over-intensive form of occupation that would give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, detrimental to the established residential amenities of this quiet residential road. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy EM8 of the Local Plan Part 1, Policies DMH 5 and DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2, and Policy D14 of the London Plan.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan require development proposals to achieve a high standard of design that responds positively to local character and distinctiveness. Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 similarly seeks high quality design that respects the form, scale, appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 requires development to be designed to a high standard, taking account of matters including the scale, massing and proportions of surrounding buildings, established building lines, plot patterns and the prevailing character of the streetscene. Policy DMHD 1 further requires that extensions and alterations remain subordinate to the host dwelling and do not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal involves only limited external alterations, comprising the replacement of the existing garage door with a window and the installation of a disabled access ramp to the front of the property. These alterations would be modest in scale and appearance and would appear proportionate and subordinate to the host dwelling. In purely visual terms, the proposed physical changes would therefore not result in harm to the character or appearance of the streetscene.

Notwithstanding this, the application must also be considered in the context of the intensified nature of the proposed use. Woodville Gardens is characterised by modest family dwellings and bungalows within a predominantly residential environment occupied by single households. Whilst the physical alterations themselves would be visually acceptable, the proposed use of the property as a four-person HMO would introduce a materially more intensive pattern of occupation than the established character of the area.

This intensified character would likely manifest itself through increased residential and servicing activity associated with multiple unrelated occupants, including increased movements, additional refuse storage requirements and associated domestic paraphernalia. Whilst these impacts would principally affect residential amenity, they would also cumulatively erode the established character of this quiet residential street, which is predominantly defined by single family occupation.

Accordingly, whilst the proposed external alterations would be acceptable in design terms, the intensified nature of the proposed use would be at odds with the established residential character of the area and would conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1, and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policy DMT 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 requires development to ensure that safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian access is provided and that development would not have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding highway network. Policy DMT 2 seeks to ensure that development does not result in a significant impact on road safety or traffic congestion. Policy DMT 6 requires development to comply with the Council's adopted parking standards. Policies T4 and T6 of the London Plan similarly seek to ensure that development proposals appropriately assess transport impacts and provide suitable parking provision.

The application site is located within a residential area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 1a, which is considered to be very poor and therefore results in a greater reliance on private motor vehicles. The site currently benefits from off-street parking to the front of the property and the proposal would retain two off-street parking spaces.

The proposal seeks the change of use of the existing dwellinghouse to a four-bedroom HMO for occupation by up to four persons. In accordance with the Council's parking standards, an HMO accommodating up to six occupants requires a maximum parking provision of one space per two occupants. As such, a maximum requirement of two parking spaces would apply in this instance. The proposal would therefore comply with the Council's parking standards through the retention of two off-street parking spaces. The Highway Authority has reviewed the proposal and raises no objection in relation to parking provision or highway safety impacts.

In terms of traffic generation, whilst the proposal may result in some increase in comings and goings associated with the occupation of the property by unrelated individuals, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a severe cumulative impact on the local highway network, unacceptable levels of parking stress, or prejudice pedestrian and vehicular safety.

The Highway Authority has requested conditions requiring details of cycle parking provision and electric vehicle charging infrastructure in accordance with London Plan requirements. These matters could be secured by condition in the event of an approval. Refuse and recycling storage can also be accommodated within the site without detriment to highway safety.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable in highway and transportation terms and would comply with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Local Plan Part 2 and Policies T4 and T6 of the London Plan.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

- Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy D3 of the London Plan requires development proposals to provide high quality living environments with appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and amenity, and to deliver indoor and outdoor spaces that are comfortable and inviting for occupants. Policy D6 of the London Plan further requires residential accommodation to provide functional and fit-for-purpose layouts, including minimum bedroom size standards.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Local Plan Part 2 states that all housing development should provide an adequate standard of internal accommodation to ensure a satisfactory living environment for future occupiers. Policy DMH 5 further requires HMO proposals within Article 4 areas to comply with all relevant planning standards relating to residential amenity and living conditions.

The proposed bedrooms would individually achieve acceptable levels of outlook and natural light and would each benefit from an en-suite bathroom. The bedrooms themselves would also comply with the minimum bedroom size requirements set out within Policy D6 of the London Plan.

Notwithstanding this, the proposal would provide only a small shared kitchen area as the sole communal internal space serving all four occupants. No communal lounge, dining room or other shared living or recreational space would be provided within the property. The kitchen would therefore be required to function as the sole shared space for cooking, dining, laundry and social interaction for all occupants.

Given the scale and layout of the accommodation, it is considered that the communal kitchen space would be overly constrained and insufficient to adequately serve four unrelated occupants. The space would likely become cramped during concurrent use and would not provide a comfortable or functional communal environment for residents. The absence of any separate communal living space would further result in a poor standard of accommodation, failing to provide future occupiers with adequate opportunities for day-to-day social interaction and recreation within the property.

Taken as a whole, the proposal would provide a substandard and unsatisfactory internal living environment that would not be comfortable, functional or fit for purpose. The development would therefore conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan, and Policies DMH 5 and DMHB 16 of the Local Plan Part 2.

In terms of external amenity space, Policy DMHB 18 of the Local Plan Part 2 requires residential

development to provide adequate private outdoor amenity space in accordance with the Council's adopted standards, whilst Policy DMHD 1 seeks the retention of adequate garden space.

The proposal would retain a rear garden area in excess of the Council's minimum requirement of 100sqm for a four-bedroom dwelling. Sufficient outdoor amenity space would therefore be retained for future occupiers. However, whilst the proposal would comply with the Council's external amenity space standards, this does not outweigh the identified shortcomings in the quality of the internal living accommodation.

7.6 Other Issues

- Principle of Development

Policy DMH 5 (Part B) of the Hillingdon Local Plan 2 sets out specific criteria for the assessment of proposals involving the change of use from a dwellinghouse to an HMO within areas covered by an Article 4 Direction. The policy seeks to prevent harmful concentrations of HMOs and ensure that such uses do not adversely impact the character or residential amenity of an area.

Since 11 December 2025, the entire Borough has been subject to an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights for the change of use from dwellinghouses to small HMOs. Planning permission is therefore required for such proposals and the application falls to be assessed against Policy DMH 5.

The site does not lie within a Conservation Area and therefore criterion ii) of Policy DMH 5 is not applicable in this instance. The requirements of criterion iv), relating to parking, waste storage, amenity space and impacts on neighbouring amenity, are assessed under the relevant sections elsewhere within this report.

In respect of criterion i), Policy DMH 5 requires that less than 20% of properties within the neighbourhood area are exempt from paying council tax because they are occupied by full-time students, recorded as licensed HMOs, benefit from C4/Sui Generis HMO planning permission, or are otherwise known to the Council to be HMOs. Criterion iii) further requires that less than 15% of properties within 100 metres of a street length either side of the application site fall within those categories.

A number of neighbouring representations refer to existing HMOs within Woodville Gardens, specifically at Nos. 7 and 12. Whilst there are no formal planning records, lawful development certificates, planning permissions or entries on the Council's HMO register confirming lawful HMO use at these properties, it is acknowledged that smaller HMOs do not necessarily require licensing and may not appear on the Council's register. Furthermore, up until 11 December 2025, planning permission was not necessarily required for conversion from dwellinghouses to small HMOs. On this basis, and giving appropriate weight to local resident concerns, it is considered reasonable to proceed on the basis that there may already be HMO uses operating within the street.

However, given the absence of formal records identifying the full extent of HMO occupation within the surrounding area, the Local Planning Authority cannot conclusively verify the precise concentration of HMOs within either the wider neighbourhood area or within 100m of the application site. Whilst neighbour representations suggest that additional HMOs may already exist within Woodville Gardens, there is insufficient evidence before the Council to demonstrate that the proposal would either exceed, or definitively comply with, the numerical concentration thresholds set out under criteria i) and iii) of Policy DMH 5.

In this instance, and notwithstanding the above, compliance or otherwise with the concentration

thresholds under Policy DMH 5 does not in itself make the proposal acceptable. Criterion iv) of the policy also requires that the accommodation complies with all other planning standards and does not result in a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of adjoining properties. As set out elsewhere within this report, concerns are raised regarding the intensified nature of the proposed use, the resulting impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, and the substandard quality of accommodation proposed for future occupiers.

Accordingly, whilst there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that proposal would not conflict with criteria i) and iii) of Policy DMH 5 relating to HMO concentration, it nonetheless fails to comply with criterion iv) of the policy and is therefore considered unacceptable when assessed against Policy DMH 5 as a whole.

- Flood Risk & Drainage

Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 requires development proposals to appropriately manage flood risk and ensure that development does not increase the risk or consequences of flooding either on-site or elsewhere. The policy also requires development proposals within areas at risk of flooding to demonstrate that they are resilient to all sources of flooding.

The front part of the application site falls within Flood Zone 2, whilst the remainder of the site lies within Flood Zone 1. The proposal relates solely to the change of use of the existing dwellinghouse to a small HMO and minor associated alterations. No extensions or increase in the building footprint are proposed as part of the development.

Given the limited nature of the proposal, it is not considered that the development would alter existing drainage arrangements or increase the extent of impermeable surfacing on the site. Furthermore, the proposal would not introduce a more vulnerable form of development than the existing use of the property.

In the absence of any significant physical alterations or intensification of built form, it is not considered that the proposal would increase flood risk either on the site itself or elsewhere. The development would therefore not give rise to any unacceptable flood risk or drainage concerns and is considered to comply with Policy DMEI 9.

- Biodiversity Net Gain

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. Furthermore, Policy EM7 of the Local Plan Part 1 seeks to protect biodiversity features from inappropriate development and encourages the provision of biodiversity improvements from all developments. In addition, 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The proposed development meets the de-minimis exemption for mandatory BNG, i.e. it affects less than 25 square meters of on-site habitat and less than 5 meters of linear habitat (such as hedgerow). As such the proposal accords with paragraph 187 of the NPPF and Policy EM7 of the Local Plan.

Contact Officer:

Sally Robbins

Telephone No:

01895 250230