



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 MARCH 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: 6003198

#### 60 Lansbury Drive, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 8SD

- 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 Gurpreet Lacchar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 16477/APP/2025/1616.
  - The development proposed is existing single dwelling house convert to 1x2bed and 1x1bed flats with parking, garden, and associated bin storage and bicycle storage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. During the appeal proceedings, the appellant provided revised plans intended to address the concerns of the Highway Officer, in part by demonstrating a parking space parallel to the road. Nevertheless, the revisions also showed changes to the internal layout to the upper floor flat, indicating additional bedrooms which would have been contrary to the description of the development.
3. The appellant has confirmed through final comments that these plans should be disregarded. I have assessed the appeal proposal based on the plans as originally submitted to the Council and upon which it based its decision.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the supply of family sized housing in the borough.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property forms a two storey end terraced dwelling in a predominantly residential area formed of similarly designed and scaled terraced rows. As existing, the property has three bedrooms. The Council has directed my attention to the definition of family housing within the London Plan (2021) (LP), which generally relates to properties of three or more bedrooms. The status of the existing property as a family sized dwelling is not contested by the appellant.
6. Policy DMH 2 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) (LPP2) seeks to ensure that housing mix in residential schemes is reflective of the Council's latest information on housing need. This is aligned with Policy H10 of the LP which, amongst other matters, directs regard to robust local evidence of

housing need in determining the appropriate mix of unit sizes in relation to the number of bedrooms.

7. The sub-text of Policy DMH 2 of the LPP2, at paragraph 4.6, indicates a substantial borough wide requirement for larger affordable and private market units, particularly three-bedroom properties. This is also reflected in the Hillingdon Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2025). The overall dwelling need for market housing specifically is significantly skewed towards three-bedroom properties.
8. The appeal proposal would result in the loss of a three-bedroom property and its replacement with two smaller flats of one and two bedrooms. It is presented that the two-bedroom flat could be suitable for smaller families, but this does not align with the definition of family housing provided within the LP. Based on their size, I find that both units are unlikely to be desirable as family housing.
9. The proposed flats are intended for market rent. Whilst smaller units may have a lower rent which would be attractive to some occupiers, there is nothing to suggest (nor secure) that the proposal relates to a specific affordable housing product. Irrespective of the potential for the flats to be marketed for a lower rent, this would not overcome the loss of the unit as a family sized dwelling.
10. My attention has been drawn to projected household types detailed within the SHMA, which indicates an overall increase in single person households and households with couples without children, across most age ranges. However, this relates to future households and is not reflective of current housing needs. As is inferred within the SHMA, the identified lack of family housing could be a potential determining factor to future household composition.
11. Based on the above, I find that the loss of a family sized unit, and its replacement with two smaller units, fails to account for and contribute to a housing mix which meets the identified needs of the borough. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DMH 2 of the LPP2 and Policy H10 of the LP.
12. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to Policy DMH 1 of the LPP2. This policy refers to safeguarding existing housing. The proposal would retain an equivalent residential floor space. The policy goes on to list several criteria which proposals for the subdivision of dwellings will be considered against. These relate to car parking, internal layouts and living standards. Subject to a condition seeking further details of the car parking if the appeal were to otherwise succeed, I have identified no direct conflict with Policy DMH 1 of the LPP2.
13. Nor have I identified conflict with Policy DMH 4 of the LPP2 also relating to residential conversions, a copy of which I have been provided. Nevertheless, an absence of conflict with these policies does not overcome the overall harm which I have identified through the loss of a family sized dwelling.

### **Other Matters**

14. I understand that planning permission was granted for a similar form of development at 76 Lansbury Road (No 76). This decision was dated February 2020 and therefore pre-dates the latest LP and the 2025 SHMA report. I am, therefore, not satisfied that the circumstances which led to the approval for the scheme at No 76 apply in the present case, which I have considered on its merits

and in relation to the presently adopted development plan policies. I therefore afford the decision at No 76 limited weight in support of the appeal proposal.

15. The Council has not resisted the proposal based on living conditions, highway safety, waste provisions or the character and appearance of the area. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to take a different view in relation to these matters. Nevertheless, these factors do not specifically weigh in favour of the proposal.
16. The appellant suggests that the grant of planning permission would not prevent the conversion back to a single dwelling in the future. Nevertheless, the potential future use of the property would not overcome the harm in the initial loss of an existing family sized dwelling.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

17. The proposal would represent an efficient use of the land which would amount to the creation of an additional dwelling. Whilst these represent benefits to the proposal, given the scale of the development, I have attributed the benefits limited weight. They are not sufficient to outweigh the harm arising from the loss of a family sized dwelling, to which I have attached significant weight.
18. I have identified conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*L Gardner*

INSPECTOR