



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2026

by **S F Barnes MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002695

96 Oakdene Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 0SQ

- 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 Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 17448/APP/2025/2373.
 - The development proposed is conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer and 3 front rooflights, single storey rear extension and change of use to 5bedroom 5person HMO. (Part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form states that the development has begun. However, the development as built diverges from the plans before me at the rear elevation, where the single storey extension has 2 sets of doors and 1 small window, instead of 2 windows as shown in the plans. For clarity, I have assessed the appeal against the submitted plans and evidence, rather than what has been constructed to date.

Main Issues

3. Having regard to the above, the main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed roof extension and rear dormer window on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the proposed use as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance; and,
 - the effect of the proposal on vehicle and cycle parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises the end dwelling of a short terrace of 4no. houses, all of similar 2-storey scale with front and rear gardens. Another terrace of a similar and cohesive scale and design adjoins the site at its unattached side, and this form of housing development is broadly typical of the Oakdene Road streetscene. Hipped roof forms are the predominant form at the end of these terraces and in other surrounding properties.

5. The proposal would introduce a gable-end roof which would unbalance the harmonious symmetry of the short terrace. This would sit in marked contrast to the hipped roof at the adjoining terrace and to the roof forms found in surrounding development, resulting in an incongruous appearance in its context. Whilst there may be some examples of similar roof extensions on surrounding streets those are not viewed within the same streetscene context as the proposal, and so do not justify the resulting harm.
6. The proposed rear dormer window would occupy almost the entire rear roof slope, with only a minor offset from the ridge, eaves and side wall. This would result in an over-dominant effect on the appearance of the building. The use of matching materials would not overcome the harm arising from the introduction of the alien roof form and dominant addition to the rear roof slope.
7. The proposal may well have been designed to meet the requirements of permitted development rights (PDRs). Nevertheless, it forms part of the proposal and my decision must still have regard to the relevant development plan policies. Moreover, whilst neighbouring properties may have the right to build extensions of a similar scale under PDRs, there is no substantial evidence before me to indicate that this is likely to occur. I have assessed the proposal based on the character and appearance of the area as it exists now.
8. Consequently, the proposed roof extension and rear dormer window would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, they would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (adopted 2012) and Policies D1, D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) (LP). Collectively, those policies seek to ensure that development is informed by its existing character and context and that roof extensions are subservient to the scale of the existing roof.

Living conditions

9. Oakdene Road forms part of a residential area that is suburban in character. Many surrounding properties appear to be used as single dwellings similar in scale to the appeal building, which the plans indicate was originally laid out as a 2-bedroom dwelling. The baseline for the general level of activity associated with that use means that an intensification of residential use could well be noticeable in this location.
10. As individuals, those occupying an HMO are more likely to have separate patterns of day-to-day movements, and thus result in a greater intensity of use, compared with those of a single household. In this context, the occupation of the appeal site by 5 individual occupants would reasonably result in a noticeable increase in comings and goings, including vehicle movements, even if the absolute number of occupants may not be significantly different to that of a single household. The proposal would therefore result in harmful disturbance to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers on Oakdene Road generally.
11. The proposal would also involve new ground floor and loft level bedrooms located along the wall shared with the attached neighbouring dwelling. Whilst communal space is proposed for occupants, this would be limited in size and centred on kitchen and dining facilities. Consequently, individual occupants would be likely to

use their bedrooms intensively when they are at home. The way occupiers would use the internal spaces, and the intensity with which they would use them, is likely to increase the potential for noise compared to the existing arrangement.

12. Whilst the appellant states that sound insulation would be provided to meet the requirements of Building Regulations, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that this would be sufficient to mitigate harmful effects of the proposal in respect of noise. I therefore cannot be satisfied that the proposal would avoid harm to the occupiers of the neighbouring, attached building in this regard.
13. Thus, the proposed use as an HMO would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. This would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy DMH 5 of the DMP, which seeks to avoid a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of adjoining properties.
14. The first reason for refusal given in the Council's Decision Notice also refers to Policy DMHB 16 of the DMP, which requires adequate internal space within housing. That matter is not relevant to the main issues in the appeal, and I find no conflict with that policy.

Parking

15. The application site lies within an area described by the Council as having poor access to public transport. Whilst there may be a local bus stop close to the site and a railway station not too far away, I have not been presented with any substantive evidence regarding the frequency of services from these locations. I also note that paragraph 8.17 of the DMP explains that slow and deficient public transport access between Uxbridge and central London and other key centres is an issue specifically identified by Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1. Notwithstanding the presence of nearby services, such as a medical centre and a convenience store which could be accessed by foot, the evidence suggests that occupants would reasonably be likely to rely on private cars to meet their day-to-day needs.
16. Policy DMT 6 of the DMP sets out a standard of 1 car parking space per 2 occupants for HMOs with up to 6 occupants. On this basis, the proposal would require 3 car parking spaces.
17. The plans indicate that 1 parking space would be provided in the front yard, although a dropped kerb access to that space is not indicated. Even if I were to accept that on-site provision of 1 space, a shortfall of 2 spaces would remain. There is no controlled parking zone in operation in this location, but I am mindful that on-street parking on Oakdene Road is limited by existing dropped kerbs. Consequently, the proposal would likely contribute to unacceptable pressure on the availability of on-street parking in the vicinity of the site.
18. The appellant points to the availability of other on-street parking spaces on nearby roads. Whilst parking spaces may have been available in these locations at the time that the undated submitted photographs were taken, I cannot be sure that these are representative of typical conditions in the area. For example, there may be peaks in parking congestion related to a nearby school. Overall, there is little substantive evidence to demonstrate that local on-street parking capacity could absorb the demands of the development, irrespective of whether 2 or 3 spaces would be required.

19. The second reason for refusal given in the Council's Decision Notice refers to inadequate cycle parking storage. The DMP requires 1 cycle parking space per occupant for an HMO of the size proposed. The plans indicate that sufficient space is available on the site to accommodate this, and the main parties agree that details of secure cycle storage could be secured by way of an appropriately worded condition, should the appeal be successful. I see no reason to disagree.
20. Concluding on this main issue, although adequate provision would be made for cycle parking storage, the proposal would result in a harmful effect on the availability of on-street vehicle parking. This would conflict with relevant provisions of Policies T2 and T4 of the LP and Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the DMP. Amongst other things, those policies seek to ensure adequate provision is made for parking to avoid congestion and inconvenience for local residents.

Other Considerations

21. There is no dispute that an Article 4 Direction has now removed PDRs relating to the change of use from a dwelling to a small HMO¹ on all land in the Borough. As such, the existence of such rights nationally is of little relevance to this appeal and it does not of itself demonstrate that small HMO uses could not result in harmful effects, such as those I have found here.
22. Although some elements of the proposal are acknowledged as requiring planning permission, the appellant argues that PDRs apply in respect of the roof alterations. The Council does not dispute this, or the appellant's contention that condition 6 of planning permission 17448/APP/2024/2861, which removed the PDRs for any development here, is not engaged. I see no reason to disagree.
23. Given that a roof extension similar to that achievable under PDRs has already been built, there is a realistic prospect that the appellant would seek to retain it in association with the use of the site as a single dwelling. Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, a lawful fallback position exists for the roof extensions. I return to this in the Planning Balance.

Other Matter

24. The appellant alleges that the Council has acted unreasonably, including by not giving consideration to the fallback positions advanced and by overstating likely harm to neighbouring occupiers. Other allegations relate to conduct in relation to applications that preceded the appeal scheme. However, these matters do not directly bear on my decision on this appeal, which relates solely to the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Planning Balance

25. Evidence provided by the Council indicates that it cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, currently at 2.5 years. As such, and noting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, the provisions of paragraph 11(d) of National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) are engaged. As such, relevant to this appeal, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

¹ Class L, Schedule 2, Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

26. The proposal would provide an HMO which would accommodate a number of households within an existing site. In so doing, it would make a positive contribution to the delivery of housing to meet the needs of certain groups, particularly single person households. Other benefits include the encouragement of cycling as a sustainable mode of transport, and economic benefits associated, both during construction and by future occupiers. However, in view of its small scale, the scheme's benefits attract only limited weight.
27. Against that, I have identified harm in respect of the main issues. As regards the harm to the character and appearance of the area, this would be overcome by the existence of the fallback that I identify above. Nonetheless, the identified harm to living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and to the availability of on-street parking each carry significant weight and would flow from the proposed use as an HMO regardless of the fallback. It follows that the adverse effects of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan and material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

S F Barnes

INSPECTOR