

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

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

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

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

1. NON2 Impact on Neighbour Amenity and Character

The proposed development, by virtue of the number of potential occupants and proposed use, would represent an over-intensification of the site which would be harmful to the amenities of the neighbouring properties and at odds with the established character of the surrounding locality. The proposal would have an unacceptable and undue impact on existing residential amenity in terms of noise and disturbance, over and above what would be expected for a single family dwelling. As such, the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part 1: Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMH 5 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021).

2. NON2 Unsatisfactory Internal Living Environment

The proposed development, by virtue of its layout, internal design and number of potential occupants, would fail to provide adequate communal space and facilities for the future occupiers. As such, the proposed development would provide a sub-standard and unsatisfactory level of internal living accommodation, contrary to Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021).

3. NON2 Parking/Highways

In the absence of any submitted details or evidence with regard to the level of present on-street parking demand within the locality and whether any spare capacity exists which could satisfactorily accommodate the potential parking displacement generated by the proposed level of occupancy, it is considered that 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, As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021).

INFORMATIVES

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application property is a modest, semi-detached bungalow located on the northern side of Herlwyn Avenue. The property is of brick construction, painted/rendered to all elevations, and is characterised by a hipped tile roof, single storey rear projection, and feature front gable with box window. The property benefits from front and rear gardens, but has no formal off-street parking. An access pathway, shared with no. 147, runs along the side of the property, to a dilapidated garage outbuilding at the rear, however this structure is neither usable nor large enough to count towards any off-street parking provision.

The property is located within a residential area that is uniform in character. Herlwyn Avenue is overwhelmingly characterised by semi-detached, single storey dwellings of the same two iterations in terms of original type, style and design. Numerous neighbouring dwellings have been extended and altered in some form, including hip-to-gable extensions, rear box dormers and rear extensions. Nevertheless, given the original form, from the road a visual sense of uniformity remains.

The dwellings along the road were originally designed with shallow front, walled gardens, with parking provided in the form of rear garages accessed via passageways to the side of each dwelling, shared with the unattached neighbour. These garages are no longer suitable for modern day vehicles. Whilst some front gardens have since been repurposed to provide off-street parking, along the road there is a strong reliance on on-street parking.

Since 11.12.2025, the entire Borough has been covered by an Article 4 Direction which removed Permitted Development rights for the change of use of single family dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) to small HMOs (Use Class C4). Such conversions must therefore acquire planning permission.

The site falls outside of any designated Conservation Area or Area of Special Local Character. It is located in Flood Zone 1, but falls within a Critical Drainage Area.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application proposes the construction of a single storey rear extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion and rear box dormer, and conversion of the property from Class C3 (dwellinghouse) to Class C4 (small HMO) for up to six persons. The rear extension would measure 3m in depth, and infill the space to the main rear of the dwelling and side of the existing rear projection.

It is proposed for the HMO to contain six single bedrooms, four on the ground floor and two on the first floor. Each bedroom would be served by an en-suite. A communal kitchen would be provided on the ground floor. Cycle storage would be provided within the rear garden, and bin storage to the front.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

19188/APP/2024/1794 149 HERLWYN AVENUE RUISLIP

Erection of a single storey rear extension.

Decision: 30-09-2024 Approval

19188/APP/2024/1672 149 HERLWYN AVENUE RUISLIP

NFA -Prior approval application for the construction of a 6m single-storey rear extension to the dwelling house at 149 Herlwyn Avenue HA4 6HS. The proposed extension will extend 6 meters from the rear wall of the original house and will have an eaves height of 2.5 meters and a maximum height of 2.78 meters.

The primary purpose of this extension is to create additional living space for the growing family. The extension will comprise an open-plan kitchen and dining area, providing a more functional and comfortable living environment.

The design of the extension has been carefully planned to ensure it complements the existing structure of the house. The external materials will match those of the existing building, including , ensuring integration with the current aesthetic.

We have considered the impact of the proposed extension on the neighbours and the surrounding area. The extension is designed to avoid any significant loss of light or privacy for adjacent properties.

In addition to that, according to the planning history data, similar large single-story rear extension developments have been in the neighbours' properties.

The extension will not affect the existing access to the property. The garden space will be sufficiently maintained, ensuring that the amenity of the outdoor area is preserved. There will be no adverse impact on the parking arrangements or access for emergency services.

We kindly request the approval of this application to allow us to proceed with the planned extension.

Decision: 27-06-2024 No Further
Action(P)

Comment on Planning History

As above, a rear extension of 3.6m in depth, and spanning the width of the property, was approved in autumn 2024. This scheme has not been implemented but permission for it remains extant.

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

14 neighbouring properties and the Ruislip Residents Association were consulted on the application. This neighbour consultation period expired on 27.01.2026. In total, 169 letters of representation were received, all objecting to the proposal, raising concerns over:

- HMO out of character for the area; HMO not in keeping - area comprises of predominantly family dwellings; sets precedent for others; over-intensification/overdevelopment.
- Extensions not in keeping.
- Impact on neighbour amenity; privacy, noise, disturbance.
- Increased parking pressures, highway safety; road congested during school pick-up/drop off hours.
- Impact on biodiversity/loss of existing trees.
- Lack of communal space, issues of rubbish collection, sewage.
- Loss of a family home.
- Building work has already commenced without consent, is of poor quality; party wall consent not obtained before proceeding.
- Undermines objective of the borough's Article 4 Direction.
- Safety of neighbours/elderly/children resulting from occupants; anti-social behaviour; increased crime.

A petition of 1120 valid signatures was also received against the application, with the key objections being:

- Loss of family housing and harm to housing mix
- Impact on residential character and street scene
- Parking stress and highway safety

- Impact on residential amenity
- Lack of justification and failure to demonstrate no harm
- Stretched facilities
- False statements in the application
- Unlawful roof conversion, party wall agreement and tree cut

Cllr Douglas Mills
Objection

"On behalf of nearby Herlwyn Ave residents we oppose this application to change from the existing C3 dwellinghouse criteria to a small HMO. Herlwyn Ave properties have always been and should continue to be about single persons/small family homes. Their proximity to schools and Ruislip High St means it is ideal for this type of occupation. Even with the promise of a management plan, the reality is that occupation by 6 individuals will bring a material change to the character of this road, a greater level of alteration to the front of the property compared with the surrounding neighbours and increased parking on what is a residential road, leading to a primary school. Such a change to the overall street character is not in keeping with the location".

Officer Comments on all the above:

- Impacts relating to character/appearance, neighbour amenity, parking and biodiversity/trees, and amenity of future occupiers are discussed within the relevant sections below.
- References to a loss of family housing typically cited Policies DMH 1 and DMH4. The proposal would replace self-contained housing with an equivalent amount of residential floorspace but would not subdivide/convert it (it would remain as one address/planning unit). The supporting text to Policy DMH 1 states that, for the purposes of that policy, residential accommodation should include HMOs, hence under the terms of the policy, residential accommodation would be safeguarded. As such, these policies would not be applicable to this proposal. Furthermore, an Inspector has previously concluded that the cited loss of family housing did not conflict with local policy and was not sufficient grounds for refusal in and of itself (see appeal ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3372543).
- The Article 4 Direction is not a blanket ban on HMOs - rather, it allows the Local Planning Authority to properly assess such a proposal and weigh up all material considerations before making a decision. Such planning application do not therefore undermine the the objectives of the Article 4 Direction.
- The application description was amended with the applicant's consent during the course of the application, to reflect that the proposal is part-retrospective. The planning process is not a punitive one, and whilst some works may have commenced this does not give them weight in the decision making process. The Council reserves the right to pursue enforcement action on unlawful development where required.
- Issues regarding crime/safety/anti-social behaviour are speculative as the identity and conduct of future occupiers is unknown and cannot be assumed. Overall, given the limited scale of the proposal in these contexts, no significant concerns are raised. As for any residential property, any issues in this regard would be a matter for the police at a time if/when they occur.
- Party wall matters are a civil matter between the applicant and relevant neighbour and are not a material planning consideration.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Highway Authority:
Objection.

"Site Characteristics & Background

The site is located within a residential catchment in Ruislip. The proposal is for the conversion of a semi-detached bungalow with a shared driveway to a 6-person HMO accommodation. Given the shared status of the driveway with neighbouring No.147, no legitimate/useable off-street parking would be available. The area is devoid of parking controls, and the address exhibits a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 which is considered as 'poor' and as such heightens dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport to and from the address.

Parking Provision

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Policy - DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network. There is no regional standard that can be applied.

The standard for an HMO use with up to 6 occupants requires "1 parking space per 2 occupants". Therefore, in this case in the region of 3 on-plot spaces would be required hence a clear under-provision exists with an absence of on-plot parking.

Furthermore, as the applicant has not provided any detail or evidence with regard to the level of present on-street parking demand within the locality and whether any spare capacity exists which could satisfactorily accommodate potential parking displacement generated by the proposal without undue detriment to on-street parking capacity and safety on the public highway, the default position by the Highway Authority is to recommend refusal based on the failure to submit a relevant transport appraisal and travel plan as required by the local standard. This conclusion is further supplemented by the aspect of private car dependency generated by the proposal which is likely to be higher than normal due to the relatively poor PTAL rating thereby resulting in the undue loss of on-street parking provision and potential for injudicious parking displacement onto the neighbouring public highway. Understandably the council has a duty of care to prevent such eventualities wherever possible, hence the stance.

Cycle Parking

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement of 1 secure and accessible space per occupant equating to 6 spaces. This quantum is to be located securely at the rear of the address which is considered a broadly acceptable arrangement.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Bin storage arrangements should be provided within 10 m of the highway boundary. This arrangement would then comply with the adopted waste collection distance parameters. It is confirmed that an area for refuse would be dedicated on the house frontage which indicates conformity. There are no further observations".

Officer Comments: Comments noted.

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

Part 2 Policies:

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 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 D14	(2021) Noise
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places

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 D14 of the London Plan (2021) states that - In order to reduce, manage and mitigate noise to improve health and quality of life, residential and other non-aviation development proposals should manage noise by, inter alia, avoiding significant adverse noise impacts on health and quality of life.

Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) states that the Council will seek to ensure that noise generating development is only permitted if noise impacts can be adequately controlled and mitigated.

Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that, in wards covered by an Article 4 Direction for HMOs, such as in this case, planning applications for the change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to HMO (Use Class C4 and Sui Generis) will only be permitted where, inter alia, they will not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of adjoining properties.

The supporting text of Policy DMH 5 also states that "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 on-street and off-street parking, loss of front gardens, reductions in levels of privacy, alterations to the exterior of buildings and increased generation of refuse".

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 DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to dwelling alterations and extensions will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

In this instance, it is considered that the additions themselves are of an acceptable size, scale and siting so as to prevent any significant adverse impact to neighbour amenity. Indeed, the rear extension, at 3m in depth, would be policy compliant, whilst it is noted that a rear extension of 3.6m depth, which also extends up to the shared side boundary, has previously been approved at the site, with permission remaining extant. Given the above, the single storey nature of the extension and its low roof height, overall it is not considered that the rear extension would result in any undue issues of overshadowing or overbearingness, and certainly to no greater extent than what has already been deemed acceptable under the previous approved application. The hip-to-gable and roof dormer extensions would also be considered acceptable in these regards. In terms of privacy, no additional side openings are proposed beyond what already exists at the site. Whilst the dormer would introduce new openings to the property at the rear at first floor level, there would remain a rear-to-rear separation distance to properties along Roxburn Way in excess of 21m, in compliance with local guidance, whilst it is accepted that similar first floor additions could in any case be implemented under householder Permitted Development rights. As such, it is not considered that the extensions to the property would have any undue impact on neighbour privacy.

In terms of the change of use, the proposal would convert a modest two-bedroomed bungalow into

an HMO for up to six individuals, significantly intensifying its use. This number of individuals would exceed the dwelling's current capacity based on the existing plans and number of bedrooms, and would likely exceed its capacity if, including the proposed additions, it was occupied as a single private dwelling - given that expected private dwelling features such as a lounge, dining room, shared bathroom, utility room/storage have not been included in the floor plan.

Furthermore, given the nature of the proposed occupation of the property, as six unrelated and unconnected individuals, there is likely to be a greatly increased number of comings and goings to and from the site when considered against its existing use or as a single private dwelling more generally. This would likely include movements on foot and by car throughout the day and night.

A recent planning appeal decision within the Borough (Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3327485 - 131 York Avenue) for the 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 Inspector 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"

A further recent planning appeal decision (Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3372543 - 47 Hanover Circle) for a similar conversion of a single dwelling (Class C3) to 5 bedroom, 8 person HMO (Sui Generis use) within another part of the Borough was also dismissed on several grounds, including the living conditions of neighbours with regard to noise and disturbance. Within this decision, the Inspector stated:

"Each is likely to have individual and different schedules for arrivals, visitors, and deliveries. This would have a very different, far more intensive character than a family home, significantly increasing potential for disturbance of neighbouring occupiers and heavily at odds with the established character of this residential area".

Whilst the proposal is of a lesser scale, for a maximum of six individuals, the surrounding area is characterised by modest semi-detached bungalows of a much lesser intensity. Similar to the appeal decisions above, each individual occupant is likely to have their own routine with additional visitors and deliveries. It is considered that the proposed change of use to a six-person HMO would fundamentally, and harmfully, change the level of activity on site to the detriment of the amenity of adjacent residents, given the likely increased levels of noise and disturbance from, for example, increased vehicular movements and the movements of each separate individual resident through the day and night. This level of activity would be over and above what would typically be expected for a private single dwellinghouse of the same size, both in terms of the number of occupants and that each occupant would typically have their own individual routine, as well as visitors and deliveries, as above.

This level of disturbance would then be further exacerbated by the proximity of the property to adjacent neighbours, with the main entrance to the application property, for example, being on the side of the property and opening directly onto the shared accessway with no. 147.

For the reasons above, whilst the extensions themselves are considered acceptable, it is considered that the proposed change of use, for the number of individuals specified, would result in an over-intensification of the site which would be harmful to the amenities of the neighbouring

properties along this quiet residential road. Levels of noise and disturbance would likely exceed that of the existing situation or which could be reasonably expected if the property, including the proposed additions, were occupied as a single dwelling.

The proposal would have an unacceptable and undue impact on existing residential amenity in terms of noise and disturbance and as such would therefore be contrary to Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part 1: Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMH 5 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) require development proposals to be high quality and enhance the local context, delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

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) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

Specific to this application, with regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD1 requires that:

- Roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line.

With regard to rear extensions, Policy DMHD1 requires that:

- Single storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 3.6 metres in depth.
- Flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3 metres in height

In terms of the proposed additions, the rear extension would be of an appropriate size and scale, compliant with the requirements of Policy DMHD1, appearing as subservient and proportionate. Furthermore, it would be of a conventional design, similar to other existing rear extensions in the vicinity. Whilst the hip-to-gable alteration would unbalance the roof symmetry between the application property and the adjoining neighbour no. 15, somewhat detracting from the character of the street scene, the conversion would, in and of itself, not typically be refused (provided all other aspects relating to the conversion of the loft space are acceptable) given that such an alteration can be achieved under householder Permitted Development rights. Similarly, the rear dormer would be a large and bulky addition, exceeding the provisions of Policy DMHD1, however it is accepted that a similar-sized, if not identical sized dormer could likely be constructed under Permitted Development regulations, for which planning permission would not be required. As such, in this instance there

would be no valid reason to refuse the application on this basis, given the Permitted Development fall-back position which is a significant material consideration. In any case, it is acknowledged that there are numerous other similar roof conversions - both hip-to-gable and rear dormer extensions within the vicinity, and as such, provided the extensions were finished in materials to match the existing property, overall they would not be considered to be detrimental to the character and/or appearance of the property or surrounding area.

Visually, in terms of the proposed additions, the development would therefore be acceptable. As has been mentioned however, the property lies along a road characterised by single, modest family bungalow dwellings, originally comprising of two bedrooms, whilst the wider residential area is dominated by C3 dwellinghouses. Whilst the extensions in and of themselves would be visually acceptable, the conversion of the property to a 6-person HMO would have a far more intensive character than a family home, as well as the properties that surround it, thereby at odds with the established character of this area. Whilst this would largely be experienced through impacts to neighbour amenity, rather than in a visual sense, the proposed placement of a large bin store for example, to the frontage of the property, would be at odds with the visual character of the area where frontages are typically open and views of properties from the road are unobscured.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) require consideration of whether traffic generation is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards, unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

PARKING:

Within the Local Plan, the adopted parking standards for an HMO use for up to 6 occupants are stated as "1 parking space per 2 occupants". There is no overriding London Plan standard that can be applied for this proposed use, hence the Local Plan requirements would take precedent. As such, for this proposal 3 on-plot parking spaces would be required. The property has no existing off-street parking capacity, given that the side passageway is shared with no. 147 and the existing garage building is in a state of disrepair and does not in any case meet the necessary dimensions to count towards off-street parking provision.

As a residential property, as stated in the London Plan (2021), the existing maximum parking provision for the property would be 1.5 spaces. The proposed change of use to a six-person HMO would therefore in effect double the parking requirement of the property, resulting in a further parking displacement of 1.5 spaces onto the public highway.

The proposal would not comply with the requirements of Policy DMT 6 insofar as the required off-street parking provision would not be met. However, the Policy states that, under certain circumstances, a deviation from the standard may be permitted, but only when it can be sufficiently demonstrated that it would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

As mentioned in the site description, there is a large reliance on off-street parking in the vicinity which, as neighbour representations demonstrate, is already considered to be saturated, and this is exacerbated by the location of a school at the end of the road, which results in further parking

demand during peak times. Additionally, the site's low PTAL rating of 2 indicates a high reliance on private motor vehicle transportation.

In this instance, the applicant has not provided any detail or evidence such as a parking stress survey, transport appraisal or travel plan to dispute this, or to demonstrate whether any spare capacity exists which could satisfactorily accommodate potential parking displacement generated by the proposal without undue detriment to on-street parking capacity and safety on the public highway.

As such, it is contended that the requirements of Policy DMT 6 have not been met, and considering the site's low PTAL rating and with no supporting information provided to the contrary, it is considered that the proposal would likely result in the further harmful displacement of vehicles onto the public highway. Given existing pressures and the existing needs of surrounding residents, this parking deficit would not be acceptable and would increase the likeliness of potential injudicious parking displacement onto the surrounding public highway. This position is concurred by the Council's Highway Authority, who have raised an objection to the proposal.

CYCLE PARKING:

In terms of cycle parking the Local Plan stipulates a requirement of 1 secure and accessible space per occupant, equating to 6 spaces. This quantum would be located securely at the rear of the site which is considered to be acceptable. It should be noted however that the requirement for cycle parking would be expected in addition to, and not as a substitution of, any vehicular parking requirement. As such, compliance in this aspect would not overcome the unacceptable deficit in vehicular parking as identified above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

AMENITY OF FUTURE OCCUPIERS:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity for occupiers and achieve indoor and outdoor environments that are comfortable and inviting for people to use.

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 sqm and be at least 2.15m wide.

Policy DMH 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that, in wards covered by an Article 4 Direction for HMOs, such as in this case, planning applications for the change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to HMO (Use Class C4 and Sui Generis) will only be permitted where, inter alia, they comply with all other planning standards relating to retention of amenity space.

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 proposal would create a new internal layout. The submitted plans confirm that each bedroom would have a floor area in excess of 7.5 sqm, would be no less than 2.15m wide, and would be served by adequate means of light and outlook. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that, in terms of

communal facilities, the HMO would only be served by a small (10.6 sqm) and windowless kitchen. Intended to serve six occupants, this room would be cramped and unsuitable for its purpose, particularly as it would likely house both kitchen and laundry facilities, and be used by occupants at similar times. No communal lounge, dining room or other recreational space would be provided to occupants, and the kitchen in and of itself would not provide adequate communal space for residents, nor provide a place for occupants to eat or sit down.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would provide a sub-standard and unsatisfactory level of internal living accommodation for future occupiers which would be neither comfortable or inviting, nor fit for the intended purpose. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), and Policy DMH 5 of the Local Plan.

In terms of outdoor amenity, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that, inter alia, adequate garden space is retained, while Policy DMHB 18 states that developers should provide amenity space in accordance with Table 5.3 of the Local Plan. For a six-bedroomed dwelling as proposed, a minimum 100 sqm of amenity space would be required to be retained.

Following the proposed extensions, the property would retain rear amenity/garden space in excess of 100 sqm and as such would comply with Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 with respect to outdoor amenity space. Adequate external amenity would however be expected in addition to the provision of satisfactory internal amenity, and as such this in and of itself would not override the harm resulting from the internal living environment, as identified above.

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

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

In wards covered by an Article 4 Direction for HMOs, planning applications for the change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to HMO (Use Class C4 and Sui Generis) will only be permitted:

- i) where it is in a neighbourhood area where less than 20% of properties are or would be exempt from paying council tax (or in the case of Conservation Areas 10%) because they are entirely occupied by full time students, recorded on the Council's database as a licensed HMO, benefit from C4/Sui Generis HMO planning consent and are known to the Council to be HMOs;
- ii) in Conservation Areas where less than 10% of properties are exempt from paying council tax because they are entirely occupied by full time students, recorded on the Council's database as a licensed HMO, benefit from C4/Sui Generis HMO planning consent and are known to the Council to be HMOs and the change of use does not form a consecutive HMO use in a street frontage;
- iii) where less than 15% of properties within 100 metres of a street length either side of an application property are exempt from paying council tax because they are entirely occupied by full time students, recorded on the Council's database as a licensed HMO, benefit from C4/Sui Generis HMO planning consent and are known to the Council to be HMOs; and
- iv) where the accommodation complies with all other planning standards relating to car parking, waste storage, retention of amenity space and garages and will not have a detrimental impact upon

the residential amenity of adjoining properties.

Since 11.12.2025, all wards within the Borough are covered by an Article 4 Direction restricting the conversion of dwellinghouses into small HMOs for up to six persons that would typically be afforded by the provisions of Permitted Development. As such, the proposal would fall under the assessment of this policy.

In this instance, the property lies outside of a Conservation Area. As such, part ii) would not be applicable. The individual aspects of part iv) have been assessed under their respective consideration headings.

In terms of part i): The property is located within an area dominated by single family dwellinghouses, with no significant student population. Planning records indicate that there have been no other planning applications or certificate of lawfulness applications for HMOs along Herlwyn Avenue or the surrounding roads. The proposal is considered to comply with this aspect.

In terms of part iii): The property is located within an area dominated by single family dwellinghouses, with no significant student population. Planning records indicate that there have been no other planning applications or certificate of lawfulness applications for HMOs within 100m of the application property. The proposal is considered to comply with this aspect.

As such, the proposal is considered to conform to the requirements of part i) and iii). Conflicts with part iv) of Policy DMH 5 (Part B) have however been raised in other sections of this report. Part A would not be applicable as this relates to larger HMOs (i.e. seven occupants and above).

REFUSE & SEWAGE:

Bin storage arrangements should be provided within 10m of the highway boundary. It is confirmed that an area for refuse would be dedicated on the house frontage which indicates conformity in this regard, although for reasons mentioned above a differing placement would be preferable - for which the site would in any case be able to accommodate.

Whilst each bedroom would contain an en-suite, it is not considered that any impact to the local water network would be so significant so as to warrant a refusal of the application in this regard.

BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGY

In England, Biodiversity Net Gain ("BNG") is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021).

Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is required to meet the biodiversity net gain objective of 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat.

In this instance, the proposal would meet the 'de minimis' exemption to biodiversity net gain, as defined in the statutory guidance. As such, the proposal would not have to satisfy the national biodiversity net gain objective.

In terms of ecology, whilst the proposal would require alterations to roof, there is not considered to be a reasonable likelihood of bats given the good condition of the roof and urban nature of the

location. As such it would not be considered proportionate to request a preliminary roost assessment, in this instance. There are no other ecology concerns.

Whilst it was noted on the site visit that the rear of the site has been cleared of some vegetation, including a boundary tree, the choice to remove this vegetation is not directly linked to the proposed development, but rather the separate decision of the applicant to clear the garden, for which there would be no restrictions given that the tree and other vegetation is not protected. Mitigation for the clearance works is therefore not considered to be appropriate given that these works are not required for the development to take place.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

The application site falls within Flood Zone 1, but within a critical drainage area. In this instance, the only proposed increase in footprint would be a modest rear extension, which would replace an existing patio and is of a smaller footprint to an extension that already has permission. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any greater level of surface water flood risk, either on or off the site, than the existing arrangement or what has already previously been deemed acceptable. Overall no flooding or drainage concerns are raised.

Contact Officer:

Christopher Lamb

Telephone No: