



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3361540

177 Station Road, West Drayton UB7 7NQ

- 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 Jag Rai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application ref. is 47713/APP/2024/3109.
- The development proposed is conversion of 8 bed HMO to 9 bed HMO.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers, with regard to the amount of internal communal amenity space.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains an originally two-storey Edwardian semi-detached house with roof conversion containing an ensuite bedroom on the second floor. A single-storey rear extension and outbuilding at the end of the garden have been built recently. This leaves a 13m-long rear garden, accessible via a side passage. Both it and the front are surfaced in concrete, the latter for parking but the kerb in front of the two spaces thus created lacks a dropped kerb.
4. The house has been converted into an eight-bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO), licenced for up to 16 people in nine households. Permission exists to erect a porch, which would extend what was part of the hallway and is now a communal study area containing the original front door. The appeal proposal would convert the communal study area into a further bedroom.
5. To accommodate 16 people, all but two of the bedrooms would have to be double occupancy, for which the minimum internal space standard set by Policy D6 of the London Plan (March 2021) is 11.5sqm. The drawings indicate that three would be below that standard on implementation of the porch extension and the proposed change of use. The proposal would also have the effect of reducing the communal amenity space available to residents of the HMO.
6. This would leave an 18sqm kitchen, dining and living area on the ground floor and a 3.7sqm kitchen on the first floor. The drawings indicate that the outbuilding, which is 22.5sqm in area, would be used as a secondary communal area. However, this

is some way from the house and is unlikely to be used, particularly during winter months. Overall, about 44.2sqm of communal amenity space would be left for an HMO of about 190sqm, or 212.5sqm including the outbuilding.

7. The standards at Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 increase by about 9sqm for each additional person, the largest being 138sqm for a 6-bedroom, 8-person, 3-storey dwelling. Whilst not directly applicable in this case, this would suggest a standard of 210sqm for a 16-person 3-storey dwelling. The proposal would only meet this were the outbuilding included. However, as I have found, this would not be convenient as communal space and unlikely to be so used.
8. Therefore, the proposal would increase demand on reduced and less convenient internal communal amenity space and would not provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers. This would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DMH5 and DMHB 16 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies, which require satisfactory living conditions and adequate internal space.

Other Matters

9. The site is located within West Drayton Conservation Area (CA), the character or appearance of which I am required by section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing.
10. The house faces Drayton Hall Park, an historically important open space, which, along with those at the nearby St Martin's Parish Church and The Closes, forms the core of the CA. These continue to function as an open, verdant setting to the area. While the house retains original and distinctive features, such as its ridge tiles and its bay window with hung tiles, its contribution to the CA is neutral.
11. Whilst the porch extension has permission, were I to have allowed the appeal, I would have required its implementation to provide adequate floor space. Given its scale and the neighbour's similar porch, this would have had a neutral effect on appearance. Additional comings-and-goings and activity would have a marginal effect on character compared to the permitted use as an eight-bedroom HMO.
12. I note that the Council's highways officer objected on the basis that the kerb would need to be dropped to use the two spaces created on the front garden for parking and cycle parking would have to be provided. Had I allowed the appeal, I would have imposed a condition requiring these prior to first occupation.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR