



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2024

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3324866

13 St Pauls Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 0NB

- 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 Barnard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref is HGY/2022/4514.
- The development proposed is change of use of property to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) for up to 6 occupants (Class C4 Use).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use of property to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) for up to 6 occupants (Class C4 Use) at 13 St. Pauls Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 0NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/4514, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The evidence before me indicates that the appeal property is already in use as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). I have considered the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought retrospectively.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) came into force on 19 December 2023 with a further change published on 20 December 2023. The paragraphs most pertinent to this appeal are unchanged, other than their numbering. Having considered the revisions and in light of the principles of natural justice, in this instance I do not consider it necessary to invite any submissions from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and amenity of the area, having regard to the development plan's approach to the provision of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), including the potential cumulative effects.

Reasons

5. No 13 St Pauls Road is a semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. From the evidence before me the property has previously been extended, including a rear dormer to provide rooms within the roof space. The proposal is for a change of use to a six-bedroom HMO. However, the plans as existing are identical to the plans as proposed, there are no changes proposed to the building, externally or internally.

6. Policy DM17 of the Haringey London Development Management DPD, adopted July 2017 (DPD) and Policy SP2 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (SP), taken together, aim to maintain a mixed housing offer across the borough by protecting the existing stock of family housing. To achieve this, Part A of Policy DM17 advises that the conversion of larger homes to HMO use will only be permitted where, amongst other matters, the conversion does not give rise to any significant adverse effects on the surrounding neighbourhood, including cumulative effects, arising from an over-concentration of HMOs within the area.
7. The supporting text of Policy DM17 acknowledges that HMO accommodation plays an important role in meeting particular housing needs. However, it also refers to adverse effects from clustering of HMOs. The Council also introduced a Direction made under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended. The Direction stipulates that planning permission is required for development consisting of a change of use of a building to a use falling within Class C4 (HMO) of the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended, from a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouse) of that order. The appeal site lies within the area covered by the Direction.
8. From the evidence before me, there are nine licensed HMOs on St Pauls Road. This amounts to just over 10% of properties. Notwithstanding the consideration of cumulative effects in Policy DM17 of the DPD, I have not been directed to any development plan policy or local guidance that sets out what concentration of HMOs would be acceptable or unacceptable in any particular area. The Article 4 Direction does not define areas with existing over-concentrations. Therefore, whether or not there is an over-concentration of HMOs in the area is a matter of planning judgement.
9. The Council asserts that there may be other, unlicensed, HMOs in the area. They refer to research in 2020 which estimated that 75% of all HMOs in London are unregistered. However, there is no substantive evidence to identify the location of any such HMOs that may exist. Neither is there any evidence that such HMOs exist near to the appeal site, or to conclusively show that the number of HMOs in St Pauls Road is significantly higher than 10%, as asserted by the Ward Member.
10. From my observations, St Pauls Road and the surrounding streets are a residential area which include a mix of HMOs, flats, and single dwellings. I did not observe any evidence of harmful effects on the character or amenity of the area from the use of properties as HMOs.
11. I have made my decision on the established facts and the evidence before me. Licensed HMOs represent a minority of properties on the street. For these reasons, I am not convinced that there is an existing over-concentration of HMOs in the area. Moreover, the proposal would not lead to a harmful over-concentration of HMOs.
12. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and amenity of the area, having regard to the development plan's approach to the provision of HMOs, including the potential cumulative effects. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with Policy DM17 of the DPD which seeks to ensure that change of use of larger homes to HMOs does not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts on

the surrounding neighbourhood, including cumulative effects from the over-concentrations of HMOs.

Other Matters

13. A local Councillor raised concerns at the planning application stage about the loss of a family house and I acknowledge that the site is within a Family Housing Protection Zone. However, the Council did not raise any concerns in this regard. Moreover, the property exceeds 120 square metres in gross internal floor space and, therefore, Policy DM17 would not prevent the subdivision of the property.
14. The Council did not identify any harm arising to the living conditions of the occupants of the development due to the standard of internal accommodation, or the external amenity space, or any adverse effects on highways or parking. Based on the submitted evidence I have no reason to take a different view on these matters and the proposal would comply with Policies D6, T1 and T6 of the London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, 2021 (LonP), Policies DM1, DM17, DM31 and DM32 of the DPD and Policies SP2 and SP7 in this regard.

Conditions

15. The Council has provided a list of conditions that it considers would be appropriate. I have considered these in light of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
16. As the development has already commenced, I have not included the standard time limit condition. For the same reason, it is not necessary to include a condition to detail the approved drawings.
17. However, I have no evidence that the development has been provided with appropriate bicycle parking facilities or waste and recycling storage facilities as required by Policy DM32 of the DPD, Policy SP7 of the SP and Policies D6, T1 and T5 of the LonP. Conditions to require the submission of these details are, therefore, necessary as these facilities are required to promote travel by sustainable modes and to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is not adversely affected by waste storage.
18. The conditions have strict timetables for compliance because planning permission is being granted for work that has already been carried out. As such it is not possible to use negatively worded conditions for this information to be provided before the development takes place or before it is first occupied. The wording of the conditions would ensure that the development can be enforced if the requirements are not met.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

K Townsend

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Unless within one month of the date of this decision, details of bicycle parking facilities are submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved details are implemented within one month of the local planning authority's approval, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time as details are approved and implemented.

If no details in accordance with this condition are approved within four months of the date of this decision, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time as details approved by the local planning authority have been implemented.

Upon implementation, the approved bicycle parking facilities specified in this condition shall be permanently retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 2) Unless within one month of the date of this decision, a scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities is submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved scheme is implemented within one month of the local planning authority's approval, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time a scheme is approved and implemented.

If no details in accordance with this condition are approved within four months of the date of this decision, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time as details approved by the local planning authority have been implemented.

Upon implementation, the approved refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities specified in this condition shall be permanently retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

*** END OF CONDITIONS ***



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2023

by **E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3323481

17 St Pauls Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 0NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Goldeneye Estates against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey Council.
- The application Ref HGY/2022/4521, dated 22 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2023.
- The development proposed is change of use to an HMO (Use Class C4) for 5 persons.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use to an HMO (Use Class C4) for 5 persons at 17 St Pauls Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 0NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/4521, dated 22 December 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council made some minor amendments to the description of the development. The appellant has not raised any objection to the changes made and, for clarity, I have taken the description of the development from the decision notice.
3. A separate appeal has been submitted against an Enforcement Notice at the site, which alleges an unauthorised change of use at the appeal property to mixed use, comprising of 4-self-contained flats and a small House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), and the erection of a rear dormer on the main roof and outrigger roof. Although the enforcement appeal is yet to be determined, the issues in the two appeals are different and I have therefore determined the appeal before me on its own merits. The application form for this s78 appeal states that the HMO use commenced on 27 January 2020. I have therefore made my determination on the basis that permission is being sought retrospectively for the change of use. It is not for me to determine whether the existing use is as an HMO; my focus is simply upon whether or not the use of the property as a 5-person HMO is acceptable in planning terms.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments. Where reference is made to the Framework in this decision, the paragraph numbers are those that appear in the latest version.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood, having particular regard to development plan policy and the potential cumulative effects resulting from existing Houses in Multiple Occupation in the area.

Reasons

6. The supporting text to Policy DM17 of the Haringey London Development Management DPD 2017 (DPD) explains that HMO accommodation plays an important role in meeting particular housing needs, especially for low-income residents, young people and those needing temporary accommodation. However, it goes on to say that many HMOs in Haringey provide sub-standard living conditions, are clustered in areas resulting in adverse impacts on local character and amenity, and also reduce the availability of smaller family housing, for which there is a significant need.
7. An Article 4 Direction, which came into force in 2013, removed permitted development rights across parts of the borough, including the appeal site, for the conversion of dwellings to HMOs. The Article 4 Direction, along with Policy DM17 of the DPD, seeks to enable the Council to actively manage the quality and location of new HMOs, in order to balance the aforementioned housing needs with potential adverse effects to local character and amenity, including cumulative effects arising through the overconcentration of HMOs.
8. I have not been directed to any development plan policy or local guidance that sets out the concentration of HMOs that would be acceptable in the vicinity of the appeal site. Therefore, whether or not there is an over-concentration of HMOs in the area is a matter of planning judgement. In that regard, it is common ground between the parties that there are nine licensed HMOs on St Pauls Road. This amounts to just over 10% of properties. The Council contends that there may be other, unlicensed HMOs in the area. It cites research which indicates that three-quarters of HMOs in London are unregistered. However, there is no firm evidence to identify the location of any such HMOs that may exist near to the appeal site. I have made my decision on the established facts, and these indicate that licensed HMOs represent a minority of properties on the street. Based on this, I find that the proposal would not lead to a harmful over-concentration of HMOs in the area.
9. The evidence refers to concerns about the effect of the development on noise and other potential adverse effects that are perceived to have occurred through the presence of a transient population within the community. However, at an occupancy level of five tenants, the development has a similar population to the use of the property as a family home. The level of activity generated by a five person HMO would, therefore, be similar to many other properties in the local area and is unlikely to result in a material increase in noise or other adverse effects. Moreover, on my site visit, I observed St Pauls Road and neighbouring streets, and did not identify evidence of harm to local character or amenity that had arisen due to the use of the property as a HMO.
10. Furthermore, I have been provided with details of the locations of nine licensed HMOs on St Pauls Road. Based on this information, and my own observations of the site and its surroundings, the existing licensed HMOs are dispersed along the length of the street, rather than in tight clusters. Therefore, any adverse

effects that could potentially be caused through the concentration of HMOs on St Pauls Road are likely to be mitigated by the spatial distribution of HMOs along the street.

11. I conclude that the development does not cause harm to the character and amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood. Therefore, there is no conflict with Policy DM17 of the DPD insofar as it seeks to ensure that HMOs do not give rise to any significant adverse amenity impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood, including cumulative impacts arising from an over-concentration of HMOs within an area.

Other Matters

12. Concerns have been raised about the loss of a family housing unit within a Family Housing Protection Zone. There is limited evidence on the implications of this designation for the appeal but, in any event, no external changes to the building are proposed and the internal layout does not preclude its occupation by a family in the future. Given that licensed HMOs make up only a small proportion of the dwellings on St Pauls Road, I attach limited weight to this matter.
13. The Council did not identify any harm arising to the living conditions of the occupants of the development due to the standard of internal accommodation or the external amenity space. Based on the evidence, and my own observations, I have no reason to take a different view on these matters.
14. The site has a moderate public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 3 and is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). However, given that the occupancy of the property would be similar to other residential uses, including a single dwellinghouse or two self-contained flats (which have been permitted at the site previously), the development is unlikely to generate an increase in demand for on-street parking spaces significant enough to cause harm to highway safety.

Conditions

15. The Council provided a list of suggested conditions, which I have considered against the tests set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where appropriate, I have adjusted the wording of the conditions to improve precision and enforceability, and to reflect the retrospective nature of the planning application. Both parties have been provided with an opportunity to comment on the conditions listed in the attached schedule, and no concerns have been raised with regard to the wording of the conditions or the timescales I have included for compliance.
16. The development has already commenced therefore I have not included the standard time limit condition. It is also not necessary to include a condition to define the permitted drawings, because the appeal relates solely to a change of use.
17. Condition 1 in the attached schedule requires the submission, approval, and implementation of bicycle parking facilities. This condition is necessary to ensure the development provides appropriate levels of cycle parking and to promote travel by sustainable modes.

18. Condition 2 in the attached schedule requires the submission, approval, and implementation of refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities. This condition is necessary to ensure that the character of the area is not adversely affected by open waste storage.
19. The conditions have strict timetables for compliance because permission is being granted retrospectively, and it is not possible to use negatively worded conditions to secure the approval and implementation of the details before the development takes place. The timetables incorporated into the conditions will ensure the development can be enforced against if the requirements are not met.
20. The Council suggested a condition to secure the development as a car-free development by preventing the occupants from applying for an on-street parking permit. However, as set out above, it is unlikely that the development has caused an increased demand for parking beyond former residential uses of the building. Therefore, given the small-scale of the proposal, and in the particular circumstances of this case, the condition would be unnecessary and unreasonable.

Conclusion

21. The development is in accordance with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations before me to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and subject to the conditions listed, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

E Catcheside

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Unless within one month of the date of this decision, details of bicycle parking facilities are submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved details are implemented within one month of the local planning authority's approval, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time as details are approved and implemented.

If no details in accordance with this condition are approved within four months of the date of this decision, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time as details approved by the local planning authority have been implemented.

Upon implementation, the approved bicycle parking facilities specified in this condition shall be permanently retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 2) Unless within one month of the date of this decision, a scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities is submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved scheme is implemented within one month of the local planning authority's approval, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time a scheme is approved and implemented.

If no details in accordance with this condition are approved within four months of the date of this decision, the occupation of the development shall cease until such time as details approved by the local planning authority have been implemented.

Upon implementation, the approved refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities specified in this condition shall be permanently retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

END OF CONDITIONS

Application Number:	HGY/2025/3495
Application Type:	Change of use
Address:	36 Lascotts Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8JN
Proposal:	Change of use from 5-bedroom single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a 6-bed 6-person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Class C4).
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	17/12/202
	5
Applicant:	mr marco agnelli
Agent:	Mr david barnard

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE LOCATION

The building is a traditional two-storey mid-terrace house located on the northern side of Lascotts Road. The site possesses a modest front and rear garden. The proposal seeks permission to convert this family home into a six-bedroom HMO over the ground, first, and second floors, with shared facilities including a kitchen and bathrooms.

The surrounding neighbourhood is residential in character and consists of terraced houses and a mix of family homes, some of which have been sub-divided into self-contained flats, and houses in multiple occupation (HMO).

The property is not located within a conservation area. The property is located within a 'Family Housing Protection Zone', as introduced in the 2017 local plan to restrict further residential conversions in areas identified as already having a high concentration of converted properties. It is also pointed out that the application site and this part of the borough is subject to an Article 4 Direction which came into force in November 2013, removing permitted development rights for a change of use from a single family dwelling house (Use Class C3) to an HMO (Use Class C4).

2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application proposes the change of use from 5-bedroom single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a 6-bed 6-person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Class C4).

No external alterations or extensions are proposed in this application.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

The most recent applications for this site are summarised as follows:

Address: 36 Lascotts Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8JN

HGY/2025/3440: Proposal: Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 2.85m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.85m Decision Date: 21 January 2026
Decision: Refuse

4. INTERNAL & STATUTORY CONSULTATION

The following were consulted regarding the application:

LBH Public Health: Objection

- The proposed layout fails to provide high quality accommodation as required by Policy DM17 due to the following:
- Insufficient kitchen space on the ground floor, which would require the first floor to provide facilities for more than 3 lettings
- No commentary on the accessible cycle storage facilities for residents
- Conversion to a HMO is counter to the objectives of the Family Housing Protection Zones
- The proposal would negatively impact the health and wellbeing of residents for the reasons mentioned above.

LBH Transportation Officer: The application will only be acceptable from a transport perspective subject to conditions on providing 2 spaces for cycle parking, and annotating the plans to show the location and capacity of the waste storage.

LBH Private Sector Housing Team: The team have no objection to this new HMO. However it will need a Mandatory HMO licence and adhere to the councils standards and room sizes for HMOs. Single rooms need to be at least 10m². There needs to be one set of kitchen facilities for every three lets.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 1

Objecting: 1

Supporting: 0

The following comments were raised in the representations received:

- Loss of family housing and over-concentration of HMOs
- Cumulative impact on residential amenity as a 6-bed HMO represents a clear intensification of use compared to a single household dwelling.
- Overdevelopment driven by occupancy maximisation which must be viewed in context of the substantial physical alterations being pursued at the same time.
- Precedent and policy implications would make it increasingly difficult for the Council to resist further similar applications, accelerating the loss of remaining family homes and compounding existing amenity and highways issues.

6. ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
5. Transport considerations.

Principle of development

HMO accommodation plays an important role in meeting particular housing needs, especially for low-income residents, young people and those needing temporary accommodation, however as set out in Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017 (Para. 3.36) there are broader concerns in respect of losing family units to conversions, with HMOs heavily concentrated in the east of the Borough, with this leading to what it describes as "a significant loss in the availability of family housing for which there is strong need."

As such Policy DM17 set out specific criteria that is required to be met to allow approval of the conversion of a home to an HMO within the area covered by the Article 4 Direction, specifically:

- The gross original internal floor space of the existing dwelling is greater than 120m²:

Comment: The original un-extended floor space of the property exceeds 120m² and therefore complies with this requirement.

- They do not give rise to any significant adverse amenity impact(s) on the surrounding neighbourhood, including cumulative impacts arising from an overconcentration of HMOs within an area;

Comment: The property is a large house, with an original area close to 140sqm so therefore is suitable for a conversion making it suitable for an HMO. It also has more space at the front for bins compared to other houses in the borough. The HMO Register shows that of all the sites in Lascotts Road, 10 of the 66 are HMO licenced sites. Whilst this is considered to be a high proportion of properties, the characteristics of the site itself and level of occupation being proposed needs to be taken into consideration. The property is sizeable internally with a sizeable front and rear garden. The front garden is capable of accommodating the associated waste/recycling and cycle storage that would be required for an HMO of this scale for 6 persons, which is no greater than the likely maximum level of occupation than if the property was occupied as a single family dwelling. Whilst there may be a slightly higher level of waste and general waste generated from its use as a small HMO, it would not be considered to result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of the surrounding neighbourhood.

- They are accessible by public transport, cycling and walking;

Comment: The site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 4 which is deemed to be moderate access. There are 6 different bus services accessible within 2 to 3 minutes' walk of the site. The nearest train station is Bowes Park train station, which is within 10 minutes walk and therefore overall the site is considered to have an acceptable level of access to public transport.

- They provide high quality accommodation that satisfies the relevant policies of the Local Plan, including internal space standards, provision of a satisfactory level of amenity space for occupants, and adequate and convenient refuse storage and collection.

Comment: The proposed HMO would have two large kitchens located on the ground floor and first floor which complies with HMO licensing standards. The scheme is acceptable in terms of the rooms sizes and the number of residents. The Council's HMO licensing regime provides for further

safeguards to ensure the accommodation is acceptable and kept to an acceptable and safe standard.

With regard to the stacking there may be some transfer of noise from the kitchens to the rooms above, however, in a HMO where there is shared space residents cannot reasonably be protected from noise to the same extent as might be possible in self-contained accommodation.

The frontage of the site has sufficient space for the storage of refuse bins. A condition is being placed on the consent here asking for details for the storage and screening of refuse bins.

- Where non self-contained, have exclusive use of a kitchen or space within a shared kitchen for each household.

Comment: Haringey standards for HMOs require that one kitchen is shared per three room lettings. In the case here two kitchens would be provided within one floor of each bedroom, and therefore would be in compliance with HMO standards.

Design and appearance

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

The only external works proposed to the site would consist of the installation of cycle and refuse storage, the details of which are subject to condition attached to this decision. As such, the proposal is seen to be compliant with above policy in reference to design and appearance.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high-quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments, while Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

The number of rooms in the HMO would total 6. The size of the rooms range from 10 to 12.40 sqm in size, which meets the requirement for single rooms. The maximum occupancy for this site will be 6 unrelated individuals secured by condition.

Each bedroom has access to natural light, and the layout of the HMO is such that two large kitchens would be provided, and each room would have an en-suite toilet/shower. The future occupiers would also have access to a communal garden. The standard of accommodation is considered satisfactory and would comply with HMO licencing requirements, therefore acceptable.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to

surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

In terms of use, the change to an 6 person HMO is not significant in planning terms. The comings and goings would remain similar to the existing use as a large single household family.

Whilst a maximum of 6 people, consisting of occupants forming different households may generate additional activity, such as the general coming and going of people and their visitors, and in the use of the rear outdoor space, the increase in activity likely from the proposal would not impact neighbouring properties to an unacceptable degree.

Transport considerations

London Plan Policy T1 requires all development to make the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes, and to ensure that any impacts on London's transport networks and supporting infrastructure are mitigated. Policies T4, T5 and T6 set out key principles for the assessment of development impacts on the highway network in terms of trip generation, parking demand and cycling provision.

Local Plan Policy SP7 'Transport' states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport. This is supported by DPD Policy DM31 'Sustainable Transport'.

The Council's Transportation Team have raised no objection to this application with the use of this property as a HMO not considered to have any greater impact on parking conditions over and above the existing extant use of the property as a family dwelling. A condition to ensure secure cycle storage is provided for the beneficial use of future occupation of this HMO is imposed. On this basis it considered that the development would result in any unacceptable impacts on highway safety or local parking conditions.

A HMO use of this size does not meet the threshold to be designed as 'Car Free', specifically as rented and HMO occupation generates much lower levels of car ownership than the general population. Equally there is also no evidence to show that a HMO would lead to more vehicle ownership and demand for on-street parking greater than that associated with a dwelling house.

Conclusion

The proposed conversion to a HMO is considered acceptable and will provide an acceptable layout and standard of accommodation for future occupiers, and would not be considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the surrounding locality or on the highway network in relation to parking highway conditions.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above.

7. CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed below, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Approved drawings list:
3591/5 - Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans
Site Location Plan
3591/6 - Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 No development shall take place until details of the type and location of secure and covered cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until a minimum of 2no. cycle parking spaces for users of the development, have been installed in accordance with the approved details. Such spaces shall be retained thereafter for this use only.

Reason: To promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with policy T5 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

- 4 Notwithstanding the approved plans the development hereby permitted shall not commence until final details of the refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality and to comply with Policy DM4 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

- 5 The House in Multiple Occupation hereby approved must be occupied by no more than 6 persons at any time.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers consistent with Policy D14 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DM1 and DM23 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.