



# Officer Report

|                            |                                                                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | <b>HGY/2026/1385</b>                                                        |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   | <b>Full planning permission</b>                                             |
| <b>Address:</b>            | 4 Bourn Avenue, Tottenham, London, N15 4HP                                  |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Change of use from a single-dwelling house (C3) to a HMO (C4) for 4 persons |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Sabelle Adjagboni                                                           |
| <b>Valid Date:</b>         | 29/05/2026                                                                  |
|                            | 6                                                                           |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr Yakov Stern                                                              |
| <b>Agent:</b>              | Mr Stephen Hinsley                                                          |

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse**

### **Proposed Development**

This is an application for a change of Use from Class C3 (b) to a Class C4 House in Multiple Occupation for 4 people. The application follows a previous refusal for the scheme with the main change being the provision of cycle parking and waste management facilities.

### **Site and Surroundings**

The application property is a two-storey, mid-terrace property including a loft space with rear dormer, and a single storey rear extension. It is located on the southern end of Bourn Avenue. The site lies within a Family Housing Protection Zone, reflecting the strategic priority to retain family sized housing, and is also subject to an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights for changes of use from C3 dwellinghouses to small Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The property is not located within a conservation area.

### **Relevant Planning & Enforcement History**

The planning and enforcement history in relation to this site is as follows:

#### Planning

HGY/2025/2836

Proposal: Change of Use from single family dwelling (class C3) to House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4) for up to 4 people.

Decision Date: 7 April 2026

Decision: Refuse

HGY/2018/3514

Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for proposed rear dormer and insertion of 3 x rooflights to the front roof slope. Erection of a single storey rear extension.

Decision Date: 4 December 2018

Decision: Permitted Development

### **Enforcement**

ENF/2025/0153 Change of Use - House in Multiple Occupation

Type: House in Multiple Occupation - 6 people and 6 households, granted 4 persons and 4 households

Status: In Progress

### **CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

No consultation responses have been received for this planning application. However, as the proposal is largely the same as the previously refused scheme, the previous comments from the LBH Public Health Team remain relevant and are summarised below:

#### **LBH Public Health Team**

- The kitchen is on the ground floor with bedrooms located across the two floors above, meaning bedroom four is more than one floor away from the kitchen, contrary to HMO standards.
- The application does not specify the cooking facilities provided, and at least two kitchens would be required to meet the 1:3 ratio.
- The property must exceed 120sqm under DM17, but there is a discrepancy between the stated site area (120sqm) and GIA (160sqm), and the plans do not show full measurements.
- The existing HMO licence allows four occupants and four households, confirming it already operates as a C4 HMO.
- The property lies within a Family Housing Protection Zone, where loss of family-sized homes is not permitted; converting a four-bedroom house to C4 would breach this.
- No design statement is provided to show how waste, cycle storage, or transport impacts will be addressed.
- No evidence of cycle storage is included, contrary to London Plan requirements.
- The application does not provide sufficient space or amenities to meet DM17 and risks negative impacts on resident health and wellbeing; therefore, the proposal is opposed.

### **LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

No representations were received.

### **MATERIAL 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 accommodation;
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
5. Transportation considerations; and
6. Waste Management

#### **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:

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

Comment: there is a discrepancy between the stated site area (120sqm) and GIA (160sqm) on the application form, and the plans do not show full measurements of all areas. From the officer's calculations, the existing usable gross internal floor space would be approximately 111.96sqm whilst the original un-extended gross internal floor space is approximately 74.94sqm which would fall short of the 120sqm requirement.

- b. 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 dominant land use along Bourn Avenue is C3 single-dwelling houses, reflecting its established family housing character. However, a 4-person HMO in single occupation would, in principle, generate a level of activity comparable to that of a large family household and is therefore not considered, in isolation, to result in significant adverse amenity impacts, including cumulative impacts from overconcentration.

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

Comment: The site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 3, indicating a moderate level of access to public transport. A number of bus routes and local rail services are available within reasonable walking/cycling distance of the site. On this basis, the location can be considered to have an acceptable level of accessibility by public transport, as well as walking and cycling.

- d. 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 property benefits from a license for a 4-person HMO; however, it has been operating with 6 occupiers and is currently subject to enforcement proceedings pending assessment of lawfulness. Whilst this is a separate matter, it provides an indication of the level of intensity the property has been accommodating. In this context, the proposed level of occupation would further exacerbate the identified shortcomings in the quality of accommodation.

The property comprises four bedrooms, each measuring at least 10sqm, meeting the minimum requirement for double occupancy. Each room benefits from adequate outlook and access to daylight. Two bathrooms are provided, located at first floor and one at the loft level, which is considered acceptable in principle.

The ground floor kitchen/dining area is identified as the sole communal space serving the HMO. However, no information has been provided regarding its layout, facilities, and storage provision, preventing a full assessment of its adequacy. No separate living room is proposed. As such, the level of communal space is considered inadequate and would likely result in an over-reliance on

bedrooms for day-to-day living, leading to a poor standard of accommodation and potential harm to the wellbeing of future occupiers.

Furthermore, the Council's HMO Standards require that one set of kitchen facilities should serve no more than three lettings. In this case, the layout of the kitchen is not shown, and therefore it is not possible to ascertain how many kitchen facilities sets are proposed to serve the four bedrooms, thus reinforcing concerns regarding the adequacy of communal provision. Furthermore, the HMO Standards also require that no unit of accommodation shall be more than one floor distant from a kitchen, whether for exclusive or shared use, unless a suitable, adequately sized dining room or dining area is provided for the occupiers of such lettings either on the same floor as, or no more than one floor distant, from a kitchen. No other dining area is provided and therefore the proposal would fail to service the loft level in accordance with the required standard.

Four cycle parking spaces as well as refuse and recycling storage arrangements have been provided within the front garden of the property. This arrangement is considered acceptable in principle.

Overall, the restricted original un-extended gross internal floor space, the proposed layout, and inadequate communal provision would result in a substandard form of accommodation. The scheme would fail to meet the functional needs of future occupiers and would not provide an acceptable standard of living for the number of residents proposed.

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

Comment: The Council's HMO Standards require that one set of kitchen facilities serves no more than three lettings. The proposal provides a single kitchen to serve four bedrooms. The layout of the kitchen is not provided and as such, it is not possible to ascertain how many kitchen facilities sets are proposed to serve the four bedrooms. This is further compounded by evidence of higher occupancy at the site, which indicates increased pressure on shared facilities. The proposal therefore fails to provide appropriate facilities for future occupiers.

As such, the proposal does not comply with the above policies.

## **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.

No external alterations are proposed as part of this application. Hence the design and appearance of the property will be maintained as existing.

## **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 proposed development would fail to provide a satisfactory standard and quality of residential accommodation for future occupiers. Whilst the bedrooms meet the minimum size requirements and benefit from adequate outlook and daylight, the overall layout is constrained and lacks sufficient communal living space, with no dedicated living room and limited information provided regarding the functionality of the kitchen/dining area. This would result in an over-dependence on bedrooms for day-to-day living, leading to a poor standard of accommodation and potential harm to the wellbeing of occupants.

Taken together, the proposal would not provide a high-quality living environment and would fail to meet the expected standards for residential accommodation.

### **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.

No external alterations are proposed as part of the scheme and, as such, the development would not result in any material impact on neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight, outlook, sense of enclosure, or privacy.

The proposal relates solely to an intensification of use within the existing built form. In this regard, a 4-person HMO could give rise to a level of activity comparable to that of a large family household, the increase in comings and goings and general activity associated with the use has the potential to result in some degree of additional noise and disturbance. However, on balance, and given the residential context of the surrounding area, this level of activity is not considered to result in significant adverse harm to neighbouring amenities.

### **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 site is located within an area of moderate public transport accessibility (PTAL 3), with access to a range of nearby bus routes and local rail services, indicating that occupiers would have reasonable

opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport. Given the nature and scale of the proposal, the development is not considered likely to result in a significant increase in trip generation or place undue pressure on the surrounding highway network.

The scheme includes four cycle parking spaces in the front garden which would be sheltered and secured thereby supporting sustainable transport objectives and in accordance with the London Plan and local policy requirements.

## **Waste Management**

Policy DM4 of the Development Management Plan DPD (2017) requires all development to incorporate appropriate and well-designed arrangements for the collection of refuse and recycling. Proposals must ensure that facilities are of sufficient capacity, conveniently located, and accessible for both occupants and collection services, without causing harm to visual amenity, highway safety, or the operation of the public realm.

The proposal includes two large bins which would serve for general waste and recycling. There will be located within the front garden and would be easily accessible both by occupiers and collection operatives. Additionally, the existing front boundary treatment would serve as a screen thereby preserving the visual impact and neighbouring amenities.

## **Conclusion**

Overall, the concerns raised for the previously refused scheme remain and the proposed development is considered unacceptable. The fundamental issue is that the original un-extended gross internal floor space would fall significantly below the minimum required standard of 120sqm. Notwithstanding this, although the use in principle would not result in significant harm to the character of the area or neighbouring amenities, the internal layout, inadequate communal facilities, and unclear kitchen facilities provision would result in a substandard form of accommodation that fails to meet the council's HMO Standards. The development would therefore fail to provide an acceptable standard of living for future occupiers.

Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused 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 refusal for the following reason(s):

- The gross internal area of the property has not been demonstrated to meet the minimum 120sqm requirement for HMO conversion. As such, the proposal fails to comply with policy DM17 of the Council's Development Management DPD (2017).
- The proposed change of use to a house in multiple occupation (HMO), would by reason of the lack of sufficient kitchen and shared facilities internally, provide substandard quality of accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to Policies DM12 and DM17 of the Council's Development Management DPD (2017), and the Haringey HMO Standards.

**Refusal Reasons:**

The gross internal area of the property has not been demonstrated to meet the minimum 120sqm requirement for HMO conversion. As such, the proposal fails to comply with policy DM17 of the Council's Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed change of use to a house in multiple occupation (HMO), would by reason of the lack of sufficient kitchen and shared facilities internally, provide substandard quality of accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to Policies DM12 and DM17 of the Council's Development Management DPD (2017), and the Haringey HMO Standards.