
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by **A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3360521
364 Fullwell Avenue, Ilford, London IG5 0SD

- 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 PM Renovations Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2725/24.
 - The development proposed is Proposed change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to 5 bedrooms Houses in Multiple Occupation HMO (Use class C4). Ground floor extension already approved under 0168/22 no further changes made.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application has been determined on the plans listed on the decision notice and the site location plan. It is noted that a rear ground floor extension is shown that formed part of a previous consent.
3. In its Statement of Case the Council has confirmed that reference to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in its reason for refusal is incorrect as this relates to achieving appropriate densities, which does not relate to the issue in dispute as part of this appeal. Alternatively, the Council considers that conflict arises with its Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The appellant has had opportunity to comment on this document and I do not consider any party has been disadvantaged by me considering this in the assessment of this appeal.
4. From the evidence submitted by both the Council and the appellant, the proposed C4 Use Class would be limited to 5 occupants; I have considered the proposal on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would provide sufficient living conditions for future occupiers with particular regard to communal space.

Reasons

Communal space

6. The Framework paragraph 135(f) states 'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users'.

7. The submitted plans have stated measurements (widths and lengths for kitchen and dining room) which show the proposed shared amenity spaces of a dining room (approximately 5.32sqm) and a kitchen (approximately 6.9sqm) for a total of 12.22sqm. From the evidence before me the kitchen was approved under a separate planning consent reference 0168/22 on the 4 March 2022. However, there is no evidence before me or what I viewed on site, to suggest that this kitchen extension has been commenced.
8. Policy D6 of The London Plan 2021 (London Plan) seeks to ensure housing development provides adequately sized rooms, which are both comfortable and functional layout. It provides greater detail on minimum bedroom sizes, ceiling heights and storage space. Policy 29 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) seeks to ensure internal space meets with National Internal Space Standards. Neither of the policies specifically cover minimum internal shared communal space standards.
9. The SPD provides guidance on conversion into Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) and from the evidence before me Appendix A, appears to be the most relevant. While this relates to licensing it provides planning guidance that a 5-person living, dining and kitchen space should be at least 29sqm, with the kitchen being no lesser than 7.5sqm.
10. Even when having regard to the kitchen, the proposal would only provide approximately 12.22sqm of internal communal space. This is substantially below 29sqm as required by the SPD for a shared dining/kitchen space. While it is noted that the appellant submits that the proposal would provide 17.22sqm of communal space, this would still fall short of the minimum guidelines. On this basis the proposal would not provide adequately sized communal space that would be comfortable and functional for future occupants.
11. It is concluded that given the under provision of internal communal space the proposal would not meet the requirements of the Framework, as it does not provide a high standard of amenity for future occupants. For the reasons above, I am not satisfied that the future occupiers of the proposal would have acceptable living conditions with regards to communal space, given the significant under provision as detailed in the SPD. There is also conflict with Policy D6 of the London Plan and LP29 of the Local Plan, which both while not directly covering communal space seek to ensure at least adequate accommodation space for future residents.

Other Matters

12. While the bedrooms are of a good size this does not overcome the significant lack of communal space. The appellant has put forward that other Councils give weight to larger bedrooms when considering communal space, though no additional detail has been provided on this. Nonetheless, limited weight in favour of the proposal is given regarding bedroom size but this does not overcome the harm in the lack of communal space.
13. While a small HMO could help meet housing demand and provide limited benefits to the economy of the local area, both from the construction work and additional spending from future occupants. This again would not overcome the fundamental concern as detailed above.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole, and the Framework and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR