
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by **P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/24/3358053

72 Bounds Green Road, Wood Green, Haringey, London N11 2EU

- 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 Ms Indu Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/1272.
 - The development proposed is described as: "Retention of a 7 bedroom (7 person) HMO. Proposed cycle and refuse storage."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "Retention of a 7 bedroom (7 person) HMO. Proposed cycle and refuse storage." at 72 Bounds Green Road, Wood Green, Haringey, London N11 2EU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2024/1272, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Location plan – 75BGR-100
Existing ground and first floor plan – 72BGR-101
Existing loft floor and roof plan – 72BGR-102
Existing block plan – 75BGR-201
Bike and bin storage details – 75BGR-202
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be occupied by no more than 7 persons at any time.
 - 3) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, space shall be laid out within the site in accordance with the drawings approved under condition no.1 for the storage of refuse and recycling, and that space shall thereafter be kept available for the storage of refuse and recycling.
 - 4) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, space shall be laid out within the site in accordance with the drawings approved under condition no.1 for 6 bicycles to be stored, and that space shall thereafter be kept available for the storage of bicycles.

Preliminary Matters

2. The evidence before me indicates that the use of the property as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) has already commenced. At the time of my visit, the building was internally arranged in accordance with the plans on which the Council based its decision, and some residents were present. Although the external cycle

and refuse storage shown on the plans had not yet been installed, I am satisfied that the use is operational. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the submitted plans and the current use of the property.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

- whether the development provides a suitable standard of accommodation for its occupiers, with specific regard to the provision of shared facilities and external amenity space; and
- whether the intensity of the use and associated levels of activity would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with specific regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Standard of accommodation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached residential property on the north side of Bounds Green Road. It fronts a busy main road and benefits from a sustainable location, being a short walk from Bounds Green underground station.
5. The Council's principal concerns relate to the internal layout and adequacy of shared facilities, particularly kitchens, bathrooms, and communal internal and external living areas. Whilst consultee comments reference conflict with Policy D6 of the London Plan, March 2021 (the LP), which sets out standards for internal and external space in housing developments, the Council's formal decision does not cite this policy, nor does the officer report identify any specific conflict with it.
6. Based on the evidence before me, the relevant development plan policies to this issue are Policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (formerly the Core Strategy) March 2013, consolidated with alterations since 2017 (the HLP) and Policies DM12 and DM17 of the Haringey Development Management DPD, adopted July 2017 (the DMDPD). These policies collectively seek to maximise capacity for housing, to deliver quality residential development, and for HMO proposals to meet specific criteria.
7. The decision notice also refers to LP Policy H8, and DMDPD Policies DM10 and DM35. However, these policies relate to matters such as the loss of existing housing, estate redevelopment, housing supply and cycle storage. I do not find these policies of direct relevance to this issue.
8. The property includes a spacious and functional kitchen on the ground floor, which is adjacent to a shower room. A second, smaller kitchen is located at loft level. Whilst compact, this benefits from good headroom and appears usable. Although there is no kitchen on the first floor, the availability of cooking facilities on both the ground and loft levels provides reasonable flexibility for the occupiers of the 4 first-floor bedrooms. Whilst the Council refers to a conflict with its HMO licensing standards, no copy of these standards has been provided, and they are not reflected in the development plan policies. Additionally, I note that the property holds a valid HMO licence for up to nine people living as seven households, issued shortly before the planning application was determined.

9. Communal bathroom and WC facilities are provided across all floors, allowing residents to access alternative facilities if needed. A spacious communal living/dining room is located at loft level and is accessible to all residents, supplemented by a smaller living room on the ground floor.
10. The Council raises concerns that Bedroom 2, in conjunction with the adjacent living room, could function as a self-contained unit. However, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate harm arising from this arrangement. Even if the living room were used solely in connection with Bedroom 2, sufficient communal facilities remain available for other residents.
11. With regard to fire safety concerns raised by consultees, Bedroom 2 is located on the ground floor and benefits from a large openable window and direct access to the rear garden via the adjacent living/kitchen area. There is no identified policy conflict in relation to fire safety, and no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate a breach of other regulatory regimes such as building control or licensing.
12. Although the Council cites concerns regarding the absence of dedicated communal storage, the property has reasonably sized bedrooms throughout, which could accommodate personal storage if required.
13. The Council has also expressed concerns about potential intensification and pressure on shared facilities if the property were to accommodate up to 12 people. However, the appellant has clearly stated that the proposal is for 7 occupants, as reflected in both the description of development and the submitted plans. In the absence of supporting evidence, these concerns appear speculative. Based on the internal layout, the accommodation appears suitable for the proposed number of residents. To ensure this is maintained, the number of occupants could be appropriately controlled by condition.
14. The external garden area is spacious, accessible from communal areas, and provides a practical and low-maintenance amenity space. While its use may be weather-dependent, this is not unusual for outside space and does not detract from its value.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development provides a suitable standard of accommodation for its occupiers, and no conflicts with the development plan have been identified. The proposal therefore accords with Policy SP2 of the HLP, and Policies DM12 and DM17 of the DMDPD, the aims of which have previously been set out.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

16. The site is located in a busy area with a mix of residential and non-residential uses, including nearby shops and a car dealership. Regular vehicle movements and general activity contribute to a relatively high level of background noise and footfall in the area.
17. The appeal property is a large semi-detached dwelling, capable of accommodating a sizeable household even outside of HMO use. As such, the level of activity associated with its use as a 7-person HMO, the maximum occupancy of which could be secured by condition, would be comparable to, or potentially less than, that of a large single-family household.

18. Given the scale of the property and its surrounding context, I am not persuaded that its use as an HMO would result in a material increase in noise or disturbance above what could reasonably be expected of conventional residential use. Accordingly, I am not convinced that it would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
19. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would not result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers through unacceptable levels of noise or disturbance. It would therefore accord with Policies DM1 and DM17 of the DMDPD, which together seek to ensure a high standard of amenity for the users and neighbours of development.

Conditions

20. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions, which I have considered against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have amended the conditions to ensure compliance with these provisions.
21. As the development is already operational, the statutory time limit condition is not necessary. However, a condition listing the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
22. A condition limiting the maximum number of occupiers is necessary to ensure the development operates in accordance with the approved details and to safeguard the living conditions of occupiers of both the development and neighbouring properties.
23. Conditions requiring the installation of refuse and cycle storage facilities, as shown on the approved plans, are necessary to safeguard living conditions and to promote sustainable transport. Whilst the Council's suggested wording requires these details to be implemented prior to the occupation of the development, given the development is already operational, it is more appropriate to require their installation within 3 months of the date of this decision to ensure precision and enforceability.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above, I have found the proposal to comply with the development plan as a whole. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed in my formal decision.

P Storey

INSPECTOR