



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3368487

221 Mount Pleasant Road, Tottenham, London N17 6JH

- 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 Karen Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application reference is HGY/2024/3178.
 - The development is described as the retention of a 5-bedroom HMO. New bike storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The appeal property is currently in use as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. As “retention” is not an act of development under the above Planning Act, I have considered the appeal as one that seeks planning permission, retrospectively.
4. The application form describes the development differently from the Council's decision notice, which refers to a change of use from a 4-bedroom single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a small HMO for 4 people (Class C4) with bicycle storage. Having reviewed the plans, I find the Council's description to be more accurate and have proceeded on that basis.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - whether the development provides satisfactory living conditions for occupiers with regard to communal kitchen facilities.
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties; and
 - the effect of the development on the supply of family housing.

Reasons

Living conditions – occupiers of the HMO

6. The Council's adopted Standards for HMOs (the Standards) state that one set of kitchen facilities should serve no more than 3 lettings, and that no bedroom should

be more than 1 floor distant from a kitchen. The appeal scheme provides a single kitchen and dining room on the ground floor to serve up to 4 occupiers. There is also a bedroom within the roof space, which is 2 floors away from the kitchen. The development is, therefore, at odds with the Standards.

7. The appellant states that the appeal property meets internal space standards of the Council and in The London Plan (TLP), and that the Council has issued an HMO licence, thereby confirming the adequacy of facilities. I also note that the Housing Act 2004 does not mandate a second kitchen. However, the planning system is distinct from the licensing regime, with each having its own specific requirements. While the shared kitchen and dining room is generous in size, the layout of the HMO, which places a bedroom 2 floors from the only kitchen, fails to comply with the Standards. In doing so, I am unable to conclude that the communal kitchen facilities within the HMO are adequate and conveniently located for all occupiers.
8. On the first main issue, I conclude that the appeal scheme does not provide satisfactory living conditions for its occupiers. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy DM17 of the Council's Development Management DPD (DPD) and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (LP). These policies seek to ensure that HMOs provide high quality accommodation.

Living conditions – neighbouring occupiers

9. DPD Policy DM17 permits HMOs only where they do not result in any significant adverse amenity impact on the surrounding neighbourhood, including the cumulative effects arising from an overconcentration of this type of accommodation. The Council states that about 25% of properties within the same postcode area as the site are HMOs, which the appellant does not contest. The development would not alter that proportion since it is already in use as a HMO. While this is a significant percentage, the evidence does not demonstrate that this figure alone thereby constitutes a harmful overconcentration of HMOs.
10. In my experience, some of the problems that can arise from a cluster of HMOs within an area include poor refuse management, on-street parking pressure, neglected gardens and poorly maintained buildings. From the objection raised by an interested party, residents along Mount Pleasant Road have experienced some of these problems, although there is no firm evidence to link them directly to residents of the HMO at No 221 or any others nearby.
11. The appellant has confirmed that the development is car free. The plans indicate that there is sufficient space to the rear and front of the property for refuse and cycle storage, the details of which could be covered by conditions. I am not persuaded that the use would result in any other amenity impacts over and above those that would normally be associated with residential occupation.
12. On the second main issue, I find that the development does not unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, it does not conflict with LP Policy SP2 or DPD Policies DM1 and DM17 insofar as they aim to safeguard residential amenity.

Supply of family housing

13. The appellant argues that the size of the appeal property exceeds the 120 sqm threshold in DPD Policy DM17, and its loss as a family-sized dwelling would not

materially affect the Borough's family housing stock. The accompanying text to this policy acknowledges the important role that HMOs play in meeting particular housing needs, especially for young people and low-income residents.

14. Nevertheless, the appeal property appears to retain its form as a 4-bedroom house with gardens, and so it could continue to make a meaningful contribution as a family dwelling. DPD Policy DM10 resists the loss of all existing housing unless it is replaced by equivalent new residential floorspace. No replacement provision is made in this instance.
15. The site also lies within a Family Housing Protection Zone, wherein the Council prioritises the supply of family-sized housing. If planning permission were to be granted, it would result in the loss of a family sized house, which would be at odds with the Council's priorities.
16. On the third main issue, I conclude that the development results in an unacceptable loss of family housing. It is contrary to the strategic objectives of TLP Policy H8, LP Policy SP2, and DPD Policies DM10 and DM17. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure a mix of homes that meets Haringey's identified housing needs.

Other Matters

17. The site is accessible, and the development makes efficient use of the building. No external changes are sought to the building. I understand that the HMO at No 221 is professionally managed. However, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm in relation to the harm to the living conditions of its occupiers, and the loss of a family sized house.

Conclusion

18. Overall, the development conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the National Planning Policy Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
19. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR