



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3370931

57 Grosvenor Road, Edmonton, Enfield N9 8RG

- 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 Mrs Emine Korusoy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/01659/FUL.
 - The development proposed is conversion of dwelling into 6 bed 6 person HMO.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application is retrospective and seeks planning permission for development that has already been carried out. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The appeal was accompanied by a furniture layout plan of the kitchen/dining area, which was not before the Council at the time of its decision. While the plan changes how the space might be arranged, it does not alter the physical layout of the property or the nature of the proposal. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on the plan during the appeal, and there would be no appreciable effect on the interests of parties outside the site. It is therefore reasonable to take this plan into account in determining the appeal

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development provides acceptable living conditions for its occupiers, having particular regard to the adequacy and functionality of the communal space.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to the conversion of a mid-terrace property to a six-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The only communal space within the property comprises a combined kitchen and dining area at ground floor level, which the appellant states measures approximately 16 square metres. This exceeds the minimum floor area requirement of 12.5 square metres set out in the Council's HMO Standards (2021) for a kitchen/dining room serving six occupiers.
6. However, the HMO Standards are guidance rather than policy, and the adequacy of communal space is not determined by floor area alone. The configuration and usability of the space are critical to ensuring that it serves its intended purpose and provides a safe, healthy and comfortable living environment. In this case, the

dining space forms part of a circulation route to the rear garden and is currently constrained by the presence of multiple fridges and washing machines. This arrangement significantly limits its practicality for communal dining and socialising.

7. The furniture layout plan submitted with the appeal shows how six dining chairs could be positioned around the edge of the space. However, this arrangement would result in an uninviting and impractical layout, requiring occupants to sit facing the wall with limited opportunity for social interaction. It would also obstruct the route to the rear door and garden, and there is no indication of where the displaced kitchen appliances would be relocated. As such, I am not persuaded that the space could function effectively as a communal dining area or adequately support the social and practical needs of the occupiers.
8. Obstruction of the route to the rear garden would also compromise access to the cycle store, discouraging its use and reducing the development's sustainability credentials. This is particularly concerning given that access already involves navigating a narrow hallway, fire door and the communal living space.
9. While it is unlikely that all six residents would dine at the same time, communal space in HMOs is intended to ensure that all occupiers have the opportunity to dine and socialise in a shared environment should they wish to do so. Such space plays an important role in supporting the well-being of residents by enabling them to prepare and share meals, interact socially, and engage in everyday domestic routines in a shared setting. This can help to reduce isolation, foster a sense of community, and contribute to a more balanced and supportive living experience, particularly in properties where individual rooms are limited in size. In this case, the layout and function of the communal space fall short of what is reasonably required to provide a satisfactory shared living environment, undermining the quality of life for occupants.
10. Accordingly, the development fails to provide acceptable living conditions for the occupiers, having particular regard to the adequacy and functionality of the communal space. It conflicts with Policies DMD5(a) and DMD8(e) of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) (2014), Core Policy 4 of the Enfield Core Strategy (CS) (2010) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (LP) (2021), which collectively seek a high standard of accommodation with well-designed and functional internal layouts.

Other Matters

11. I am aware from dealing with other appeals in the area that the site lies within the zone of influence of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Residential development within this zone, including HMOs, is likely to increase recreational pressure on the SAC, potentially affecting its ecological integrity. There is no evidence before me to demonstrate whether the necessary mitigation, such as financial contributions towards strategic access management measures, has been secured. However, as the appeal is being dismissed for other reasons, it is not necessary to consider this matter further.

Planning Balance

12. The officer's report indicates that the Council has delivered only 73% of its housing requirement. Consequently, paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is engaged. In these circumstances, the Framework

indicates that permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

13. The proposal contributes to housing choice and represents an efficient use of existing housing stock. The site is reasonably accessible by public transport and is within reach of local services. These are benefits that align with the Framework's objectives of boosting the supply of housing and promoting sustainable patterns of development. However, given the modest scale of the development and the absence of substantive evidence that it would address a specific identified housing need, I afford these benefits only limited weight.
14. Conversely, the inadequate provision of communal space results in a poor standard of living for the occupiers. This conflicts with development plan policies that seek to secure high-quality living environments, and with the Framework's objective of achieving well-designed places that promote health and well-being. I consider this harm to be very significant.
15. Overall, the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefits. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

16. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR