
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/25/3365676

61 Waddon Road, Croydon CR0 4LH

- 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 Benmohammed (Easy Living UK) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 24/04056/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: change of use from single family residential to HMO.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the use of the appeal property as a House in Multiple Occupation would be acceptable in terms of its effect on the housing mix within the borough;
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers with specific regard to internal living space; and
 - whether the proposal would adequately promote sustainable modes of transport.

Reasons

Housing mix

3. The appeal site forms a well proportioned semi-detached two-storey, three bedroom dwelling adjacent to the highway. The surrounding area is predominately residential in nature. The proposal seeks the change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a C4 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO).
4. Policy DM1.2 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan) supports the redevelopment of the residential units where it does not result in the net loss of three bedroom homes, as originally built, or the loss of homes smaller than 130 square metres. The explanatory text accompanying the policy identifies a need for three bedroom dwellings within the borough and that the policy is required to ensure further reduction of three bedroom homes does not occur.
5. The council contend that, as originally built, the appeal dwelling formed a three bedroom property with a gross internal floor area of less than 130 square metres

and there is nothing before me to indicate otherwise. The proposal would therefore result in the conversion of the appeal property to a five bedroom HMO, resulting in the loss of a three-bedroom dwelling (as built).

6. There is no evidence before me to suggest surrounding traffic levels make the appeal property unsuitable for use as a dwelling by families. Further, whilst the proposal could be used as a single dwelling, given the application is for its conversion to a HMO it is likely that its use would be as such which would result in the loss of a three bedroom property as originally built.
7. As such, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the housing mix within the borough, conflicting with the relevant provisions of Policies SP2 and DM1.2 of the Local Plan. When read together these policies require development to ensure that a choice of homes is available in the borough and to not result in the net loss of 3 bedroom homes, as originally built.

Living Conditions

8. The Croydon Council Houses in Multiple Occupation Standards (2024) (HMOS) requires single person rooms which share a kitchen to have a floor space of 10 square metres or more. The proposal is for a five bedroom HMO with a shared kitchen and three of the rooms are below the 10 square metre requirement. As such there would be insufficient space for day-to-day living which would therefore be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers.
9. The appellant contends that the room sizes are adequate and that there is a current HMO license in place. I have been presented with little evidence of this. Further, a HMO license would not justify the inappropriate size of three of the proposed bedrooms and the proposal's conflict with the HMOS.
10. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers with specific regard to internal living space. The proposal would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D6 of the London Plan – The Spatial Strategy for Greater London (2021) (London Plan) and SP4 and DM10 of the Local Plan. When read together these policies require new development to provide adequately-sized rooms and enhance well-being.
11. The proposal would also conflict with the HMOS which requires single person rooms which share a kitchen to have a floor space of 10 square metres or more.

Sustainable transport

12. The application site is within a controlled parking zone (CPZ), which is indicative of a level of parking stress within the area. I also noted on my site visit there were low levels of off-street parking along this section of the highway.
13. Given the nature of HMO's, the proposal would likely result in different travel patterns to the occupation of a dwelling used as a family home where trips may be taken together and fewer vehicles required. An increase in the number of cars associated with the property, would exacerbate the level of parking stress with an increase to the detrimental impact on air quality, personal health, well-being, and the environment.
14. The appellant has stated that they are happy to provide a planning obligation which would restrict the future occupiers access to parking permit. However, I

have no such obligation before me, and I cannot be sure that proposal would not lead to an increase in parking stress.

15. Whilst I have not been direct to a specific policy, the Council contend that five cycle parking spaces are required for the proposal. This includes at least one suitable for a wider / adapted bike, with these spaces requiring a 1.5m clear width on the side of the Sheffield stand and a minimum access width of 1.2 metres required.
16. The appeal property benefits from a modest rear garden accessed via the side of the appeal property, with this side access approximately 0.9 metres in width. Whilst no details of cycle provision have been supplied, given the size of the rear garden there would likely be sufficient space for the required cycle storage. Whilst the access to the rear of the appeal property is below the 1.2 metre width given by the Council, I consider it likely that the width of 0.9 would accommodate most bicycles. As such, details of cycle parking could be secured through condition.
17. Nevertheless, the proposal would lead to an intensification of parking stress and therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not adequately promote sustainable modes of transport. The proposal would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies T3, T4, and T6 of the London Plan and Policies SP8, DM29 and DM30 of the Local Plan. When read together these policies require development to be car-free as the starting point and to reduce the impact of car parking in any development

Conclusion

18. Overall, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the provisions in the Framework, which indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR