



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by **Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/25/3372048

4 Ivy Road, Northampton NN1 4QT

- 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 Mr V Kryshinets against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2211/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the Change of Use from House in Multiple Occupation for 6 occupants (Use Class C4) into House in Multiple Occupation for 7 occupants (Use Class Sui Generis).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the Change of Use from House in Multiple Occupation for 6 occupants (Use Class C4) into House in Multiple Occupation for 7 occupants (Use Class Sui Generis) at 4 Ivy Road, Northampton NN1 4QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/2211/FULL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos ASM-24-V20-053 Location Plan & Block Plan, ASM-24-V20-050b Existing floor plans and ASM-24-V20-051b Proposed Floor Plans.
 - 3) The house in multiple occupation at 4 Ivy Road shall not be occupied by more than seven residents at any one time.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and amenities of the surrounding area, with reference to parking provision.

Reasons

3. The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms at the appeal property, which is currently in use as a house in multiple occupancy (HMO), by one. The full parking requirement of one on-plot space per bedroom as set out by the Northamptonshire Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (PS SPD) cannot be met. In such a circumstance, the requirement of the Housing in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (HMO SPD) is the provision of a parking beat survey to inform as to the availability of parking in the area. Such a survey has not been provided but, as it was difficult to find a parking space at the time of my site visit on a weekday afternoon, such a survey would be highly likely only to confirm the paucity of on-street parking available in the area.

4. However, even if a beat survey had confirmed that there is insufficient on-street car parking capacity, the HMO SPD still allows the application to be supported provided that two criteria are satisfied. These are (i) that the property is located within 400m of a bus stop served by a bus route(s) providing a service of at least one bus every 30 minutes between 0700 and 1900 Mondays to Saturdays and (ii) that it be located within 400m of facilities and services contained in the town centre, a district centre, local centre or neighbourhood parade. The Council's Planning Committee Report sets out that the site is approximately 350 metres from shops and bus stops on Kettering Road and a 10-minute walk to the Wellingborough Road Local Centre, and they do not contradict this in their submissions in defence of the appeal.
5. Whilst no precise details of the bus service provision available at the nearest bus stop have been provided, the appellant's undisputed evidence is that ten bus routes are served, which would not be unusual given the proximity to the town centre. Whatever the exact level of provision, I am satisfied that the aims of Principle 4 of the HMO SPD would be met in that the appeal site is sustainably located within walkable distances to services and facilities and with good access to public transport. Furthermore, the appeal property is already in use as a six-bedroom HMO, and what is proposed would add only one bedroom to this. It must be noted in that respect that Principle 4 of the HMO SPD includes scenarios where a completely new HMO is proposed, where the same criteria are applied.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that there would be no conflict with the aims of the HMO SPD, where it sets out the criteria for assessing the impact of HMOs in parking terms. In turn, the proposal would accord with Policy H5 of the Joint Core Strategy 2014 and Policy HO3 of the Northampton Local Plan Part 2 2023, where collectively they seek to ensure that HMO development does not adversely affect the character and amenity of existing residential areas.

Other Matters

7. Concern has been raised by interested parties as to the impact on highway safety, however I do not consider that even if there were to be an increase of one extra vehicle that there would be any material impact in that regard. Likewise, comings and goings would not be materially increased by the provision of one extra bedroom. Although the area is currently above the HMO percentage figure set out in the development plan, the proposal is not for a new HMO but for an increase in the size of an existing one. The percentage would therefore not change.
8. The Council's Private Sector Housing team confirm that the room sizes, amenities and facilities shown on the submitted plans indicate that the proposed HMO would meet the requirements for a seven occupant HMO. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would result in litter in the area.

Conditions

9. Conditions relating to the time period to commence the development and setting out the approved plans are needed to provide certainty. For the same reason, it is also necessary to specify the maximum number of people that can occupy the HMO.

10. I am not persuaded that there is a case to impose a requirement to provide cycle storage given that the proposal is for one extra bedroom, and that the current application should not be seen as a way to address any existing deficiency. There is also nothing before me, nor did I observe anything at my site visit, to suggest that bin storage is an existing issue. The provision of one extra bedroom is unlikely to alter this. Conditions relating to cycle and bin storage are therefore not necessary or reasonable in this instance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR