



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3367433

6 Cambourne Avenue, Edmonton, London N9 8QG

- 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 Abraham Feld against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application reference is 25/01305/FUL.
- The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension, rear dormer extension with front roof lights and the change of use from a single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a 6-bed HMO (Class C4) with the provision of refuse and cycle storage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Abraham Feld against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling situated on the southern side of Cambourne Avenue, in a primarily residential area. At present it is a self-contained single dwellinghouse with three bedrooms; the proposed development is the change of use of the property to a house in multiple occupation ("HMO") with six single-person bedrooms, extensions and alterations to facilitate that change of use, and the provision of external refuse and cycle storage facilities. The one reason for refusal given by the Council covered three issues, all relating to living conditions, which I address in turn: the overall space within the property; the amount of communal (including kitchen) space; and the internal layout.
5. The six single-person bedrooms would be between 8.01m² and 10.86m² in area; two would have ensuite shower and toilet rooms, and there would be two shared shower and toilet rooms on the ground floor.
6. Policy DMD5 of the 2014 Enfield Development Management Document ("the EDMD") requires that the conversion of existing dwellings into HMOs will only be permitted where it provides "a high quality form of accommodation which meets internal floor space standards in the London Plan"; Policy DMD8 requires that all residential development should "provide a well-designed, flexible and functional layout, with adequately sized rooms".

7. Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 applies space standards in line with those set out in the nationally described space standard (“the NDSS”)¹. There is no standard set out either in the London Plan or the NDSS for a six-bedroom six-person dwelling on three storeys, but for the nearest comparable type – a five-bedroom six-person dwelling on three storeys – a minimum GIA of 116m² is required. A four-bedroom dwelling for the same number of people should be a minimum of 112m², and even a three-bedroom dwelling for six people should have a GIA of at least 108m².
8. The submitted information shows that the enlarged property would have a gross internal area (“GIA”) of 94.33m²; this would be well below even the smallest minimum space standard for a dwelling intended to accommodate six people, and it is therefore likely that it would provide somewhat cramped accommodation for future residents. Based on another appeal decision in the borough at 28 Oxford Road², the appellant argued – and the Council accepted in its appeal statement – that the space standard set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 does not apply to HMOs. I address that point in a little more detail in the associated costs Decision but, in any event, the requirements of Policy D6 are a useful guide for assessing whether housing would be likely to provide adequate space for the intended number of residents; as I have just described I consider that the appeal property would fall short in that respect. Nevertheless, on the basis that compliance with the space standard is not a development plan requirement for this appeal proposal, my overall conclusion will also be informed by the other detailed matters to which I now turn.
9. Two kitchens would be provided – one of 10.01m² on the ground floor, which the appellant describes as a “communal kitchen/dining space”, and one on the second floor measuring 6.04m². As there would be two kitchens it is reasonable to assume that they would not each need to serve all six residents, and both main parties referred to the Council’s HMO licencing standard, which requires kitchens serving up to five people to have a floor area of at least 6m².
10. The HMO licencing requirements require single person bedrooms to be a minimum of 7.5m²; the six bedrooms here would be between 8.01m² and 10.86m² in area and so would all comply with the standard, though none could be described as generous in terms of space and it is likely that most or all residents might, at least some of the time, wish to eat or even socialise outside their bedrooms. The second-floor kitchen would not be large enough to also provide adequate space for sitting and eating and, as no other communal living space would be provided, that burden would fall entirely on the ground floor kitchen.
11. Based on the submitted drawings, and notwithstanding the description used by the appellant, I do not consider that the ground floor kitchen would provide adequate space for residents to sit and eat in comfort. This is not just because of its size for the number of people, but because it would also need to be kept reasonably clear to allow occupiers to get access to and from the cycle storage facility in the rear yard. It would be a cramped or crowded space, unfit for its intended purpose.
12. In respect of this matter, the appellant again referred to the Oxford Road appeal decision, and also drew my attention to two cases within the borough where the Council granted planning permission for HMOs with “kitchen only” layouts at 301

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/technical-housing-standards-nationally-described-space-standard>

² PINS Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3306709

Carterhatch Road³, and 107 Brimsdown Avenue⁴. At Oxford Road my colleague (dealing with a situation where the development had already been carried out) noted that although the kitchen was compact (at 13.36m²) it contained a table and chairs and, based on what they saw, they considered it to be adequate to serve its intended purpose for five residents; for the reasons I have set out above, that is not the case here. At Carterhatch Road, the approved drawings show two kitchens of more than 9m², one on the ground floor and one on the first floor, with space for a table and chairs shown in the larger ground floor kitchen⁵, while at Brimsdown Avenue, as well as a second kitchen on the second floor, the 15.1m² ground floor dining kitchen clearly provides adequate room for a table and chairs for four people. All of these other examples are at least slightly more generous in terms of kitchen and dining space or layout, and none provides significant support for this appeal proposal.

13. The Council's other concerns about internal layout focused on Bedroom 2 at the rear of the ground floor, on the basis that it would be subject to noise and disturbance and cooking smells from the adjacent kitchen, and that access to the communal rear yard would be adjacent to its window. In my view, that bedroom would be particularly vulnerable to noise disturbance. This would in part be down to the close proximity of its external door and window to those of the main kitchen, but it would also arise from the internal layout. That bedroom's internal door would open onto the hallway right next to not only the main kitchen, but also to the two shared bathrooms; it would be likely to be an especially busy, and relatively noisy, part of the property.
14. I recognise that it is not uncommon in HMOs for there to be a rear ground floor bedroom, and that is often next to or close to a kitchen. As well as the developments referred to already at Oxford Road, Carterhatch Road and Brimsdown Avenue, the appellant drew my attention to a further grant of planning permission for an HMO at 38 Upton Road⁶. Not all of those cases are directly analogous to this appeal scheme – for example, at Carterhatch Road the affected bedroom's external door and window would be well away from those of the kitchen. The other examples illustrate that there is, or should be, no *in principle* objection to such layouts. Here though, there are some shortcomings in respect of Bedroom 2, as I have described. Were they the appeal scheme's only shortcomings they might not be fatal to the proposal. However, in the light of the limited overall living space, and the inadequacy of the kitchen and dining spaces which would be provided, they add to my concern that the proposed development would not provide an adequate standard of accommodation for the intended number of residents.
15. For the combination of factors I have just set out, I conclude that the proposed development would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It would therefore conflict with Policy 4 of the 2010 Enfield Core Strategy, which seeks high housing quality standards, and Policies DMD5 and DMD8 of the 2014 Enfield Development Management Document, the principle relevant requirements of which I have summarised at paragraph 6 above. I also find conflict with Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021; notwithstanding the agreed position between the main parties that the minimum internal space standards in Table 3.1 of that policy

³ LPA Ref: 25/00747/FUL

⁴ LPA Ref: 25/00862/FUL

⁵ Though looking at the plans the question of getting bikes through to the rear yard storage again raised itself in my mind.

⁶ LPA Ref: 25/01020/FUL

do not apply to HMO schemes, it also requires housing development to be of high quality design, and to provide comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose.

Conclusion

16. The scheme conflicts with the development plan read as a whole. None of the material considerations identified, including those of the National Planning Policy Framework, outweigh this conflict or justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector