



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2026

by **J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/W/25/3372804

24 Strawberry Road, Salford M6 6PT

- 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 John Regan against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/0376.
 - The development is conversion of existing house to HMO and rear dormer extension with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing house to HMO and rear dormer extension with loft conversion at 24 Strawberry Road, Salford M6 6PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/2025/0376, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos SR-001 001 Rev. A; SR-001 002 Rev. A; and SR-001 003 Rev. A.
 - 2) The number of persons in residence at the hereby approved house in multiple occupation (HMO) shall not exceed 5 at any one time.
 - 3) Unless within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for the storage of cycles, is submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved scheme is implemented within 3 months of the local planning authority's approval, the use of the site as a HMO (use class C4) shall cease and all equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed until such time as a scheme is approved and implemented.

If no scheme in accordance with this condition is approved within 6 months of the date of this decision, the use of the site as a HMO (use class C4) shall cease and all equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed until such time as a scheme approved by the local planning authority is implemented.

Upon implementation of the approved cycle storage scheme specified in this condition, the cycle storage shall thereafter be retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner above is duplicated from the Application Form. However, I have removed the phrase “retrospective application for ...” as this is not an act of development.
3. The appellant has indicated that the change of use and works started and were completed in March 2023. The Council consider the change of use to have taken place and works to have been completed. During my site visit I observed a development which matches the application plans. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
4. On 16 December 2025, the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst broad changes to the structure of the Framework are proposed as part of this consultation, these proposals could be subject to further change and can only be given very limited weight at this stage. It has therefore not been necessary to consult the parties on the changes.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would result in a concentration of HMOs that would be harmful to the character of the area.

Reasons

6. Policy H10 of the Salford Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Designations, January 2023 (LP), seeks to control the conversion of houses into HMOs. LP Policy H10 supports conversions where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect, either alone or cumulatively with other development, with regard to noise and disturbance, on-street parking, waste management, and population turnover. Furthermore, it only supports conversions where they would not result in local infrastructure’s capacity being exceeded, and where it would not result in a dwelling being adjacent to two uses specified within the policy.
7. The HMO SPD¹ provides further detail to support LP Policy H10. Policy HMO1 within the SPD, advises that planning permission would not normally be granted for HMOs where the proportion of HMOs would exceed 10% of all residential properties within a 100m radius of the application property. For clarity, SPDs are not part of the development plan. Instead, they are material considerations which support the development plan.
8. The SPD advises that an overconcentration of HMOs can have an unacceptable effect on residential character. In particular, with regard to noise and disturbance, imbalanced and unsustainable communities with high levels of transience, parking pressure, increased levels of crime, and a growth in the private rented sector at the expense of owner-occupation.
9. If the appeal were allowed, 22 properties within a 100m radius of the appeal property would be HMOs. This would amount to 16.7% of properties. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to SPD Policy HMO1. Nonetheless,

¹ Salford City Council, Supplementary Planning Document, Houses in Multiple Occupation, Adopted 4 June 2024 (updated 14 January 2025)

within the Delegated Decision Record (DDR), the Council state that it is not anticipated that the use of the property as an HMO, of this size, would generate a level of noise and disturbance that is significantly greater than what would normally be expected for a family dwelling. The Council also acknowledges that the proposal is unlikely to have a noticeable effect upon on-street parking and waste storage could be accommodated within the rear alleyway. Moreover, the Council concludes within the DDR, that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

10. There is no cogent evidence before me that the proposal would result in increased levels of crime. Furthermore, 110 properties within a 100m radius of the appeal property, approximately 83%, would not be HMOs. Accordingly, it has not been demonstrated that the change of use would result in an imbalanced or unsustainable community. Finally, it has not been substantiated how the proposal would result in fewer properties being owner occupied.
11. The appeal property has been licensed as a HMO dating back to 2022 and the use of the property has not generated any complaints. A lack of complaints itself does not demonstrate that the use of the property as a HMO is acceptable. However, this is supported by a lack of objection from consultees and interested parties. Moreover, my observations on site corroborated consultees' responses and the Council's assessment with regard to on-street parking, waste storage, and the building's relationship with neighbouring properties. Despite a conflict with SPD Policy HMO1, the above evidence combined demonstrates that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the neighbourhood.
12. It is not disputed that the proposal would not result in an exceedance of local infrastructure's capacity. Neither is it disputed that the proposal would not result in a dwelling being adjacent to two of the uses listed within LP Policy H10.
13. On balance, I conclude that the proposal would not result in a concentration of HMOs that would be harmful to the character of the area. The proposal would comply with LP policies H1, F3, D5, and H10; where they indicate that development shall ensure that it does not have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of users of other buildings, amongst other matters.

Conditions

14. The Council's Highways Officer indicated a condition they considered would be necessary in the event that the planning application was allowed. I have considered whether that condition and further conditions would be necessary in light of the guidance within the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
15. In the interest of certainty, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary.
16. A condition limiting the number of residents at any one time is necessary to ensure that the development does not have a harmful effect on the conditions of neighbouring occupiers. It would also ensure that the development would provide acceptable living conditions for occupiers of the HMO.
17. A condition requiring the submission of details of cycle storage is necessary to promote the use of sustainable transport modes and to reduce demand for on-street parking. Given the planning application subject to this appeal is retrospective to the development occurring, it is necessary to impose time limits for

implementing the cycle storage. Also, it is necessary to include clauses that the approved use shall cease if details of cycle storage are not approved or the storage is not implemented in a timely manner.

18. A condition specifying a time limit to commence development is not necessary as the development has already commenced.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR