



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/25/3374411

22 Welford Street, Salford M6 6BB

- 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 James Taylor against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/0929.
 - The development proposed is change of use from C3 to C4.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner above is duplicated from the Application Form. However, I have removed reference to “Current there is one family tenant and I wish to convert the house to a HMO so three people from different households can rent the property.” As this alone is not an act of development. Rather, it provides context for the proposed act of development.
3. 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 Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would result in a concentration of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) that would be harmful to the character of the area; and,
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of 20 and 21 Welford Street.

Reasons

Principle of development

5. 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.

6. 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. The SPD advises that an overconcentration of HMOs can have an unacceptable effect on residential character. This includes creating imbalanced and unsustainable communities with high levels of transience. For clarity, SPDs are not part of the development plan. Instead, they are material considerations which support the development plan.
7. If the appeal were allowed, approximately 30% of properties within 100m radius of the appeal property would be HMOs. There is already a large cluster of HMOs in the area, and the proposal would add to this. A significant proportion of the local population is likely to be transient, and the appeal proposal could increase the transient population. A large transient population leads to an imbalanced local community. In turn, this could lead to the harms identified in the HMO SPD. As such, the proposal could create further harm and would not represent the sustainable re-use of the appeal property.
8. Whilst the proposal is modest in scale, and by itself may not cause significant harm, the cumulative effect of a high concentration of HMOs would be materially harmful. I acknowledge that some of the Council's evidence against the proposal may be theoretical. However, the HMO SPD advises that the Council's concerns are based on experience of an overconcentration of HMOs. As such, the emphasis of LP Policy H10 is on the applicant to demonstrate that no harm would be caused. There is no cogent evidence that indicates that harm would not arise from a large concentration of HMOs in this instance.
9. I acknowledge the appellant's experience of managing rental properties and the Property Management Plan (PMP). However, planning permission would not be personal to the appellant. Instead, it would relate to the appeal property. Therefore, there is no guarantee that the appellant would manage the property in perpetuity. Also, the proposed measures within the PMP would not mitigate the harm associated with a high concentration of HMOs, most of which are not managed by the appellant. As such, it would not be reasonable to impose a condition which required the PMP to be enforced.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would result in a concentration of HMOs that would be harmful to the character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to LP policies D5, F3, H1, and H10, where they indicate that all developments shall deliver a high quality of life and this can be achieved by delivering a diverse mix of homes, amongst other matters.

Living conditions

11. The appeal property is an end of terraced property and is located the other side of a narrow alleyway from 20 Welford Street (No 20) and opposite 21 Welford Street (No 21). The area is defined by high density development, largely comprising of terraced blocks of dwellings.

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

12. If the proposed change of use occurred, No 20 would be adjacent to 3 HMOs and No 21 would be adjacent to 2 HMOs. Occupiers of HMOs are more likely to live independently when compared to occupiers of a shared household. This would lead to increased residential activity including comings and goings from the property. Accordingly, this would lead to neighbouring occupiers experiencing increased noise and disturbance.
13. The proposed HMO would only accommodate 3 occupants, and the proposal does not include any works. As such, the scale of development is modest and by itself would be unlikely to cause harm. Nevertheless, allowing the appeal would result in both Nos 20 and 21 being adjacent to multiple HMOs. Given the high density of development, the increased noise and disturbance generated by multiple HMOs that are adjacent to a single property, would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of those properties.
14. A lack of objections from consultees and interested parties does not mean that harm would not persist. Furthermore, planning permission would be tied to the appeal property. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to future occupiers of neighbouring properties.
15. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Nos 20 and 21. The proposal would be contrary to LP policies D5, F3, H1 and H10 where they indicate that development shall ensure that it does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the users of other buildings, amongst other matters. It would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the Framework where it indicates that decisions should ensure that development create places with a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

16. The appeal property is in proximity to public transport and employment opportunities. It would also provide acceptable levels of internal space and include appropriate facilities for a HMO of this size. The proposal would not be harmful to the appearance of the area, nor would it have a harmful effect on highway safety. Nonetheless, these factors do not overcome the identified harm.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR