



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3374229

27 Queens Road, Wood Green, London N11 2QJ

- 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 Mehmed Cannur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application reference is HGY/2025/0327.
- The development proposed is the change of use of the property from a dwellinghouse to a small-scale HMO for up to 4 residents (Class C4 Use) and the installation of refuse and cycle storage in the front garden.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. No 27 Queens Road is a two-storey mid-terrace Victorian property. It has three bedrooms and a shower room/WC on the first floor. On the ground floor, as well as the kitchen, are two reception rooms, one of which was being used as a bedroom at the time of my visit. The proposal was described on the application form as “Planning Permission for the existing use of the property as a dwellinghouse (C3)”, and it was stated that development had not started. Later on the same form, the current use of the property was described as “C4 HMO” – that is, a smaller House in Multiple Occupation – and it was stated in the “development dates” section that the development – an HMO – had been completed in a single phase in July 2024.
3. A different description was used on the planning statement, where the proposed development was described as a “Change of Use from C3 (Dwellinghouses) to C4 (Houses in multiple occupation) for up to 3-4 people”. The Council described the scheme on the decision notice as a “Change of use of the property from a dwellinghouse to a small scale HMO for up to 6 residents (Class C4 Use) and the installation of refuse and cycle storage in the front garden”, though the officer report set out that the proposal is for up to four residents. The appellant’s appeal submission used the same wording as had been used on the planning statement, and indicated that “there are currently four tenants occupying the property”.
4. Notwithstanding the various descriptions used, it is clear from all the information before me that the development for which permission is sought is the use of the property as a “smaller” HMO within Class C4 of the Use Classes Order, with the rear ground floor reception room being used as a fourth bedroom. I have used a form of words in the banner heading above based on the decision notice, as it provides a clear description of the development, though I have amended it slightly to reflect the fact that the use would be limited to no more than four residents.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the supply of family housing; and
- Whether the proposed HMO would provide acceptable living conditions for occupiers, with particular regard to the amount of bedroom space, and the adequacy of kitchen and bathroom/toilet facilities.

Reasons

Family housing

6. The appeal property is in an area covered by an “Article 4 direction” removing permitted development rights for a change of use from a dwellinghouse within Use Class C3 to a “smaller” HMO within Use Class C4. The 2017 Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document (“the DM DPD”) acknowledges that HMOs play an important role in meeting particular housing needs, especially for low income residents, young people and those needing temporary accommodation, but also recognises that conversion to HMOs can reduce the availability of smaller family housing, for which there is significant need in the borough.
7. Policy DM17 of the DM DPD says that permission for the conversion of homes to HMOs within the Article 4 area will only be granted where proposals comply with a range of criteria. Of particular relevance here is criterion (a), which limits conversions to larger dwellings with an original gross internal floor area greater than 120m². The Council was satisfied that the use would comply with criteria (b) and (c) of Policy DM17, which respectively deal with impacts on neighbouring amenity, and accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling. However, the floor space of the property is a little under 96m², so the development does not comply with criterion (a). I address matters relating to criteria (d) and (e) in my consideration of the other main issue.
8. While the property is not currently let as a family dwelling, its use as an HMO would mean the loss of a property well-suited for use as smaller family housing. In this respect it would therefore conflict with the relevant provision of Policy DM17 of the DM DPD which I have set out above. It would also conflict with Policy SP2 of the 2017 Haringey Local Plan (“the HLP”) and Policy DM10 of the DM DPD which, among other things, seek to ensure that the provision of housing meets the borough’s needs.
9. As there would be no net loss of housing I find no specific conflict with Policy H8 of the London Plan 2021, which seeks the replacement of existing housing which would be lost. This does not alter my overall conclusion on this matter.

Living conditions

10. The four bedrooms are each intended to accommodate one person. Criteria (c) and (d) of Policy DM17 of the DM DPD require the provision of high-quality HMO accommodation, including in respect of living space, and the provision of adequate space in a shared kitchen for each household. In assessing this matter, I have had regard to the Council’s 2017 Standards for HMOs (“the HMO standards”) – while these are part of the HMO licencing regime rather than the development plan, they

are referred to in the supporting text to Policy DM17 and are a useful guide to minimum acceptable standards for housing of this type.

11. Where there is a separate kitchen, as is the case here, the HMO standards require bedrooms for one person to be at least 10m² in area. The rear ground floor room measures around 9.0m²; on the first floor the front bedroom has an area of around 15.7m², the first rear bedroom¹ is around 9.7m², and the second rear bedroom (in the outrigger) is around 8.0m², although the last of these includes a narrow and constrained area by the doorway so the actual usable floorspace is somewhat smaller. Only one of the four rooms therefore complies with the space standard so, while each room may well be capable of accommodating a bed and other necessary furniture, overall most of the bedrooms would still provide cramped living space.
12. The HMO standards do not set a specific space requirement for kitchens, but they do require that a set of kitchen facilities – including sufficient cupboard and worktop space, a fridge and freezer, a sink and drainer, cooking facilities including a hob with a minimum of four burners or hotplates, and adequate power sockets – should serve no more than three lettings. The kitchen (both as shown on the submitted drawings and “as seen” during my visit – they are not the same) includes only one each of sink and cooker. While the HMO standards say that where more than one set of facilities is required these may be provided within one room, it is not clear that the kitchen floorspace would be sufficient to accommodate that provision.
13. The ground floor living room would provide some communal space which would be useful for residents as an alternative to their bedrooms or the kitchen. However, the limited size of, and equipment in, the kitchen itself mean that it would be likely to be a cramped and intensely-used space; it would not be well-suited to meet the needs of four individuals living independently.
14. The Council also expressed concern about the size and provision of bathroom facilities. The HMO standard requires a minimum of one bath or shower and one WC for every five occupiers sharing the facilities. The main bathroom on the first floor is, at around 3.2m², not a large space. However, it includes a shower, washbasin and WC and, I saw, it is not unduly cramped. There is also a second shower and WC on the ground floor; that room *is* somewhat cramped, as there is only very limited clear floorspace between the toilet and the shower. Nevertheless, it is a useful secondary facility for occupiers. I am satisfied that the provision of bathroom facilities would be acceptable to serve four residents, but this does not outweigh the harm I have found in other respects.
15. The shortfalls in bedroom space and kitchen facilities mean that the proposed HMO would not provide acceptable living conditions for occupiers. The development would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy DM17 of the DM DPD which I have set out above, as well as with Policy DM12 which, among other things, requires all housing development to be of a high quality.

¹ This was misreported as 3.2m² in the appellant’s statement, though from the submitted drawings that in fact appears to be the floor area of the shared bathroom.

Other Matters

16. The appellant referred to a grant of planning permission for a change of use to a C4 HMO for up to three occupants at 15 Richmond Road². That other property is a very short distance from the appeal site, and I was able to view it (externally, at least) during my site visit. However, I have no further information about that scheme, and the factors which the Council may have taken into account when granting planning permission. It does not carry significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

17. The use of the appeal property as an HMO would provide accommodation for four households. However, in taking a family-sized unit out of circulation, the overall provision of housing is not increased, given that a family home with three bedrooms might also reasonably be expected to accommodate at least four people; the shortcomings in respect of private living space and kitchen facilities would also be likely to be less keenly felt by a single family unit rather than a group of adults living independently. While the government is therefore seeking to significantly boost the supply of homes, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework"), such increase as would be provided by the appeal scheme does not carry significant weight in this case.
18. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
19. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector

² LPA Ref: HGY/2021/1486