



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: 27th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3374312

85 Beaconsfield Road, Tottenham, London N15 4SH

- 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 Nicole Thomas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application reference is HGY/2025/1665.
- The development proposed is a change of use from C3 to C2 children's home.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether it has been demonstrated that there is a local need for the proposed type of residential accommodation.

Reasons

3. No 85 is a two-storey terraced property on the eastern side of Beaconsfield Road, currently used as a dwellinghouse, in a predominantly residential area of generally similar properties. The proposed development is the change of use of the property to a two-bedroom children's home; it would accommodate children, aged between 10 and 17, with emotional and behavioural difficulties. A manager and one or two support staff would be present during the day, with two staff members providing overnight care. There would be no significant external or internal alterations to the property as part of the scheme.
4. Policy DM15 of the 2017 Haringey Development Management DPD ("the DM DPD") says that proposals for new special needs housing will be supported where it can be shown, among other things, that there is an established local need for the form of special needs housing sought having regard also to the aims and recommendations of the Council's Housing Strategy and Older People Strategy. Neither the planning application nor the appeal submissions included direct evidence of local need, instead referring to grants of planning permission for C2 uses elsewhere in Haringey as demonstrating need. The three other examples are at Keston Road¹, Elizabeth Road², and Aylmer Road³, which provide accommodation for up to five, three, and four children respectively.
5. Elizabeth Road is described in the related officer report as providing accommodation for children with learning disabilities, autism, and physical disabilities, while the majority of other homes in the borough which support

¹ LPA Ref: HGY/2024/0324, decision dated 2 August 2024

² LPA Ref: HGY/2024/1330, decision dated 8 October 2024

³ LPA Ref: HGY/2025/0114, decision dated 3 September 2025

children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. The consultation response from the Council's Head of Children's Commissioning ("the HoCC") therefore acknowledged that it would meet a particular specialised need. However, this means that it is not directly comparable to this appeal scheme.

6. In determining the proposal at Keston Road, the Council's officer report noted no objection from the HoCC. A year or so later, in respect of Aylmer Road, the HoCC's position had shifted to objecting, commenting that "there are 10 registered children's homes in Haringey and the number of Haringey children in care placed within residential homes has been decreasing over the years". That view is entirely consistent with the Council's children's services response in this case, which also noted that there were five additional approved planning applications pending Ofsted approval, and that there was therefore a risk of an oversupply of facilities.
7. It appears that planning permission was granted for Aylmer Road after the appellant amended the application both to reduce its scale – it was originally proposed as a five-bedroom scheme⁴ – and to ensure that the Council had "first option" on vacancies. My assumption is that this option has been secured by a planning obligation or similar agreement, as it is not addressed in the conditions on that permission. The appellant objects that the Aylmer Road decision was made after this appeal scheme was refused planning permission. However, that may simply reflect the amendments being made to address the Council's concerns. In this appeal, there is neither evidence of specific local need, nor any mechanism which would ensure that any provision would meet a local need. The other permissions do not therefore carry significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme.
8. The appellant provided additional information during the appeal, including a 2023 Ministerial Statement⁵ in which the then Minister for Housing and Planning said that local planning authorities should "give due weight to and be supportive of applications, where appropriate, for all types of accommodation for looked after children in their area that reflect local needs". While Ministerial Statements can be material considerations carrying significant weight, for the reasons I have just set out, it is by no means certain that the proposal before me here would meet or reflect local need – the statement does not therefore weigh significantly in its favour.
9. An Ofsted press release highlights local authorities' struggles to find homes for children with complex needs⁶, though the implication of the Council's evidence here is that there is not a shortfall of such provision within Haringey. A national news article⁷ addresses management matters rather than material planning issues. E-mail screenshots of requests for accommodation placements do not, quite rightly, include identifying details which have been redacted. However, there is other evidence of correspondence relating to Brent, Gateshead, Kent, and Swindon, so the appellant is clearly dealing with placements over a wide area. None of the additional information provided is demonstrative of the proposed development meeting specific local need in Haringey.

⁴ Use of a fifth bedroom for emergency placements was also approved at Aylmer Road.

⁵ *Planning for accommodation for looked after children*, Statement UIN HCWS795, 23 May 2023

⁶ *Children with complex needs can wait years for a stable home*, Ofsted, 16 January 2024

⁷ *Care homes in England reject vulnerable children to protect Ofsted ratings*, The Guardian, 11 February 2024

10. Accordingly, I conclude that it has not been demonstrated that there is a local need for the proposed type of residential accommodation. The development would not therefore comply with Policy DM15 of the DM DPD, the principal relevant provisions of which I have set out above. I acknowledge that the Council found that the proposal would comply with other criteria of that policy relating to the standard of housing and facilities, proximity to public transport links, shops and services, and to impacts on living conditions in the locality – and nothing which has been put before me leads me to disagree with their assessment – but that does not alter my overall conclusion on the matter.

Conclusion

11. While I have considered the benefits of the scheme which have been put to me, there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector