



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2026

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/W/25/3376342

45 Lichfield Street, Salford M6 6DJ

- 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 Paolo Bavagnoli of MBB Property Management Ltd against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/1279.
 - The development proposed is change of use from residential (use class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation HMO (use class C4).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from residential (use class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation HMO (use class C4) at 45 Lichfield Street, Salford M6 6DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/2025/1279, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing number: 2025-LFL-01-ZZ-DR-A-00-0004-A5-P02.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawing hereby approved, details of secure cycle parking to meet the cycle parking standards outlined within Annex C: Car Parking Standards of the Salford Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Designations (2023) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved cycle parking shall be implemented and made available for its intended use prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be retained thereafter.
 - 4) The property shall be occupied by no more than five persons at any one time in connection with its use as a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would result in a concentration of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) that would be harmful to the residential character of the area, and to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regards noise and disturbance.

Reasons

3. 45 Lichfield Street (No 45) is a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling located on the northern side of Lichfield Street. It is proposed to change its use to an HMO for up to five persons.
4. No 45 falls within a predominantly residential area of mostly terraced housing, which is covered by an Article 4 Direction which removes permitted development rights for the change of use of residential dwellings (Use Class C3) into small HMOs (Use Class C4). The Direction was introduced due to concern over clusters and over-concentrations of HMOs within some areas, and the impact that this has on community balance and local amenity.
5. Policy H10 of the Salford Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Designations (2023) (LP) states that the conversion of existing houses to HMOs will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact, either individually or cumulatively with other development, on the positive residential character of the surrounding neighbourhood. This is with particular regard to noise and disturbance, on-street car parking, waste management, and population turnover.
6. The HMO Supplementary Planning Document (updated 2025) (SPD) provides further detail to support LP Policy H10. SPD Policy HMO1 states that planning permission would not normally be granted for new HMOs where the proportion of HMOs would exceed 10% of all residential properties within a 100m radius of the application property as a result of a proposed new HMO.
7. I note that the parties have adopted a slightly different approach to this calculation. Specifically, to ensure consistency, the Council uses an LLPG address point to determine whether or not a property falls within the 100m radius. Based on this approach, the Council calculates that the proposal would result in 20 HMOs within a 100m radius of the site. This equates to 10.3% of properties, which marginally exceeds the threshold set out in the SPD. However, the '100m buffer map' shows that most existing HMOs are concentrated to the north of Gerald Road. No 45 is located further to the south, in an area containing comparatively few HMOs. Indeed, no other HMOs are identified on Lichfield Street.
8. Compared to a single household occupying No 45, the occupation of the HMO by up to five unrelated individuals could lead to some additional activity, such as general comings and goings of the occupiers and their visitors, and vehicle movements. However, the existing arrangement of No 45 includes three good sized bedrooms and the dwelling could be occupied by different members or generations of the same family, including grown-up children. Such members of the family may well have different work or education schedules to one another and share only limited living arrangements, resulting in frequent comings and goings to the dwelling throughout the day. Therefore, the level of activity, noise and disturbance resulting from the occupiers of the HMO would not necessarily be greater than current levels.
9. Furthermore, whilst future occupiers of the HMO may be transient and live at the property for a comparatively short time, this does not mean they would not have a similar level of interest in the well-being and cohesion of the area as a family. Nor do I have any evidence that the HMO would be poorly managed. Therefore, although marginally exceeding the SPD threshold, the appeal proposal would not

unduly harm the positive residential character of the area, nor given its relatively isolated position, would it result in an imbalance in the community or undermine social cohesion and stability.

10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in a concentration of HMOs that would be harmful to the residential character of the area, or to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Consequently, there would be no conflict with LP Policy H10. Further, there would be no conflict with LP Policy D5 in so far as it seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the users of other buildings.

Other Matters

11. Most dwellings along Lichfield Street do not have off-street parking and parking along the road is not restricted. Whilst a 'snapshot in time', on my weekday lunchtime site visit, I saw that although cars were parked on both sides of the road, there was space available to park close to No 45, notably along Tabley Street. Furthermore, whilst there is no dropped kerb to the road, the forecourt to the front of No 45 is large enough to accommodate a single vehicle alongside the bins. The demand for on-street parking may increase because of the proposal but, despite the concerns of interested parties, there is no demonstrable evidence that there is insufficient capacity to accommodate it. Moreover, whilst photographs show cars parked over the pavement opposite No 45, I have no substantive evidence that an HMO would lead to hazardous or inconsiderate parking.
12. The proposed second-floor bedroom would be partially under the eaves of the roof. Nevertheless, it would exceed the minimum room size (based on two people cohabiting) in the Council's 'Standards for houses in multiple occupation' and the centrally positioned roof light would provide adequate natural light.

Conditions

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have undertaken some minor editing in the interests of precision and clarity.
14. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. To protect the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers, I have imposed a condition which controls the occupation of the property to a maximum of five persons. A condition relating to cycle storage has also been imposed to encourage alternative modes of transport. In the absence of any persuasive evidence that the proposal would be poorly managed or lead to potential for anti-social behaviour, I do not find it necessary that contact details of the managing agent be displayed at the property.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, the proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Gravett INSPECTOR