
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2017

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3176566

410-412 Green Lanes, Palmers Green, London N13 5XG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Walkers Chemist Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00088/FUL, dated 5 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the formation of one studio flat within existing building at second floor level including inserting door and balcony to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal provides suitable living conditions for the future occupiers of the development with particular regard to internal space and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to the second floor area of the existing building which is accessed from the rear via a metal staircase. Internally, the space is already laid out as residential accommodation in a similar manner to the appeal proposal.
4. The Council have assumed that the flat would be occupied by two persons, whereas the appeal documentation indicates that it would be for single person occupancy. On this basis, the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard would require a minimum of 39 square metres. Given that the flat provides around 45 square metres of floorspace, the proposal would exceed that requirement.
5. From my site visit I saw that the bedroom area had restricted head height and has very limited outlook, a point which is acknowledged by the Appellant. To my mind, given these limitations the proposal would not provide an acceptable standard of accommodation. Whilst this could be addressed through the provision of a dormer window (as suggested by the Appellant) that is not the proposal before me.
6. Turning to the kitchen/living area, this would be located to the rear of the flat which has a lower floor level than the hall/bedroom/bathroom areas. This area

of living space would be more than adequate for the future occupants of the flat, especially with the provision of a balcony to the rear. There would also be clear views out from the new doorway to the balcony and from the existing rooflight on the north elevation (which is not shown on the submitted drawings). I also noted at my site visit that there was a further rooflight above the kitchen area on the south elevation which provided further natural light to the kitchen.

7. The proposal also involves the removal of the existing internal wall between the bedroom and the kitchen/living room. Whilst this would improve the living conditions to the bedroom area by providing a greater amount of light and improved outlook, to my mind it would still not overcome the harm I have identified.
8. For the above reasons the proposal would not provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupants of the flat contrary to Policy 3.5 of The London Plan (2015), Policy CP4 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policy DMD8 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and the Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance which amongst other matters seek to ensure that new housing proposals are well designed with adequate internal amenity space. The proposal would also be at odds with the overarching design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR