
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2017

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3180392
46 Links Side, Enfield EN2 7QU

- 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 Mr Erdogan Hayirli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/01336/FUL, dated 15 March 2017, was refused by a notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is to create a separate living unit (2 bedroom flat) within existing detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the mix of housing, with particular regard to local and national planning policy.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a residential neighbourhood characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows. The properties are set back from the road, with driveways providing curtilage parking and modest front and rear gardens.
4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof. The submitted plans show that the property has two bedrooms, a kitchen/diner, living room, study, two bathrooms and a large therapy/activity room which includes storage space. I would therefore concur with the Council that despite only two of the rooms being identified as bedrooms, the property is clearly a family sized dwelling capable of accommodating at least three bedrooms. The generous private garden area and curtilage parking reinforces that view.
5. The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy, adopted 2010 (CS) identifies a deficit of family homes (3 bed houses) in the Borough¹ and Policy CP5 of the CS makes provision for a range of house types, and seeks to maximise the number of family homes. In recognition of the need to ensure that there is no net loss of family housing, or harm the strategic objective to increase the supply of larger

¹ Paragraph 5.43 The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy, 2010-2025

three bed units, Policy DMD5 of Enfield's Development Management Document, adopted 2014 (DMD) states, amongst other things, that where development involves the conversion of family units, compensatory provision for family accommodation (3 bedroom +) must be provided within the development.

6. The proposed development would convert an existing family sized home into two self-contained flats, one with two bedrooms and one with a one bedroom. Consequently, as no compensatory provision would be provided, there would be a net loss of family housing in the Borough. Furthermore, the appeal site lies in an area which is clearly characterised by family sized accommodation. The loss of this family home would therefore fail to address the Council's objective of trying to protect and improve the sustainability of the community and address a recognised housing need.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful effect on the housing mix. I have taken into account all of the policies referred to by the Council, and the proposal would be contrary to the development plan, in particular Policy CP5 of the CS and Policy DMD5 of the DMD, the aims of which are set out above. I also find conflict with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan and paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to ensure that there is a wide choice of high quality homes and that planning authorities plan for a mix of housing to meet their needs.

Other Matters

8. The Council is concerned that the appeal proposal does not provide sufficient information for them to be satisfied that the proposed development would make adequate provision for on-site parking, cycle parking and waste storage.
9. There is an existing vehicular access to the site from Linkside Gardens, and an area of hard surfacing within the site that would accommodate up to two cars. Properties within the immediate residential neighbourhood generally have access to curtilage parking, and at the time of my site visit, which was mid-day on a week day, there was a significant amount of unrestricted on-street parking space available. Whilst I accept that my site visit only provides a snapshot of the local highway situation, the site also lies in a relatively accessible location, close to some local services and public transport links. Furthermore, the site has a relatively large curtilage where there would appear to be sufficient space to accommodate both refuse and cycle storage facilities for the appeal proposal.
10. Accordingly, in the absence of any substantive evidence that would suggest otherwise, I am satisfied that should the appeal proposal have been acceptable in principle, then subject to conditions to secure on-site car parking, cycle and refuse storage facilities, the appeal proposal would not to my mind have an adverse impact on highway safety, and provision for refuse storage could be secured.
11. I have had regard to the appellant's health, however personal circumstances rarely outweigh planning considerations. The weight that I can afford to this matter is therefore limited.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR