



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022

**by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21<sup>st</sup> July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3290542**

**20 Catherine Road, Enfield EN3 6DE**

- 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 Yusuf Solak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref 21/02067/FUL, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2021.
  - The development proposed is a new dwellinghouse for a single-family, which includes one double bedroom and one single bedroom.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. In their grounds of appeal, the appellant states that the Council did not upload the planning officer's report to its website. However, the officer's report has been submitted with the Council's questionnaire, and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment on it.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
  - Character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape;
  - Living conditions of residents of 18 Catherine Road with regards to outlook and light; and
  - Living conditions of future residents with regards to space standards.

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

5. The appeal site is located at the end of a small terrace of dwellings. Although there is some variation in the layout of the dwellings in this terrace and the use of materials, they are of a relatively consistent design which gives the terrace a pleasing if understated appearance.
6. The proposed dwelling would be located in a 2-storey extension to the side of No 20, in a gap between the host building and the neighbouring property of No 18. It may be that there is potential to locate an extension within the confines of the site.
7. However, the design of the proposal includes a number of features which give it an incongruous appearance. The front elevation of the proposal would project beyond the front wall of the terrace. Whilst the degree of projection would be limited, it would be readily apparent as a jarring feature which would detract from the appearance of the host building and the terrace as a whole. Although No 18 is set further forward in the streetscape, this does not justify the design of the proposal within the context of the host terrace.
8. The set back of the upper floor from the side boundary with a partial gable roof flush with the proposed front elevation would also appear as a contrived feature. The unsympathetic design of the main entrance and front ground floor window would add to this unfortunate appearance.
9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D4 of the London Plan 2021; CP 30 of the Core Strategy 2010; and DMD 7, DMD 8 and DMD 37 of the Development Management Document 2014 (the DMD). Together, these policies seek high quality development of garden land that takes account of the nature of the surrounding area, and responds to its context through its layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape.

### *Living Conditions - 18 Catherine Road*

10. The extension would project towards the side boundary with No 18. The rear elevation of No 18 includes an inset area and a rear offshoot which has a number of windows to habitable rooms, including glazed French doors on the ground floor.
11. Due to its height and proximity to No 18, the proposal would appear as an overbearing and enclosing feature in views from these windows. Similarly, based on the evidence before me and my observations on site, the proposal would also lead to a significant reduction in the amount of sunlight and daylight reaching those windows. Although the proposal would be set back from the side boundary at first floor level, this would not be sufficient to overcome the harm I have identified in respect of outlook and light.
12. I therefore conclude that, due to its scale and location, the proposed development would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of residents of No 18 with regards to outlook and light. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the amenity requirements of policies DMD 7 and DMD 8 of the DMD.

### *Living Conditions - Space Standards*

13. Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 establishes a number of criteria with regards to housing quality and standards. The appellant contends that the proposal would meet the minimum standards. However, although the submitted Design and Access Statement includes two different figures for the proposed single bedroom, both of these are below the required area as stated in policy D6.
14. With regards to the double bedroom, again two different figures are given, although it is only one of these which would not comply with the floorspace required by policy D6. However, mindful of the contradictory nature of the figures quoted, the appellant has not demonstrated that the proposal would meet planning policy.
15. The proposal would also only include a shower room as opposed to a bathroom, and I share the Council's concerns that this would not be suitable for the form of family housing proposed.
16. Based on the evidence before me, the proposal would not provide suitable living accommodation with regards to the internal space standards set out in local and national planning policy. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the housing quality and standards required by policies D6 of the London Plan; CP 4 of the Core Strategy; and DMD 6 and DMD 8 of the DMD.

### **Conclusion**

17. I am mindful of the benefits arising from the proposal, including the provision of a dwelling which would add to the supply and mix of housing in this area. However, the benefits arising from a single dwelling would be very limited, and would therefore not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in respect of character and appearance as well as living conditions. On these matters, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the Framework.
18. Overall, I conclude that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the identified benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. Consequently, the proposal would not represent sustainable development and the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Cross*

INSPECTOR