



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2024

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/23/3330497

25 Latymer Way, Edmonton, Enfield N9 9UB

- 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 Zenel Baraku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 23/01341/FUL.
 - The development proposed is sub-division of site together with conversion of single-family dwelling house into two single family dwellings, alterations to front fenestration, bike shed and drop kerb with vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Zenel Baraku against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield which is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have used the description of development as stated on the Council's decision notice, rather than that given on the application form, as this is more precise. While works to sub divide the appeal property are substantially complete, from my observations they do not generally correlate with what is shown on the plans. As such, for clarity, I have determined the appeal based on the plans that were before the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the living conditions of the future occupiers, with regard to internal space;
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - highway safety, with regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. While there would be no hallway at the proposed new dwelling, the front door would not lead directly into the main living area, owing to the proposed porch, which would also provide some limited storage space. However, the proposed kitchen is relatively small, and because of the location of the window and

doors, there would be limited wall space. The plans do not illustrate a layout for the kitchen, and it is not clear that appropriate facilities could be provided in the available space in a comfortable and functional layout to ensure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers on a day-to-day basis. Furthermore, proposed Bedroom 2 falls short of the advised floor area and minimum width of a single bedroom, as set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), indicative of the confined nature of the accommodation. Overall, the proposed accommodation would be generally limited in size, leading to a cramped and claustrophobic environment for the future occupiers.

6. Consequently, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers, with regard to internal space, and would conflict with Policy D6 of the LP, Policy CP4 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) (EPCS) and Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document (2014) (DMD). Amongst other things, these policies require housing development to be of a high-quality design, suitable for its intended function and to provide adequately sized rooms.

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site is a corner plot, located at the end of a residential street of generally uniform semi-detached properties, several of which have porches which are spaced out along the street. The similarity in the built form creates a sense of balance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appeal property benefits from an extension to the side and rear and its subdivision would make efficient use of the brownfield site. It would also contribute an additional small dwelling to the housing supply in an accessible location. Nevertheless, the proposal's design would not reflect the prevailing vernacular detail of the surrounding properties owing to the introduction of two porches in proximity to one another. This would be a visually discordant addition in the street scene due to the failure to respond to the pattern of built form along Latymer Way. The proposal would be unduly prominent, and it would stand out as being incongruous, unbalancing the character and appearance of the area.
9. Therefore, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the LP, Policy CP30 of the EPCS and Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the DMD. These policies include a requirement for development to optimise site capacity by ensuring that it is of the most appropriate form for the site and existing pattern of development, having regard to its context.

Highway safety

10. There is limited off street parking provision along Latymer Road, and I observed high levels of on-street parking as a result, with parked cars partially obstructing the pavement. The proposed access to the appeal site would remove a section of Latymer Road that could be used for on-street parking. While off-street car parking spaces are proposed, there is no substantive evidence that the car parking space for the proposed new dwelling could be safely accessed, achieve adequate site lines or meet manoeuvring requirements. Furthermore, there are inconsistencies in the submitted plans in relation to the location of the porch of the proposed dwelling and it has not

been clearly articulated that a parked car could readily be accommodated adjacent to the boundary wall as shown on plan ref LR25/209.

11. If the off-street parking space was not used for its intended purpose, the proposal could result in additional pressures for parking along Latymer Way from future occupiers, in combination with a reduction in space for off-street parking. This would be at a section of the road where there are parking restrictions owing to double yellow lines on one side of the road. In these circumstances, the proposal could affect the free flow of traffic, reduce visibility or pose a danger to pedestrians.
12. Consequently, the proposal would be harmful to highway safety, with regard to car parking, and would conflict with Policies T2, T4, T6 and T6.1 of the LP, Policies CP24 and CP25 of the CS and Policies DMD45, DMD47 and DMD48 of the DMD. These policies, amongst other things, require development proposals to not increase road danger, providing parking layouts with adequate site lines that meet manoeuvring requirements and vehicle access that does not have an adverse impact on highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

Other Matters

13. Policy compliance would be achieved on a range of other matters, including the effect of the proposal on trees and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, the lack of harm on these matters would be a neutral factor and would weigh neither for nor against the development.

Conclusion

14. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that I should take a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR