



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **D Wilson BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/24/3357431**

**31 Westminster Road, Edmonton, Enfield N9 8RA**

- 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 Baris Demirer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref is 24/01685/FUL.
  - The development proposed is change of use from dwelling house (Use class C3) to HMO (Use class C4) for up to 6 persons (retrospective).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant submitted amended plans<sup>1</sup> with the appeal. The changes include the removal of a bedroom on the ground floor and replacement with a communal area. It is also proposed to re-configure the loft bedroom through the removal of the kitchen. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the Council, and on which people's views were sought. While the Council have seen sight of the amended plans as part of this appeal, they have not had the opportunity to formally comment or consult on the amended plans prior to the appeal being lodged and significant changes to the appeal scheme are proposed, with the reduction in bedrooms conflicting with the description of development. For that reason, I consider that the Council, along with any interested parties, would be prejudiced if I determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plans. Accordingly, I have determined this appeal based on the plans originally submitted with the planning application, on which the Council made its decision.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with regard to internal living space.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exist and Prop. Ground Floor Plans 240503A-A1-03  
Pre-Exist. And Exist. First Floor Plans 240503A-A1-04  
Exist. And Prop. Loft Plans 240503A-A1-05  
Pre-Exist. And Exist Roof Plans 240503A-A1-06

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling that is situated within a predominantly residential area. The building contains a total of six bedrooms, with two being on the ground floor, three on the first floor and one large bedroom is located within the loft space.
5. Policy DMD 5 of the Development Management Document (DMD) Adopted November 2014 (DMD) states that residential conversions must meet the internal floor space standards in the London Plan and London Housing Design Guide. And that they should; provide a well designed, flexible and functional layout, with adequately sized rooms in accordance with the London Housing Design Guide.
6. The bedroom in the loft is located by a single door located at the top of the stairs and the room itself has its own kitchen and ensuite, which is accessed via the bedroom. This room is capable of providing independent living accommodation but would fall short of the minimum floor area and as such, would not provide an adequately sized room for future occupiers.
7. The only communal living space proposed is the kitchen on the ground floor. However, its small size would not enable a seating area for the six occupiers proposed. It would be a particularly cramped space when in use by occupiers whilst cooking and would therefore provide a poor shared living space for future occupiers.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with regard to internal space. It would be contrary to Policy D6 of The London Plan 2021, Core Policy 4 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 Part of Enfield's Local Development Framework Adopted November 2010 and Policies DMD 5 and DMD 8 of the DMD. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that housing development is of high quality design and provide adequately-sized rooms, meet internal space standards and provide well-designed, flexible and functional layout.

## Other Matters

9. The proposed development would provide accommodation for single occupants, contribute to providing diverse housing types and have the potential to address the needs of single-person households and young professionals. However, these benefits do not outweigh the inadequate internal space that would be provided.
10. The Council have found that adequate living conditions would be provided for future occupiers with regard to daylight and ventilation and that a sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space would be provided. I also note that it is suggested that the rooms would be well furnished and high quality. However, these are neutral matters.

## Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*D Wilson*

INSPECTOR