



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3362135

55A Redlands Road, Enfield EN3 5HN

- 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 Trevor Ford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/03877/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a “1 bed 2p dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Revised drawings have been submitted with the appeal. These include changes to the size, siting, footprint and appearance of the proposed dwelling. These amendments represent a fundamental change to the appeal proposal and are tantamount to a new scheme. In addition, the revised drawings have not been subject to consultation and therefore it would be prejudicial to the interests of interested parties to take them into account. For these reasons determining the appeal on the basis of the revised drawings would be contrary to the principles established by the Courts¹ and the advice in the Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals – England (2025), which states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i) whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to external and internal space provision, natural light, outlook, privacy and natural ventilation, and
 - ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

¹ Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney (2018), which refined the “Wheatcroft principles” set out in Bernard Wheatcroft v Secretary of State for the Environment (1982)

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The appeal site comprises a small parcel of land situated to the rear of 55A Redlands Road. It fronts onto a road, The Brightside, and is bounded by gardens on 2 sides and by a forecourt serving garages to the west. It is located in a residential area that predominately comprises 2-storey terraced houses with hipped roofs and relatively long rear gardens.
5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a 2-storey, 1-bedroom, 2-person detached dwelling. This would occupy a significant proportion of the site leaving negligible space between the house and the high boundary fences for useable private amenity space. Although I note that this space would exceed the minimum requirements in terms of its area, due to its layout and the high level of enclosure created by surrounding fences it would not provide adequate amenity for future occupiers.
6. The proposal would face the road. Apart from a single door, the rear and flank elevations of the dwelling would be without any apertures resulting in an essentially single aspect dwelling with limited outlook and access to natural light. In particular, due to its orientation, sunlight within the dwelling would be negligible and the scope for cross ventilation, particularly at first floor level, would be limited.
7. The window² serving the kitchen/living/dining area would be very close to the back edge of the pavement. There would be limited scope for defensible space or planting within this narrow strip of private land and therefore passersby would be able to easily look into the main living space resulting in extremely compromised levels of privacy. Installing obscured glazing or closing curtains or blinds would further exacerbate the outlook and natural light issues identified above.
8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposal would provide unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It therefore fails to accord with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) which, amongst other matters, requires development to provide sufficient daylight and sunlight, useable outside amenity space and dual aspect dwellings. There is also conflict with Policies DMD6, DMD8, and DMD9 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (EDMD) which seek high quality accommodation and amenity space. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of the London Plan Guidance Housing Design Standards (2023).
9. The Council has suggested that the proposal does not accord with the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015) (NDSS) which require a Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 58sqm for a 2-storey, 1-bedroom, 2-person dwelling. However, the Council's measurements exclude the hallway and stairs. The NDSS defines GIA as the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls that enclose the dwelling which includes partitions, structural elements, cupboards, ducts, flights of stairs and voids above stairs. The Council's assessment is therefore flawed in this respect. By my calculation the GIA of the proposal is 58sqm and therefore there is no conflict with the NDSS in this respect.

² The floor plan shows 2 windows the elevation shows one.

10. Whilst the proposal does not include any internal space specifically demarcated for storage the floor plans show a very small unlabelled room on the first floor. Given its size, and the absence of a window, I consider it likely this room would provide storage and therefore the requirements of the HDSS would be accorded with in this respect.

Character and Appearance

11. Due to its siting close to the road, and its separation from other houses the appeal proposal would be an anomaly in this area where terraced housing with front gardens prevail. In addition, due to its siting the windowless flank elevations would be unduly prominent and incongruous features in the street scene particularly in the view looking towards Redlands Road from The Brightside.
12. Due to its siting and design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it fails to accord with the aims of LP Policy D3, EDMD Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 and Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) (CS) insofar as they require good design that positively responds to local distinctiveness, is appropriate to the existing pattern of development, and does not harm the character of the area.

Other Matters

13. The Council has cited many planning policies in its reasons for refusal including some that are explicitly related to residential extensions. Those policies not been referred to above are not directly related to the matters before me.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR