
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3372869

18 Tudor Road, Edmonton, Enfield N9 8NY

- 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 Ali Demir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/02023/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from a single family dwelling (use class C3) to a 6-person House in Multiple Occupation (use class C4).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. An amended plan has been provided with the appeal submission, which showed the removal of bedroom 6 and an enlarged bedroom 5 in response to the refusal reason. Whilst the amendment relates to an internal change that seeks to improve the quality of the accommodation, having regard to the Wheatcroft principles, and given there are a number of third party interested parties who have made representations at the application stage, who would not have commented on the amended scheme, this would result in procedural unfairness. I will therefore proceed to determine the appeal based on the plans determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupants, with regard to floor to ceiling heights.

Reasons

4. The proposal would provide two bedrooms in the loft, one of which would largely be under the sloping roof of the appeal property. The London Plan at Policy D6 requires development to meet the minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area. The majority of the floorspace in bedroom 6 would be below the minimum 2.5m height, with the Appellant acknowledging that this bedroom would not provide sufficient space with acceptable ceiling heights. Given that most of the room would not have sufficient height, this would unduly restrict the usability of the internal space within this bedroom.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would fail to provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupants with regard to floor to ceiling heights. As such, it would be contrary to Policies D3 and D6 of The London Plan,

Policies CP4 and CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DMD 5 and DMD 8 of the Enfield Development Management Document, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design with rooms that have comfortable and functional layouts. It would also be contrary to Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out standards to ensure that development proposals create well-designed places that are of high quality.

Other Matters

6. The refusal does not identify any other concerns including in relation to parking, waste or the concentration of HMOs. These are all however neutral matters, and not ones which weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

7. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR