



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: 14 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3372717

7 Bourne Hill, Enfield, Southgate N13 4LJ

- 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 Ridgeway London Properties against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/02104/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of dwellinghouse into 2x flats including terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed loss of a dwellinghouse upon the supply of family-sized housing,
 - whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupants, with regards to private amenity space provision,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with regard to privacy and noise and disturbance, and;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the area.

Reasons

Family-sized housing

3. Policy DMD 5 of the Enfield Development Management Document (Enfield DMD) requires development involving the conversion of existing family units into self-contained flats to provide compensatory provision for family accommodation, which is identified as accommodation of three bedrooms or more.
4. The proposal would provide two flats, which the submitted plans identify as a one-bedroom flat on the ground floor, and a two-bedroom unit on the upper floors. Although the appellant has referenced a labelling error, the proposed floor plans for the unit on the upper floors indicate a study/office space and not a third bedroom. Whilst the study/office space is large enough for a single bedroom, given

the overall Gross Internal Floor Area of this flat would be around 87sqm, it would fail to meet the space standards required by Policy D6 of The London Plan and the NDSS of 93sqm for a 3-bedroom 5-person unit over 2 storeys. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal, based on the proposed unit on the upper floors being a two-bedroom flat. As such, the proposal would result in the loss of the existing dwellinghouse on the appeal site, and that the proposal would fail to provide family sized accommodation.

5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect upon the supply of family-sized housing. As such, it would be contrary to Policies DMD 4 and DMD 5 of the Enfield DMD, Core Policy 5 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (Core Strategy) and Policy GC4 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to prevent the loss of existing family units. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 63 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seeks, amongst other matters, housing that meets the needs of different group in the community.

Living conditions – future occupiers

6. Each of the two flats would be provided with private amenity spaces. The proposed upper floor unit would have an external amenity area of around 6.6sqm, with this size falling considerably short of the minimum 23sqm required for this size of dwelling as set out in Policy DMD 9 of the Enfield DMD. This roof terrace, given its proposed depth of 1.2m, would also fail to comply with the size of private outside space required by Policy D6 of The London Plan. Given this part of the proposal is for a 4-person residential unit, the small size of the roof terrace would not provide sufficient external amenity space for future occupants.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would fail to provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupants, with regard to private amenity space provision. As such, it would be contrary to Policies DMD 5 and DMD 9 of the Enfield DMD, Core Policy 4 and Core Policy 5 of the Core Strategy, and Policy D6 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, good quality and adequately sized private amenity spaces. It would also conflict with Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Living conditions – neighbouring occupiers

8. The proposed flat on the upper floors would be served by a terrace at roof level. As it is proposed to have 1.8m high timber screens, this would limit overlooking to the garden areas of the neighbouring buildings to either side, with views mainly being to the rear parking area and beyond to the gable of the property on Caversham Avenue.
9. The Council has referenced concerns arising from the perception of overlooking but given the short projection of the terrace, which would have screening set close to the boundaries with No. 7A and 9 Bourne Hill, I do not consider that there would be any material harm arising from any such perception.
10. The proposed terrace would provide future occupants with an external area to sit out in and utilise. Whilst this would inevitably generate some noise, and noting the elevated position of the terrace, such activity would not be dissimilar to the use of nearby rear garden areas. The terrace would not be of a size that would allow for

large gatherings, and as such, there would not therefore be any harmful noise or disturbance arising.

11. Given the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to privacy or noise and disturbance. As such, it would comply with Policies DMD 8, DMD 9 and DMD 68 of the Enfield DMD and Policy D3 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to preserve amenity, including in relation to privacy and noise and disturbance. It would also not be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Reference has been made in the refusal notice to Core Policy 30 of the Core Strategy, but this is not directly relevant to living condition matters.

Character and appearance

12. The appeal site is situated in an area that exhibits a variety of building types and designs. The setback of properties behind front garden and parking areas, as well as the presence of street trees and grass verges, provides for a pleasant, verdant residential character to the area.
13. The appeal property forms part of a short terrace row that feature small box style dormers. The proposal would replace one of these with doors that would provide access to a proposed external terrace which would be enclosed by a timber screen to the sides and a glazed balustrade to the front. Whilst this would differ from the simple appearance of the dormers on this terrace row, I was able to see variety in the design of roof forms in the immediate area around the appeal site, including front dormer additions and variation in materials. In this context, the proposed roof terrace which would be to the rear of the site, would not appear as an incongruous addition.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and the area. As such, it would not be contrary to Policies DMD 13 and DMD 37 of the Enfield DMD, Core Policy 30 of the Core Strategy and Policy D3 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design that has special regard to their context. It would also comply with Paragraph 135 of the Framework which seeks development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

15. The Council's decision raises no concerns in relation to refuse and recycling collection arrangements or parking pressures. These are neutral matters and not ones which weigh in favour of the development.
16. Reference has been made to the planning history of the appeal property and enforcement action. I have however dealt with the appeal before me on its own merits, having regard to the description of the development from a dwellinghouse to two flats.

Conclusion

17. There would be no harm in relation to the effect of the proposed development on neighbouring occupiers or in relation to character and appearance, but these are neutral considerations.

18. The proposed development would be harmful in relation to the supply of family-sized housing and would fail to provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupiers. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR