



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3367942

33 Doncaster Road, Edmonton, London N9 7RD

- 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 Hasmat Habibi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application reference is 25/00015/FUL.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing structure and the erection of a single-storey dwelling between Nos 33 and 35 Doncaster Road.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed development was described on the planning application form as the “erection of a single-storey dwelling on a gap site (no 33a) adjacent to 35 and 33 Doncaster Road currently vacant with a garage structure (and demolition of existing structure)”. A revised description was used on the decision notice issued by the Council, and subsequently on the appeal form; I have used that more concise wording in the banner heading above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether the proposed dwelling would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space and layout;
 - Whether the development would include adequate provision for cycle storage;
 - Whether the development would include adequate provision for the storage and collection of refuse and recycling; and
 - Whether the development would incorporate adequate measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change, with particular regard to minimising energy-related CO2 emissions.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal relates to a gap site, with a single garage on it, between Nos 33 and 35 Doncaster Road. It is in a suburban and predominantly residential area, with

housing of a variety of types and styles. Doncaster Road itself is characterised by short terraces from the early- and mid-20th century of relatively modestly scaled, two-storey houses with shallow front forecourts. Common (though not universal) features on the street include two-storey front bay windows (often with half-timbering), porches (evidently originally open, though some have subsequently been enclosed), red tiled hipped roofs (though the neighbouring No 35, among others, has recently had a hip-to-gable conversion) and rendered front walls (some painted, usually white, others with a bare “pebbledash” finish).

5. The proposed development is the removal of the garage, and the erection of a single-storey dwelling. This would extend across the full width of the gap between No 33 and No 35, with a flat roof behind a raised parapet. The principal front elevation would be set very slightly behind that of the houses on either side, but a front porch would extend beyond that elevation across most of the narrow plot. The porch would be comparable in size to that at No 35, but would be out-of-scale with the much smaller infill building proposed, dominating and overwhelming its frontage.
6. The overall design of the dwelling, and the similarity and very close proximity of the porch to that at No 35 would also be visually confusing; it would not read clearly as a self-contained dwelling, but because of its proportions and stylings it would also not read as a sympathetic or harmonious extension to the buildings on either side. The proposed cycle and refuse stores would also occupy much of the small front forecourt, adding to visual clutter and the sense of the new building having been shoehorned onto the site.
7. I note the Council's comments about the proposed materials, in particular the suggestion that render does not often weather well. I recognise that render usually needs regular maintenance and repainting, but given its widespread use in the area I do not consider it would be a fundamentally unacceptable material on this site. However, this does not outweigh or mitigate other harm I have found.
8. I also acknowledge, as I have set out in paragraph 4 above, that many of the properties on Doncaster Road have been altered. Sometimes alterations (for example, the addition of incongruous “stone” cladding, or clumsy infilling of open porches) could not, in my view, be said to have made a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area. If anything, though, the presence of unsympathetic alterations nearby highlights the importance of securing high-quality development. While the existing garage on the site is in a poor condition, and its removal would be no loss in terms of the quality of the area, the harm I have found the proposed dwelling would cause would be likely to endure for the long term.
9. While I have had regard to an earlier dismissed appeal¹ relating to a proposed two-storey dwelling on the same site, there are considerable differences between that scheme and the one before me now. While there is nothing in the earlier decision with which I would take issue, given the differences it has not had a great bearing on my overall conclusion here.
10. The proposed dwelling would be unsympathetic and cramped in its design, an incongruous and disruptive presence in the streetscape, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore conflict with Policy CP30 of the 2010 Enfield Core Strategy (“the ECS”), Policies

¹ PINS Ref: APP/Q5300/W/24/3338139

DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the 2014 Enfield Development Management Document (“the EDMD”), and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021.

Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high design standard, of a scale and form which is appropriate to its setting, and legible and easy to understand.

11. There would also be conflict with the provisions of section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”) which aim to achieve well-designed places, in particular Paragraph 135 which seeks to ensure that development functions well and adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive as a result of good architecture, sympathetic to local character, and establishes or maintains a strong sense of place.

Living conditions

12. The proposed dwelling would have a gross internal area (“GIA”) of around 39m², and so would comply with the minimum requirement for a one person single-storey dwelling set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, and which reflect the Nationally Described Space Standard (“the NDSS”) ^{2 3}. Whether a dwelling would provide adequate and successful housing is not simply a case of meeting that minimum standard, however. Policy D6 also requires comfortable and functional layouts; Policy DMD6 of the EDMD seeks a high standard of accommodation, and Policy DMD8 requires well-designed, flexible and functional layouts, “with adequately sized rooms in accordance with the London Housing Design Guide”.
13. The London Housing Design Guide has been superseded by the 2023 London Plan Guidance Housing Design Standards (“the LPG”). Among other things, the LPG says that combined living/kitchen/dining spaces for one person should have a minimum floor area of 21m², and that it should not include the space immediately inside the front door, or any circulation space needed to access other rooms. Here, by the Council’s measurement, the living/kitchen/dining space would be around 16.5m², and part of that would be the space by the front door. The submitted drawing does not, for example, show any space where even a small dining table might realistically be accommodated. In total, again by the Council’s measurement, around 6m² of the dwelling would be given over to circulation space, principally the corridor providing access to the shower room and bedroom.
14. No breakdown of the floor areas was provided in the submitted drawings and documentation. The appellant objected that the figures I have quoted above “must have thus been scaled off by the case officer”, though they have not actually disputed the accuracy of the Council’s calculations. It was suggested that the minimum floor area for the living/kitchen/dining area “could easily have been achieved if the large sleeping area had been reduced”, though given the considerable part of the dwelling given over to circulation space it is by no means obvious that this would achieve a significantly more comfortable layout (and no alternative drawings demonstrating how that would be done are before me).
15. The appellant drew my attention to an allowed 2009 appeal in respect of 55 Carterhatch Road⁴, elsewhere in Enfield, in which the Inspector granted permission for a development including a dwelling only around 2.4m wide at its

² Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard, Department for Communities and Local Government 2015

³ The minimum GIA for a dwelling of this type is 39m², though it can be reduced to 37m² where, as would be the case here, a shower room rather than a bathroom would be provided.

⁴ PINS Ref: APP/Q5300/A/08/2085358

narrowest. However, that decision is almost 17 years old, and my predecessor was working with a very different development plan – none of the ECS, EDMD or London Plan 2021 were in place at the time, nor had the NDSS been published. That appeal decision does not weigh significantly in favour of this proposal.

16. While I recognise that it is sometimes possible to create dwellings which provide adequate living spaces despite their narrow, awkward or otherwise constrained sites, for the reasons I have just set out I am not satisfied that this appeal proposal would achieve that. It would be likely to provide very cramped accommodation, even for its intended single occupier.
17. The proposed dwelling would not therefore provide acceptable living conditions. As a result, it would conflict with Policies DMD6 and DMD8 of the EDMD, and Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, the principle relevant provisions of which I have summarised in paragraph 12 above. There would also be conflict with Policy CP30 of the ECS, Policy DMD37 of the EDMD, and Policies D3, D4 and D5 of the London Plan 2021, which require built development to be of a high standard and suitable for its intended function, with inclusive design.
18. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the provisions of Chapter 12 of the Framework which aim to achieve well-designed places, in particular Paragraph 135 which seeks to ensure that developments function well, and provide a high standard of amenity for all users.
19. I find no conflict on this matter with Policy DMD9 of the EDMD, which relates to the provision of suitable private amenity space, or with Policy D8 of the London Plan 2021 which relates to the quality of the public realm. Both of these policies were referred to on the decision notice, but there is nothing before me to indicate how they are directly relevant to this matter. My finding on this point does not alter my overall conclusion on this matter.

Cycle storage

Refuse and recycling storage

20. The submitted drawings show that the proposed development would include storage units for bicycles, and for refuse and recycling. The submitted drawings indicate that there would be storage space for one bicycle, and for two refuse and one food bins. In terms of the *quantity* of space it seems that this would meet the minimum requirements.
21. However, the proposal is that the storage would comprise two separate front-opening cabinets, arranged in an L-shape on the front forecourt. One cabinet would be set in a recess at the side of the front porch, and overall it is not at all clear that it would be possible to open the cabinets fully. The storage arrangements proposed would not therefore be “fit for purpose”.
22. The appellant has suggested that this is a matter which could have been dealt with by conditions, and I agree that this is sometimes an appropriate course of action for matters such as this. Here though, it is not; as I have set out in addressing the character and appearance main issue above, the proposed size and siting of the cabinets on the very small front forecourt would contribute to the development having a cramped appearance. Any measures to make the cycle or refuse/recycling storage adequately functional would be likely to increase visual clutter at the front of the building, either by requiring larger cabinets, or by requiring the

proposed two cabinets to be spaced further apart. In turn, this would exacerbate the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

23. I conclude that the proposed development would not make adequate provision for cycle storage. In this respect there would be conflict with Policies CP24 and CP25 of the ECS, Policy DMD47 of the EDMD, and Policy T2 of the London Plan 2021 which they seek to encourage sustainable travel choices and support provision, including a convenient and accessible environment, for cyclists, and Policy DMD45 of the EDMD which requires the adequate provision of cycle parking.
24. I also conclude that the proposed development would not make adequate provision for the storage and collection of refuse and recycling. In this respect there would be conflict with Policy CP22 of the ECS, Policy DMD47 of the EDMD, and Policy T7 of the London Plan 2021 which, among other things, require appropriate provision to be made for the storage and collection of waste, with layouts which make safe, functional and efficient provision for servicing, including refuse collection.
25. For both of these issues, there would be conflict with the provisions of Chapter 9 of the Framework which seek to promote sustainable transport, notably Paragraph 115 which seeks to prioritise sustainable transport modes including cycling and Paragraph 117 which seeks efficient access by service vehicles. There would also be conflict with Chapter 12 of the Framework which aims to achieve well-designed places, in particular Paragraph 135 which seeks to ensure that developments function well.
26. I find no conflict on these matters with Policy DMD46 of the EDMD which relates to vehicle crossovers and dropped kerbs; with Policies DMD48 of the EDMD, and T3 and T4 of the London Plan 2021, which are primarily related to dealing with transport implications of larger developments; or with Policies T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan 2021 which relate to car parking standards. These policies were referred to in the reasons for refusal on the decision notice relating to cycle storage and the storage of refuse and recycling, but they do not appear to me to be directly relevant to the matters at issue here. My finding on this point does not alter my overall conclusions on these two matters.

Climate change

27. There are several relevant development plan policies addressing climate change and related matters. Policy CP20 of the ECS requires all new developments to address the causes and impacts of climate change by, among other things, minimising energy use, while Policy DMD49 of the EDMD requires all development to include measures capable of mitigating and adapting to climate change. Policy DMD50 seeks the achievement of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 (or equivalent) in minor residential development, where it is technically feasible and economically viable to do so. Policy DMD51 of the EDMD requires all developments to minimise energy-related CO₂ emissions in accordance with a prescribed “energy hierarchy”, while Policy DMD53 seeks further CO₂ reductions through the provision and use of on-site renewable energy generation and the use of low and zero carbon technologies.

28. The planning application was accompanied by an energy statement⁵ modelling the proposed development's energy demand and carbon emissions. This set out a "baseline" carbon emission position for the development based on the performance requirements of Part L of the Building Regulations, and then modelled reductions in line with the "be lean", "be clean" and "be green" tiers of the energy hierarchy set out in Policy SI2 of the London Plan 2021.
29. Applying "be lean" measures – seeking to minimise energy consumption through, for example, - maximising the insulating properties of the building fabric, achieving high levels of air tightness, and providing efficient services and lighting – was calculated to lead to a reduction in CO₂ emissions of 1.8% of the baseline. No suitable "be clean" measures (relating to supplying energy efficiently) were identified. The assessment of "be green" measures concluded that air source heat pumps ("ASHPs") *could* (my emphasis) be viable in the development, and that this would lead to a further reduction in CO₂ emissions of 52.7% of the baseline. The energy statement therefore concluded that the development could achieve a total reduction of 54.6% of the baseline CO₂ emissions.
30. The Council's officer report expressed concern that the CO₂ emissions had not been shown consistently in the application, though it did not explain in what way. During the appeal, the appellant stood by the energy statement, though without providing anything which directly addressed the Council's concerns. Nevertheless, and as the Council had also acknowledged, on the best reading of the evidence put forward, the scheme has at least the potential to comply with the development plan's requirements in respect of reducing CO₂ emissions and addressing the causes and impacts of climate change.
31. However, the information provided does not show how those reductions would be met – in particular, there is nothing to show where an ASHP would be located. Again this information is something which, in some circumstances could, were the development acceptable in all other respects, be dealt with by condition. However, having regard to the way the site is tightly constrained by neighbouring dwellings, I am not satisfied that would be the case here. While I recognise that ASHPs can run relatively quietly, as far as I am aware they are not yet silent so. If nothing else, therefore, in order to avoid noise causing unacceptable harm to neighbours' living conditions I consider it important that such details should be available to be considered at this stage rather than dealt with later by condition.
32. It has not been shown that the proposal would incorporate adequate measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change. It would therefore conflict with Policy CP20 of the ECS, and Policies DMD49, DMD50, DMD51 and DMD53 of the EDMD, the principle relevant provisions of which are set out above. For the same reason, it would also conflict with the provisions of Chapter 14 of the Framework, notably Paragraph 163 which states that the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change should be considered in preparing and assessing planning applications.
33. I find no conflict with Policy SI12 of the London Plan 2021, which was referred to in the decision notice (and, indeed, its officer report) on this matter, but which deals with flood risk management. Given the context, my assumption here is that the Council in fact meant Policy SI2, which among other things sets out the energy hierarchy as I have described in paragraph 28 above. In my view this is no more

⁵ Innervision Design, January 2025

than a minor, if unfortunately repeated, typographical error, and it has not had any significant bearing on my determination of this appeal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

34. Paragraph 11 d) and Footnote 8 of the Framework state that, where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date (including where the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, or where the Housing Delivery Test (“HDT”) indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below the housing requirement over the previous three years) planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The Council acknowledges that its most recent HDT results mean that this “presumption in favour of sustainable development” applies here.
35. The Framework seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. The appeal proposal would provide one self-contained dwelling, in a location which has a reasonable range of services nearby. However, while it would make a small contribution to increasing housing choice, the evidence before me is that one-bedroom market housing is identified a low priority in the borough’s most recent housing needs assessment. The single occupant of the dwelling could make only very limited contribution to supporting and sustaining local businesses and services. Overall, I consider that social and economic benefits arising from the development would be limited.
36. The development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, would not provide adequate living conditions for its occupier, and would not adequately mitigate or adapt to climate change. As I have set out in assessing the main issues above, there would be conflict with specific provisions of the Framework in respect of each of those matters.
37. The harm which would arise from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal would not therefore amount to sustainable development in the terms set out in the Framework.
38. The harm which would arise from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal would not therefore amount to sustainable development in the terms set out in the Framework.

M Cryan

Inspector