
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3374236

118A Galliard Road, Edmonton, Enfield N9 7LR

- 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 Mehmet Torun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00505/FUL.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage to self-contained dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal included on the application form is not clear. I have therefore adopted the description of development outlined within the Council decision letter.
3. The evidence indicates that the building is already being used as a dwellinghouse and I noted on my site visit that the building has its own entrance via the side elevation of No. 118 Galliard Road (No.118) along with its own post box.
4. I have been supplied with floor and elevation plans. However, the details on the plans that are before me differ from the arrangement that I observed on my site visit.
5. Amongst other more minor inconsistencies, whilst at the site I observed that the kitchen is located within the area identified on the plans as a bedroom, with the bedroom located within the area identified as a kitchen. There were also two high level windows present within the rear elevation, one serving the bedroom and one the bathroom to the rear of the building. These are not included within the elevation plan and are not clearly identified on the floor plans.
6. For the avoidance of doubt, I have made my decision on the basis of the plans, rather than on the basis of what I saw during my site visit.

Main Issues

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of the building with particular regard to the floorspace of the building, the provision of windows and overlooking.

Reasons

8. Regardless of whether the dwelling would comprise a 1 bed 2 person dwelling or a 1 bed 1 person dwelling, the accommodation on offer would fall short of the requirement for the latter on the basis of the plans, and the resultant floor space would be well below the 39m² (with bathroom) floor area detailed within Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP). That floor area is a minimum, which applicants are encouraged to exceed. The proposal would therefore provide undersized accommodation which by reason of its cramped nature would have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of future occupiers.
9. The proposed dwellinghouse would effectively form a single aspect dwelling given that it appears from the elevation plans that no window opening would be provided to the kitchen area, which would as a result mean that future occupiers would be dependent upon artificial lighting whilst it was in use. This would have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of future occupiers and Policy D6 of the LP indicates that single aspect dwellings should normally be avoided.
10. Given that the garden to the rear of No.118 is not of great depth, the dwelling would not be set back a substantial distance from the rear elevations of No.118 and other two storey properties on Galliard Road. Whilst the garden space for the proposed dwelling would be overlooked, that is also the case for other gardens within the locality where it is likely that views are available into garden spaces from other properties. I do not find conflict with the development plan in that regard.
11. However, the limited distance between the openings on the proposed dwelling and windows on the rear elevations of properties on Galliard Road would mean that occupants of the building would feel overlooked given there are openings on that side of the building which would serve the bedroom and living area, especially given that the properties on Galliard Road are two storey in height. This would have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of future occupiers. The separation distance within the evidence is detailed as 11m, which would fall well short of the distances outlined as being required within Policy DMD 10 of the DMD and although these are referenced as a minimum distance between rear facing windows, I consider them applicable to this case.
12. The proposal would therefore conflict with Core Policy 4 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) (CS), Policies DMD 8 and DMD 10 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) (2014) and Policy D6 of the LP which broadly seek good housing quality and standards in order to secure good quality living conditions.

Other Matters

13. The evidence indicates that the building within which the dwelling would be provided has previously benefitted from planning permission as a garage. Whilst of substantial construction, it is not a building in itself of such a scale, size or position that it causes any substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area.
14. The dwelling would be accessed along the existing side access between No. 118 and No. 120 Galliard Road through a gate. Storage space for up to three bicycles along with a refuse store are identified on the plans. Although limited information is provided, were I minded to allow the appeal it would be possible to secure further detail on these matters via condition. There are limited details with regard to

parking before me, but there is nothing within the evidence which compels me to consider that there would be any significant adverse effects arising as a result of any parking requirement associated with the dwelling.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

15. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there is nothing to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR