



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2026

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3376472

14 Evesham Road, London N11 2RN

- 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 Ms Lynzi Zilin Wang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application reference is 25/02513/HOU.
- The development for which permission is sought is the change of use of an outbuilding to a residential annexe.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of an outbuilding to a residential annexe at 14 Evesham Road, London N11 2RN in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/02513/HOU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The outbuilding to which this permission relates shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling known as 14 Evesham Road, London N11 2RN.

Procedural Matter

2. The development was described on the planning application form as
“Proposed change of use of existing outbuilding (previously approved with planning permission as a garage in 2016) to residential ancillary annex, including retention of internal fittings (shower and WC) installed in 2018. The annex is occasionally used by household members and is not used as a separate dwelling.”
3. I have used the shorter wording from the appeal form in the banner heading above, as it provides a more concise description of the development. I have not included the word “retrospective” as it is not descriptive of development, though as the development has been carried out I was able to view it during my site visit.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the use of the outbuilding as a residential annexe provides acceptable living conditions for occupiers, with particular regard to living space and layout.

Reasons

5. No 14 Evesham Road is a two-storey dwelling at the end of a terrace block next to the junction with Ollerton Road. The appeal relates to an outbuilding at the end of the rear garden, next to the boundary with No 1 Ollerton Road. The outbuilding

was originally approved in 2015 as a garage¹, though I understand that the garage door to Ollerton Road was sealed off in 2018. There is a pedestrian gate to the garden from Ollerton Road, which allows access to the outbuilding without it being necessary to go through the main house, but this is not in itself an unusual arrangement for a property on a corner plot. The outbuilding is of solid and permanent construction rather than a “shed”; it has been fitted out with a shower/WC, and a small set of kitchen-type units. The outbuilding is now being used as a residential annexe, and it is this change of use for which planning permission is now being sought.

6. The outbuilding has, by the Council’s measurement, a Gross Internal Area (“GIA”) of 19.88m². As the Council put it, this is “way less than” the 37m² minimum GIA requirement for a studio flat for one person set out in the Nationally Described Space Standard², which is applied by Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021; I agree. However, permission is not being sought for a self-contained dwelling, but for an annexe functionally linked to the main dwelling, so that it essentially acts as an extra bedroom for No 14. Although the outbuilding has a small set of kitchen units, including a sink and a fridge, it has neither oven nor hob, so it is not set up for an occupier to live completely independently from the main dwelling. In this light, I consider it provides an adequate amount of living space.
7. The main space within the outbuilding appeared to have acceptable daylight, and a reasonable outlook across the shared rear garden. The outbuilding does not have any garden space of its own; the Council infers from this that “the existing rear garden would be shared between occupants of the main property and the outbuilding”, though that observation only reflects the basis on which planning permission has been sought. I agree with the Council’s assessment that if the outbuilding were to be rented out separately “the lack of a dedicated amenity space would be to the significant detriment of the occupant” – apart from anything else, the small size of the garden would offer limited privacy for either party in that situation. However, it is adequate for a functionally linked use.
8. Although the Council’s officer report notes that “outbuildings are meant for incidental uses to the main property and not for habitation”, in my experience it is not entirely unusual for residential annexes – traditionally often known as a “granny flat”, but perhaps equally likely these days to be used by younger adult family members – to be in a separate building. I have not been made aware in this case of any planning policies or guidance which set specific standards for annexes, either in terms of living space, facilities, or which require them to be physically connected to the main dwelling. I emphasise that my decision is made on the basis that the proposal is not for independent occupation of the outbuilding. Use of the outbuilding as a separate dwelling would be a material change of use requiring a separate grant of planning permission.
9. For the reasons I have just set out, I conclude that the use of the outbuilding as a residential annexe provides acceptable living conditions for occupiers. As such, I find no conflict with Policies 4 and 30 of the 2010 Enfield Core Strategy, Policy DMD8 of the 2014 Enfield Development Management Document, or Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies

¹ LPA Ref: 15/04400/CEA

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

seek to ensure that residential development provides adequate internal and amenity space, with a flexible and functional layout and adequately-sized rooms.

Other Matters

10. In assessing the impact on neighbouring amenity, the Council found the development acceptable, though it went on to note in the same section of its report that it would be “an alien development in the setting” which would “detract from the established pattern of development in the area”. Apart from being couched in very broad terms rather than identifying specific harm, that analysis is somewhat at odds with its earlier conclusion that the change of use would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character of the area.
11. I also note that the level of comings and goings associated with the use of the outbuilding as an annexe would be unlikely to cause more disturbance to neighbours than would similar movements if it were used for other purposes ancillary to the main dwelling, such as a home office or gym. I consider that the development is acceptable in these respects.

Conditions

12. I have imposed a condition relating to the ancillary use of the outbuilding because, for the reasons I have set out above, its size and layout make it unsuitable for independent occupation. As the development has already been carried out, no other conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector