

Monthly Decisions on Town Planning Application Appeals

- 1.1 Between the 3rd December and the 31st of December 2010, 14 appeal decisions had been received from the Planning Inspectorate. One of those was withdrawn. The table below confirms how many appeals were upheld and how many were dismissed. Details of each appeal can be viewed on the departmental website.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

APPEALS RECEIVED	DISMISSED	ALLOWED	WITHDRAWN	PERCENTAGE DISMISSED
14	9	4	1	70% Not including invalid appeal

- 1.2 Of the overall number of appeals these have been divided between delegated decisions, i.e those made by officers under the scheme of delegation and committee decisions. It will be noted that no appeals of refusals at committee had been determined.

DELEGATED DECISIONS

No. of APPEALS	DISMISSED	ALLOWED	WITHDRAWN	PERCENTAGE DISMISSED
14	9	4	1	70%

COMMITTEE DECISIONS

	No. of APPEALS	DISMISSED	ALLOWED	WITHDRAWN	PERCENTAGE DISMISSED
Refusal as per officer recommendation	0	0	0	0	_Not applicable as no appeals decided
Refusal against officer recommendation	0	0	0	0	Not applicable as no appeals decided

Key Issues raised with Planning Inspector

Members will be interested to note the outcome of one of the appeals which allowed an appeal on an application refused by officers on the 30th March 2010. The application was at 4 St Andrews Road, Enfield, EN1 3UB and proposed the conversion of a single family dwelling house into 2 self contained flats comprising of 1 and 2 bed flats. The department refused the application as the net internal floor area of the existing dwelling is below the minimum standards for the creation of a one and two-bed units and the subsequent loss of a 3 bedroom single family dwelling, would result in an over intensive use of the property and unacceptable residential mix not in accordance with the Enfield Strategic Housing Assessment 2010) which identifies a need for large family size residential accommodation and an oversupply of smaller single person accommodation. Moreover, the department felt that the development would result in the loss of a property more appropriately occupied as a single family dwelling house which contributes to the availability of a full range and size of dwellings in the Borough's housing stock.

The inspector whilst acknowledging that the proposal would conflict with Core Strategy Policy CP5 felt that as the conversion would result in a net increase in the housing stock of one dwelling and therefore felt that this factor was sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the Core Strategy. He also felt that the proposed extension could be included in the overall calculation of gross internal floorspace.

The Inspectors decision is disappointing and appears inconsistent with other appeal decisions which have placed a great deal of weight on safeguarding against the loss of family housing. The department feels that notwithstanding the fact that the proposal would lead to an increase in the housing stock the loss of the family unit which there is a particular shortage of should have been the defining issue as safeguarding against its loss should have outweighed any benefits accrued by the additional 1 bed flat.