



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3179726

24 Westbury Road, London N11 2BY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Andrew and Pamela Koutsoudis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00768/HOU, dated 21 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer to create new bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer to create new bedroom at 24 Westbury Road, London N11 2BY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00768/HOU, dated 21 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 581/02, 581/03, 581/04/A, 581/05, 581/06/A, 581/07/A, 581/08, 581/09/A.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details /samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details /samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in an area of mixed suburban dwellings, being mainly semi-detached pairs along this particular road. The proposed rear dormer would occupy most of the main roof slope and would not be inset, subordinate or below the ridge line as the Council generally requires. However, it would largely not be seen from the rear as it would face the long flank wall to the adjacent rear dwelling running at right angles along the rear boundary to No 24 and blocking most views of it from the rear. It would not be readily visible from elsewhere within the wider area apart from the gardens either side. The relatively narrow separation between the pairs of dwellings and

the increase in chimney height would restrict views of the dormer towards the side and rear, so that there would be no significant effect from those vantage points.

4. However, the frontage would be altered by the gable end and increase in ridge height of about 1m. Nevertheless I find the effect on the frontage is limited, because there would be a small increase in ridge height that would be offset by a parapet. The proposed gable end with dormer behind would result in a different main roof profile and layout compared to the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. There would be a relatively modest increase in overall height and width to the roof of No 24 but in all other respects their frontages would continue to match, so I find in this case this would not significantly disrupt the character of the pair of semis, or allow No 24 to dominate to the detriment of No 22.
5. I observed the character of the area reflects several examples of a similar roof development in the same road and surrounding roads which did not appear significantly discordant or dominant, and I have no reason arising from the appeal to consider that this case would be so. I have also taken account of the fact the appellant drew my attention specifically to similar alterations made at Nos 36, 51 and 55. Notwithstanding that, similar developments do not automatically set a precedent.
6. Given the limited visibility of the proposed development from the side and rear, and its limited effect to the front, the appearance of the development would not appear materially harmful in the local context given its residential nature and the local variations in roof styles at differing properties in the mixed character of the vicinity. Consequently the development would not be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area as a whole.
7. The development would not fulfil all the criteria of Policy DMD13 on Roof Extensions. However, I find there are material considerations as identified above which mean the resulting development would not be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area despite that. I conclude it would otherwise accord with the London Borough of Enfield's 2014 Development Management Document Policy DMD37, and Core Strategy Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

Other Matters

8. I have noted that works to the roof may affect the neighbouring property under the Party Wall Act, however that is a separate regime that has not had any significant bearing in my decision as it does not fall within my remit as regards the Planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

9. Conditions have been imposed in the interest of certainty and to ensure a satisfactory final appearance to the development. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

S Jones INSPECTOR