



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 July 2021

by Mr James Blackwell LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3271337

166 Winchmore Hill Road, Southgate N21 1QP

- 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 Hassan Dogan against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/03553/HOU, dated 31 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as loft conversion with rear dormer windows and velux windows to the front and side, part first floor rear extension including roof alteration to the existing side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer windows and velux windows to the front and side, part first floor rear extension including roof alteration to the existing side extension at 166 Winchmore Hill Road, Southgate N21 1QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/03553/HOU, dated 31 October 2020, 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 drawings: D03 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan); D04 (Proposed First Floor Plan); D05 (Proposed Loft Plan); D07 (Proposed Roof Plan); D10 (Proposed Elevations); D11 Rev 1 (Proposed Elevations); D12 (Proposed Section AA); D13 (Proposed Section BB); D14 (Block Plan); and D15 (Site Location Plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of the planning application, the 2016 iteration of the London Plan has been superseded. Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the 2016 Plan¹ were cited in the Council's reason for refusal. Whilst both parties have been given the opportunity to comment, I have received no further representations from the parties on the implications of the 2021 Plan² with regard to the proposed development. Nonetheless, in this case I am satisfied that I can rely

¹ The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (2016)

² The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021)

on the policies of the Council's adopted Core Strategy³ (Core Strategy) and the Council's Development Management Document (2014) (DMD), as the content of these policies in relation to the main issue of this case is consistent with the broad strategic policies of the London Plans and the overarching design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located on the southern side of Winchmore Hill Road. The properties along this side of the road are mostly detached or semi-detached and vary in terms of design and style. Whilst the roofs on the southern side of the road share a consistent ridge height, roof design along the road is mixed. As a result, there is no particular symmetry or uniformity between the properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal dwelling.
5. The proposed development would reconfigure the existing roof to incorporate an additional storey to the property, which would be achieved by extending the front and rear roof planes at each side. The new roof would not increase the height of the property, so the dwelling would remain aligned with the ridge height of neighbouring properties. The top floor would be integrated within a sloped roof at the front and back, which ensures the additional storey would appear proportionate to the existing dwelling, and not overly dominant when viewed from the street. The roofs of the properties on either side of the appeal dwelling have also been converted to accommodate an additional floor, so the development would be in-keeping with the pattern of development in the area.
6. At the front of the appeal property, there is an existing side extension which projects out from the main bulk of the dwelling. This extension currently has a flat roof which runs into the front slope of the roof over the main part of the house. Due to the mis-matched roof treatments between these two elements of the dwelling, the side extension currently jars with the main part of the property, and therefore appears prominent and visually obtrusive. This is harmful to the appearance of the appeal property and the wider street scene. The proposed development would reconfigure the roof over the side extension, so that it follows the same pitch as the main bulk of the roof at the front and both sides. This design would allow the existing side extension to integrate much more effectively with the host dwelling, which would significantly improve its appearance. This would contribute positively to the street scene.
7. The development would incorporate two dormers at the rear, each of which would include a Juliet balcony under a modest pitched roof. Policy DMD13 of the Council's DMD says that rear dormers should be inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof, with inset distances usually expected to be between 500-750mm. Whilst these inset distances would be met from both the eaves and the edges, the inset distance from the ridge of the dormers to the ridge of the main roof would fall short. Nonetheless, it was apparent from my site visit that most of the neighbouring properties to the east of the appeal property

³ The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010 – 2025 (2010) (Core Strategy)

incorporate full width flat roof rear dormers, which are significantly bulkier than the dormers proposed in this instance. Whilst I acknowledge the Council's comments that these dormers are not necessarily authorised, due to their prevalence, they have nonetheless become a common feature at the rear of these properties. When considered in this wider context, I am satisfied that the slight shortfall in inset distance between the ridge of the dormers and the ridge of the appeal property would not lead to an unacceptable degree of prominence, as the dormers would be consistent with the pattern of development in the vicinity of the appeal property.

8. Similarly, whilst I acknowledge the Council's comments that the scale of window openings should generally reduce as you go up a building to ensure hierarchy and subservience, there are several examples of Juliet balconies within the roofscape of properties neighbouring the appeal dwelling. Given they are already a feature within the vicinity of the appeal dwelling, I do not consider that they would appear incongruous or discordant with the host property.
9. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling nor the surrounding area. The development would therefore be consistent with Policies CP4 and CP30 of the Core Strategy, which seek to ensure that development achieves high-quality design which responds well to local distinctiveness. The development would also be consistent with the objectives of Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Council's Development Management Document⁴, which set out design guidelines to ensure that extensions respect the character of the area through appropriate size, scale, bulk and massing. Finally, the development would be consistent with the overall design objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

10. The Council has expressed concern that the external materials of the Juliet balconies would not match the existing dwelling. Whilst the annotations on the drawings do indicate that the materials would indeed match, a condition can be included to ensure this is the case.

Conditions

11. I have included a plans condition for clarity. As just mentioned, to ensure the development is consistent with the current design of the appeal property, I have included a condition requiring the external finishes to match those of the existing property.
12. Whilst the Council has suggested a condition to restrict any recreational usage of the new roof, I do not consider that any elements of the new roof could conceivably be used for such purposes. As such, I do not consider such a condition to be necessary in this instance.

⁴ Development Management Document (DMD), November 2014

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR