



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3275931

54 Windmill Road, Edmonton, N18 1PA

- 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 Tadylall Manic against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/01145/HOU, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to roof to form gable end involving rear rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to roof to form gable end involving rear rooflight at 54 Windmill Road, Edmonton, N18 1PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01145/HOU, dated 25 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: MARCH21_54WMR_01 and MARCH21_54WMR_02.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of the proposed development on the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposal.
3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). However, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed and there was no need, therefore, to invite the parties to make further submissions in response to this revision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of Windmill Road and on the corner of that road with Henley Road. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace two storey house that has already been extended to the rear, side and at roof level. The surrounding area comprises similar two storey houses, a number of which have also been extended.
6. The appeal proposal involves extending the hip end to the main roof to form a gable end. A new rooflight would also be installed on the rear elevation of the roof, to which there is no objection. The Council acknowledge that, as a result of the various extensions to the host property, not much of its original elevational detailing remains. The original roof form, in particular, has been substantially altered through the construction of a two storey side extension and a rear dormer roof extension.
7. In relation to the surrounding area, there are a number of similar large roof extensions, including those on the properties that form part of the same terrace as the appeal site. There are also examples of properties with gable ends, either side on or fronting Windmill Road, including a recent gable extension at 40 Windmill Road (No.40). Whilst the Council indicate that the latter was built under permitted development and was not subject to local plan policies that seek to control roof extensions, the existence of this gable extension has not, in my judgement, resulted in any significant harm to the character or balance of that property or the terrace it forms part of.
8. As I also noted on my site visit, works appear to be progressing to construct a gable extension at 64 Windmill Road. This property occupies a similar end of terrace location as the appeal site. As with No.40, this gable extension would not, in my view, disrupt the character or balance of that property or the terrace it forms part of.
9. Within the above context and whilst I accept that the appeal site occupies a prominent corner location, the proposed hip to gable end would not, in my judgement, result in any harm to the appearance of the host property or the wider terrace that it forms part of. As with the other examples, it would not disrupt the character or balance of the host property or the wider terrace.
10. The proposed gable end would sit reasonably comfortably within the extended and much changed roofscape to the host property. It would introduce more interest and variety to the existing roofscape of the wider terrace, and would do so in a form that would be proportionate to the scale, form and massing of the host property's extended roof. The proposal would not, therefore, be overly dominant or incongruous.
11. Whilst I accept that the property at the opposite end of the terrace, to the appeal site, maintains a hip end, the distance that separates it from the appeal property means that the two are not read together. Even so, although the appeal proposal would change the appearance and rhythm of the existing roofscape there would be no harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property or streetscene.
12. The Council contend that the proposed gable end would not respect the original and established roof form, its shape and massing. As I confirmed above, the host property has already been substantially extended and altered, and within

that context the proposed gable extension would not result in any harm to its appearance.

13. Accordingly, I find that the proposed gable end extension would not be at variance with policy D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, policy DMD 6, 8, 13 and 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 or the corresponding policies of the Framework.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested various conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. Conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plans and for materials to match existing, are necessary and reasonable in order to secure a high-quality development and to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a list of approved plans.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR