
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by John Gunn DipTP, DipDBE, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/21/3277548

First Floor Flat, 179 Willoughby Lane, Tottenham, London N17 0RY

- 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 Harry Chagar against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00117/FUL, dated 13 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a Loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a Loft conversion with rear dormer at First Floor Flat, 179 Willoughby Lane, Tottenham, London, N17 0RY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00117/FUL, dated 13 January 2021, 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: Location Plan, N.A/179WL/101, N.A/179WL/102, N.A/179WL/103, N.A/179WL/104, N.A/179WL/105 and N.A/179WL/106
 - 3) 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that it would be fair for me to have regard to the current version of the Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site occupies a corner location at the junction of Willoughby Lane and Dysons Road. It lies on the border between terraced houses to the north, west and east, and commercial premises to the south. The host property comprises of a first floor flat above a shop. It falls within a group of similarly designed buildings, with forward facing gables being a prominent feature of the immediate locality. They utilise a similar palette of materials.
5. The proposed dormer would be located on the rear facing roof slope. Whilst it would be visible from Willoughby Lane, and the southern part of Dyson Road, it's position towards the rear of the site, the limited amount the dormer would project above the lower ridge, and the presence of existing roof features, would mean that views of the proposal from the public realm would be very limited. Furthermore, given the tight arrangement of the buildings adjoining the site, views from the courtyard to the rear of the neighbouring property at 181 Willoughby Lane, would also be very limited.
6. I acknowledge that there were no examples of dormers on properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. I also note that there is an expectation within Policy DM13 that roof extensions, will normally be inset from the eaves, ridges and edges. However, the policy does not preclude roof extensions, or reduced insets. Given the proposals location and lack of prominence from surrounding areas, I find that the introduction of the proposed dormer, with limited insets, would not appear as a dominant or incongruous feature. I also note that the distinctive harmony of the gable would be unaffected.
7. In light of the above, I conclude that proposal would integrate suitably with its surroundings, in accordance with Policies D1, D3, D6 and D8 of The London Plan (2021) Policy CP30 of the Enfield Council Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 of Enfield's Development Management Document (2014). Similarly, the proposal accords with the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other matters, requires developments to be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Conditions

8. I have imposed conditions pertaining to the timescale for commencement of development and the approved plans for clarity, certainty and enforceability. In the interests of a good quality, contextually appropriate, outcome for the proposed development, I have required the materials to match the appeal building.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant considerations, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out.

John Gunn

INSPECTOR