



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09/03/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3287341

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 Tadyllal Manic against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/03495/HOU, dated 12 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Hip to gable (granted under appeal) and extension to rear dormer window'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The side of Windmill Road where the appeal site is located is predominantly residential in character. No 54 sits within a section of the road mainly characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The host dwelling is an end-terraced property situated on a corner plot at the junction with Henley Road. It has been substantially extended and includes a two-storey side and rear projection. Large rear dormers are common in the area and the appeal dwelling has an existing box-dormer to its rear roof slope. However, this dormer and others in the area are generally set away from the boundary with Henley Road. This helps to reduce the prominence of these bulky roof additions with a focus on more traditional pitched roof forms closer to the boundary with the street. Overall, these factors give order and consistency to the street scene.
4. The evidence before me indicates that planning permission has already been granted for a hip to gable roof extension. However, the proposed dormer would combine with the gabled end to create a bulky and dominant roof form close to the roadside boundary. In addition, when seen cumulatively with the existing hipped roof of the rear projection and the existing box dormer, the proposal would result in an unconventional and cluttered roofscape to the side and rear of the dwelling which would significantly detract from the quality of the street scene.

5. I conclude, the development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with the design and local context requirements of Policy D4 (Delivering good design) of the London Plan (2021), Policies DMD 6 (Residential Character), DMD 8 (General Standards for New Residential Development), DMD 13 (Roof Extensions) and DMD 37 (Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development) of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (2014) and Policy CP30 (Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the Built and Open Environment) of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010).
6. The Council's decision also refers to Policy D1 (London's form, character and capacity for growth). This policy primarily relates to the preparation of area assessments and development plans. Whilst I have therefore not identified specific conflict with this policy, this does not diminish the conflict with the other development plan policies identified above.

Conclusion

7. The development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR