



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3366359

131 Croyland Road, London N9 7BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Anita Faloye against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00112/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a loft conversion to include rear dormer, dormer to rear outrigger and front roof lights.
-

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 host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of 2-storey houses with mirrored 2-storey outriggers to the rear. It is situated in a residential area comprising terraced housing of similar age and appearance. Except for 127 Croyland Road, which includes an imposing and incongruous rear roof addition, the terrace of which the appeal property forms part retains its original roof form. This gives it a high degree of uniformity at roof level, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a flat-roofed roof addition that would occupy the main rear roof slope and almost the entirety of the roof of the outrigger to enable the formation of 2 bedrooms. Whilst I note that this addition would not be visible from the street, due to its siting, bulk, massing and design it would be an overly dominant and incongruous element in views from gardens and properties to the rear and would severely harm the unity of the terrace.
5. For these reasons, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such it fails to accord with Policies DMD 6, DMD 8, DMD 13 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) and London Plan Policies insofar as they require good design that positively responds to local distinctiveness, is appropriate to the existing pattern of development, and does not harm the character of the area.

There is also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

6. The information before me indicates that the appeal property benefits from permitted development rights and that the appellant may be able to add a substantial roof addition to the rear of the appeal property without the need for planning permission. The appellant has suggested that the appeal proposal would be 1.85m³ larger than would be allowed under permitted development limitations. However, in the absence of clear evidence that this is in fact the case and a Certificate of Lawfulness to demonstrate what precisely can be constructed under permitted development rights, I attribute limited weight to the suggested fall-back scenario.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR