



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

**by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3368396**

**1A Raynham Terrace, Edmonton, London N18 2JN**

- 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 Mr J Azemi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application reference is 25/00609/FUL.
  - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormers.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with rear dormers at 1A Raynham Terrace, Edmonton, London N18 2JN in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/00609/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:
    - Location Plan (RT 1A)
    - Proposed Plans (RT 201, January 2025)
    - Proposed Elevations (RT 202, January 2025)
  - 3) Where they have not been specified on the application form or in the approved drawings, external materials used in the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. This appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached property, divided internally into two self-contained flats, at the corner of Raynham Terrace and Woolmer Road. The proposed development is a hip-to-gable conversion of the main roof, and the addition of a large rear dormer.
4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a variety of types and styles of housing. Most of the housing closest to the appeal site has hipped roofs, though the semi-detached pairs at 27-29 and 23-25 Woolmer Road have original gable ends, and the appeal property's attached "twin" No 3 Raynham Terrace has already had a hip-to-gable conversion. Given this immediate context, the proposed gable would not be out of keeping with its surroundings.

5. While there are some rear dormers visible from public spaces close to the appeal site, they appear to be limited in number rather than being a significant feature in the area's character or appearance. In this case, the proposed dormer would extend across the full width of the rear roof slope, and continue in an L-shape over the flat roof of a rear outrigger. It would be a prominent feature in the streetscene, visible from the north along Woolmer Road, from where it would add considerable mass to the roof of the building.
6. If I were considering the appeal proposal in isolation, it is likely that the bulk and mass of the rear dormer would not be acceptable. However, the roof alterations would not be seen on their own – at the moment, a large dormer on the attached No 3 gives the semi-detached pair including the appeal property an unbalanced and lopsided appearance, and the high party wall along the boundary between the two properties is a particularly stark and unsympathetic feature. While existing harm is not in itself a justification for further harm, in this case the proposed development would return a degree of visual balance and harmony to the building as a whole, so that the overall impact of the scheme would be approximately neutral. This is not a consideration which could necessarily be applied to any other similar proposal in the vicinity which might come forward.
7. I conclude that the proposed roof alterations would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy CP30 of the 2010 Enfield Core Strategy, Policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the 2014 Enfield Development Management Document, or Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, those policies seek to ensure that development (including residential extensions) achieves high quality design, is appropriate in scale and massing, and otherwise in keeping with the character of the property and the local area.

### **Conditions**

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have included a condition requiring materials matching the existing building to be used for the extension.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

*M Cryan*

Inspector