
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3233114

86 Old Park Ridings, Southgate, London N21 2ES

- 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 Akin Aydemir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00747/HOU, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing windows to white upvc and front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the replacement of windows and doors in the front elevation and side elevation. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to replacement of windows and doors to the rear elevation and planning permission is granted for the installation of replacement uPVC windows and doors to the rear elevation at 86 Old Park Ridings, Southgate, London N21 2ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00747/HOU, dated 25 February 2019 and the plans referenced AYD-02-PL01 and AYD-02-PL02, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has been undertaken and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Grange Park Conservation Area (GPCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two-storey villa style dwelling. It is one in a row of three properties of this design that incorporates a distinctive double height semi-circular bay with projecting gable roof and a first-floor balcony above the front door. The appeal property is located in the Grange Park Conservation Area (GPCA) which is characterised by its range of residential properties including shops. The street on which the appeal site is located is notable for its variety of property styles, most of which contribute positively to the area in terms of their architectural and historic detail. At the rear, the

- appeal site overlooks a dense tree belt that is located in an area of open space that forms part of a golf club.
5. Although the appeal is retrospective the application form states that the previous windows and doors were timber and a photograph of the front elevation prior to the undertaking of the works has been submitted showing the previous windows and doors.
 6. On my site visit I noticed a range of window and door designs and materials in the surrounding area, including timber and uPVC. The existing windows and doors in the area that serve to enhance the character and appearance of the CA are painted timber windows which incorporate traditional features such as glazing bars and lead detailing. The existing windows and doors in the area which do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA are uPVC and lacking in any detailed features.
 7. I find that the windows and doors on the front and side elevation have a harmful effect on the distinctive character of the dwelling and detract from the significance of the property in terms of its contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The materials and the design are unsympathetic to the traditional appearance of the property with the frames appearing bulking and lacking in any texture, with the glazing lacking in any detail. Although there are existing uPVC windows and doors in the street-scene I am concerned that allowing additional examples on a key building would serve to exacerbate the harm that already exists. I am also required to determine the appeal on its individual merits. The Council have commented that the existing uPVC windows and doors in the street may have been installed prior to the implementation of the Article 4 direction, may be lawful by virtue of time, or have been installed without consent.
 8. The windows and doors in the rear elevation are not clearly visible or prominent from any public vantage points. The contribution of the rear elevation to the significance of the CA is less than the front elevation. Due to this lack of prominence and significance the windows and doors that have been installed to the rear elevation have a neutral impact, and therefore preserve, the character and appearance of the CA.
 9. Therefore, the windows and doors that have been installed in the front and side elevation do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the GPCA. Accordingly, there is conflict with Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policies 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.8 of The London Plan (2016) which seek, amongst other things, to deliver quality design and to protect the heritage assets of Enfield in terms of their character and appearance.
 10. The windows and doors in the front and side elevations are also contrary to guidance in the Grange Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015) and the Grange Park Conservation Area Management Proposals (2015) that sets out the significance of the CA and the management of development within it.
 11. The windows and doors that have been installed in the rear elevation have a neutral impact and thereby preserve the character and appearance of the GPCA. Accordingly, they comply with Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Development

Management Document (2014) and Policies 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.8 of The London Plan (2016) which seek, amongst other things, to deliver quality design and to protect the heritage assets of Enfield in terms of their character and appearance. They also broadly comply with guidance in the Grange Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015) and the Grange Park Conservation Area Management Proposals (2015) that sets out the significance of the CA and the management of development within it.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has commented that the windows and doors subject to the appeal are more energy efficient, more environmentally friendly and safer than the previous timber windows and comply with current building regulations. These matters do not however outweigh the harm I have identified is caused to the character and appearance of the CA. Also, there is nothing to suggest that the same could not be achieved with more appropriately designed windows and doors.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. Having regard to paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I find that the harm to the CA is relatively localised and therefore the development causes less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. I do not, however, find that this harm is outweighed by any public benefits of the development.
14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the replacement of windows and doors in the front elevation and side elevation but allowed insofar as it relates to replacement of windows and doors to the rear elevation. As the development has been undertaken, there is no need to impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans as suggested by the Council.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR