



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2019

by O S Woodward BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3240425

83 Holly Walk, Enfield EN2 6QB

- 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 Ms Denise Everitt-Story against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/02614/HOU, dated 19 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is insertion of front door to front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It appears from all I have seen during the appeal process that the appeal development has already been completed, so I have worded my decision accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, in particular on Enfield Town Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The site includes a house which forms part of a Victorian terrace of 15 properties running along the south side of Holly Walk. It is within Enfield Town Conservation Area. The terrace is attractive, well detailed and appears to have had minimal alterations to the front elevation. A distinctive feature of the terrace are the recessed porches, which add articulation to the front elevation. These have largely been retained along the terrace, although new front doors have been inserted to Nos 79, 95, 97 and 99. Of these, however, only Nos 79 and 95 fully enclose the porch, because Nos 97 and 99 remain partially recessed. All the properties, including those with new doors, have either entirely or mostly timber front entrance doors, which are robust and in keeping with the host terrace. These factors, both individually and combined, positively contribute towards the significance of this part of the conservation area.
5. The appeal door is positioned along the front elevation, fully enclosing the porch. The door has significant glazing to its top half, which affords views of the retained original door behind. The proportion of the door as glazing and the overall rather plain appearance are out of keeping with the character of the

host house and the wider terrace, including several recessed doors that are of a more traditional, ornamental design. The loss of the characteristic and attractive porch area, as an open feature, also harms the character and appearance of the largely unaltered terrace. This loss alone has an unacceptably harmful impact such that a condition could not be applied regarding the design detail of the door to overcome this objection. The development has therefore caused less than substantial harm to the conservation area.

6. A number of other front doors that are flush to the front elevation are found further east along Holly Walk. However, these are all on properties of different design and character which are situated around a corner from the subject terrace and are not appreciated as part of the same architectural composition. Consequently, they do not justify the appeal development.
7. Therefore, the door by reason of its location on the front elevation enclosing the porch and detailed design with excessive glazing, fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling, the terrace it forms a part of the wider Enfield Town Conservation Area, conflicting with the development plan, in particular the relevant parts of Policies CP30 (Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the Built and Open Environment) and CP31 (Built and Landscape Heritage) of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010, Policies DMD37 (Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development) and DMD44 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets) of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 and Policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan.
8. As set out above, the appeal development has caused less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of Enfield Town Conservation Area and the provision of a secondary front door provides no public benefits to outweigh this harm, failing to comply with Para 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. Concerns are raised regarding anti-social behaviour, community safety and heating the property. No evidence is provided that substantiates those concerns, nor that they could not be addressed by other means. I therefore attribute them limited weight.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

O S Woodward

Inspector