



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3328391

21 The Grangeway, Enfield, Southgate N21 2HD

- 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 Khaled Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 23/00764/FUL, dated 2 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is shop front change with entrance door and side window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development had been completed prior to the application to the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the building and the Grange Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No.21 The Grangeway is located within the Grangeway Grange Park Local Centre and the Grange Park Conservation Area. It is a three storey building situated in a corner position and part of a short terrace of three buildings which have shopfronts at ground floor level with residential use above.
5. The previous shopfront has been significantly altered by removal of the pre-existing entrance door and replacing it by an aluminium framed door. The timber framed shopfront and part of the rendered stallriser have been removed and replaced by a glazed aluminium framed shopfront. There are new transom windows at the upper level and "black out" panels to the lower section. In particular, the original top row of small paned windows, which was a distinctive feature, has been removed. A side window facing Nester Avenue which also had small paned glass elements has been replaced by an aluminium framed window.
6. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or

appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

7. The Grange Park Conservation Area is relatively small and mainly based upon a group of houses built between 1910 and the 1930's. In terms of its special interest, the earlier parts possess a single unity in style deriving from a range of features influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement. The shopping parades have similar high quality features to many of the houses. The Council has referred to the Grange Park Conservation Area Appraisal, which advises that three parades of shops with flats over provide the focus for the conservation area. The appraisal states that they are of high architectural quality and have retained their distinctiveness, although it is much compromised by loss of original shopfronts and joinery and by poor maintenance and ugly additions.
8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Shop Fronts and Associated Advertisements advises that proposals for new shopfronts should be sensitive to the age and character of the building in which they are situated. At my site visit I observed that whilst the architectural form of the early shopping centre buildings remains, changes to shopfronts over time has eroded some of the cohesion in design, resulting in a varied street scene. Nevertheless, the replacement shopfront at No.21 has resulted in the loss of early features, including the ornate glazing, which are typical of buildings in the conservation area. It has also harmed the character and appearance of the short terrace that it is part of because the other two shopfronts still retain early design detailing and use of materials.
9. Although the shopfront has been replaced through the use of quality materials, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the short terrace of buildings and fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Grange Park Conservation Area.
10. However, I consider that the amount of harm to the conservation area is less than substantial. Paragraph 208 of the Framework indicates that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
11. The appellant submits that the alterations have improved the appearance and viability of the unit, thereby protecting its ongoing use for public benefit. However, no detailed evidence has been submitted to support this assertion. I find that the benefits from the proposal would primarily constitute private benefits for the appellant, rather than public benefits, and would not outweigh the harm that has resulted from the development to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
12. The development therefore conflicts with Enfield Core Strategy policies CP30 and CP31 which seek to maintain and improve the quality of the built environment and to preserve and enhance heritage assets. It conflicts with Enfield Development Management Document policies DMD40 and DMD44

regarding the development of ground floor frontages and need to conserve and enhance the special interest of heritage assets. It also fails to conform with London Plan policies D3, D4 and HC1 regarding design and the requirement to respect and enhance heritage assets that contribute to local character.

Other Matters

13. I am advised that the appellant was not aware that permission was needed for the works. However, that is not a determining matter in this appeal.

Conclusion,

14. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR