



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/23/3326836 64 Aldermans Hill, Southgate N13 4PP

- 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 Arjan Borufi against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/02924/FUL, dated 11 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as Application for planning permission to retain the existing shopfront.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of new shopfront at 64 Aldermans Hill, Southgate N13 4PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02924/FUL, dated 11 September 2020, and the following submitted plans: Location Plan, Block Plan – 353.BP.01, Drawing No 353.P.01 and Drawing No 353.P.02.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, the appeal form includes different wording which better captures the scope of the development, which has already been carried out, and reflects the description in the Council's decision notice. I have therefore used this revised description in my decision, although I have omitted words which do not describe acts of development.
3. My attention has been drawn to the roller shutter which is installed on the appeal site. However, it is neither shown on the submitted plans nor referenced in the description of development. Accordingly, although the appeal submissions of the main parties deliberate on the acceptability of the roller shutter, I have determined the appeal based on what is proposed, as per the submitted plans. My decision does therefore not cover the roller shutter.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023. However, as its provisions that are most relevant to this appeal have not materially changed, no parties will have been prejudiced by my having regard to the latest version in reaching my decision.
5. As the proposal is in a conservation area (CA), I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, as set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). Although the Council's Officer Report identifies that there is insufficient heritage-related information, the evidence

submitted with the appeal includes sufficient detail to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Lakes Estate CA.

Reasons

7. The site contains a café bar within a terrace which includes ground-floor commercial units in Park Parade. The traditional terrace has a consistent overall vernacular, with for example the upper floors containing striking architectural features such as a corner turret, bay windows, brick arches and gables. However, whilst consoles and brick pilasters remain between the ground-floor units, the parade of shopfronts and associated features are varied and incorporate a mixture of designs and materials. For example, fascias vary in style, height, width and depth, some shopfronts have a traditional design with stallrisers whilst others have a contemporary appearance with more glazing and aluminium framing, one of the shopfronts is set back, and some units have projecting canopies. This variety is reflected in the adjoining terrace which has a similar architectural coherence overall but contains a mixture of shopfronts with a variety of ground-floor designs and features. The site and surrounding area therefore read as being characterised by active commercial frontages with a mixture of designs and appearances in attractive terraces.
8. The site is within the Lakes Estate CA. On the basis of the submitted evidence, including the details provided in the appellant's appeal statement, the CA's significance stems from, amongst other things, the architectural and historic interest of the Edwardian buildings estate. With its regular layout and developed over an unusually short period, the high-quality buildings include various decorative features. The Park Parade terrace positively contributes to this, but the intrinsic interest and its main contribution to the CA stems from its overall form, with the contribution of the much-changed ground-floor units predominantly stemming from their provision of a lively, active parade.
9. Situated beneath a canopy, the installed shopfront is set back and, containing black aluminium bifold doors with extensive glazing, has a contemporary appearance. The fascia is relatively large and, as per submitted evidence indicates and on close inspection, appears to have been attached on top of a previous fascia. However, despite the set-back (which is relatively small) and the extent of glazing and aluminium framing, the shopfront reads as an acceptable feature in the streetscene and does not detract from the terrace's overall coherence and grandeur. Its materials and simple design, along with the fascia (including its width, height, depth and materials) reflect other units in the parade and thus appear as congruous, unobtrusive features in their context. The consoles and pilasters also remain. In addition, the shopfront's open nature, provided by its glazing and set-back, maintain the parade's lively, active character, whilst its position does not read as incompatible given not all other units in this and the adjoining terrace are flush with the façade.
10. Accordingly, although the appeal proposal cannot reasonably be described as enhancing the CA, it does preserve the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. In coming to this view, I have taken into account

that the drawing showing the previous shopfront (Drawing No 353-.P.01) is said to show a previously refused shopfront proposal.

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the Lakes Estate CA, whose significance is preserved. I therefore find that it accords with Policy HC1 of the London Plan, Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DMD40 and DMD44 of the Development Management Document. Amongst other aspects, these require development to be of a high quality, have special regard to the context and character of heritage assets, and preserve and conserve their significance; and shopfronts to maintain visual interest within the street and respect the rhythm, style and proportions of the building group. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised and the submitted evidence, I conclude that the proposed development accords with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.
13. The Council has not suggested any conditions. Given that the development has already been completed, and on the basis of the available evidence, I have no reason to impose any conditions. However, in the interests of clarity and certainty, I have listed the plans in my decision.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR