



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by D Marley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3362361

68 Aldermans Hill, London N13 4PP

- 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 Zain Akbar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/04078/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “Proposed retractable Awning + steel frame + fabric Vinyl or acrylic (red to match existing brickwork)”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of a retractable awning to side elevation at 68 Aldermans Hill, London N13 4PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/04078/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 approved plans: Site Plan, Proposed Ground Floor Plan, Proposed North Section, Proposed Roof Plan, Proposed West Long Section, and Proposed Location Plan.
 3. No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address used in my decision from the Decision Notice, as this more accurately describes the site.
3. I have used the Council’s description of development in my formal decision as it more accurately and concisely describes the development to which the appeal relates. It does not fundamentally change the development subject of the appeal. I am therefore satisfied that neither party would be prejudiced by my use of it.
4. Whilst some documents submitted with the appeal refer to the proposed development as being retrospective, at my site visit I noted the proposed plans were clearly different to the existing situation and there was no evidence to suggest

that the proposed development had commenced. As such, I have determined the appeal based on the plans before me.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to The Lakes Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is within The Lakes Estate Conservation Area (the 'Conservation Area'). The statutory duty set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. The Conservation Area draws its significance from, amongst other matters, the architectural and historic interest of Edwardian residential development, the decorative quality of the architectural detailing, and decorative boundary walls.
7. The property at 68 Aldermans Hill comprises the existing patisserie, alongside an outdoor space. The building itself appears to retain much of its original features on first floor level and above, whilst the ground floor is characterised by the presence of the rendered shop frontage and side elevation, and associated signage. There is an existing veranda attached to this side elevation, which is identified as non-original. The outdoor space is enclosed by an existing brick wall and metal railings with decorative features.
8. At my site visit, I noted that views through these railings from viewpoints along both Grovelands Road and Aldermans Hill were limited due to the presence of existing built development and the width of the gaps between the railings. Opposite the appeal site on Grovelands Road is a building with a similarly positioned and arranged outdoor space, which lacks the railings present on the appeal site. The appeal site is located along a commercial street, with existing commercial units including awnings of a variety of styles and colours, some of which are a similar colour to existing architectural detailing.
9. The proposed development would introduce a retractable awning to provide further coverage than the existing veranda. It would also include a number of permanent metal supports, and when deployed would extend across the majority of the outdoor space. No works are proposed to the upper floors of No 68.
10. As the proposal would not affect the upper floors of No 68, it would not alter the identified features of architectural and historic interest, and associated architectural detailing. These features would also remain clearly apparent in the street scene. The proposed development would act to extend the existing veranda and would partly limit views of the rendered wall. My attention has not however been drawn to any specific feature of either the rendered wall or the veranda that make a positive contribution to the building's character or that of the Conservation Area, and I see no reason to take a different view. In addition, the design of the proposed awning would clearly reflect its function in allowing the veranda to be further extended.
11. Given the wide variety of existing awnings nearby, including those that have some similarity in colour to existing architectural features, the use of a red awning would not appear either out of place or of unacceptable quality, nor contrast with the brickwork on the host building. It would nevertheless be necessary, given that full

details and precise colour specification were not submitted with the appeal, to secure the full details of proposed materials to be used via condition.

12. The existing boundary treatment makes a positive contribution to the character of the host building, deriving primarily from the materials used and the role it plays in separating both visually and functionally an enclosed area of space away from the public street. The proposed development would not affect either the materials used in the boundary treatment, nor the role it serves in separating the outdoor space from the street.
13. I acknowledge the Council's argument that the presence of the awning and steel supports would provide additional coverage of the patisserie's outdoor area compared to the existing situation, and that the steel supports would remain present when the awning was retracted. However, given the limited visibility and nature of the outdoor area, the outdoor area already appears as an enclosed space separate from the wider street. This would not change as a result of the proposed development. This contrasts with the opposing outdoor space on Grovelands Road, which lacks the railings present at No 68 and as a result appears considerably more open than the appeal site. The proposed development would not therefore affect how the outdoor area is perceived from the street nor affect perceptions of openness within the wider street scene.
14. As a result of these matters, the insertion of a coloured awning and steel frame would neither appear out of place, nor appear visually intrusive, to the host building or its associated features. The proposed development would not affect the contribution of the boundary treatment to the character of the host building. In addition, the proposed development would not result in altered perceptions of enclosure from the public realm, and would not affect how the layout of the Conservation Area is experienced.
15. I therefore find that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and thus the significance of the heritage asset. As there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area, the proposal would therefore comply with the relevant provisions of Policies D4 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021, Core Policy 30 and Core Policy 31 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DMD 37 and DMD 44 of the Development Management Document 2014. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure development delivers high quality design and is appropriate to its context, and that development proposals have regard, and avoid harm, to heritage assets.

Other Matters

16. Interested parties have raised concerns that the proposed development may result in impacts to highway safety, to the living conditions of existing occupiers, may result in litter and other pollution, or may affect matters of health and safety. Concerns have also been raised regarding the current use and layout of the site and other nearby commercial properties, as well as the potential for further planning applications in the future either at the appeal site or elsewhere. These matters are largely speculative and there is no substantive evidence before me to support them. Furthermore, the Council has not raised an objection in these regards, and I see no reason to take a different view.

17. A number of parties have raised a previously refused planning application related to a similar development proposal at the site. Limited information has been submitted with regards this application and, on the evidence presented, the appeal before me was submitted in response to this previous refusal. As a result, I have afforded this matter limited weight in my decision.
18. The Council has noted the need for a licence to be granted for any tables or chairs to be placed on highway land. The requirement for such a licence would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.
19. My attention has been drawn to errors in supporting documentation submitted with the application. I have had regard to these statements, and to the identified erroneous matters, which have not been determinative in my decision.

Conditions

20. The Council has recommended certain planning conditions to be imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. I have assessed the Council's suggested conditions with reference to the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') and Planning Practice Guidance.
21. As the development has not yet commenced, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit condition, and in the interests of certainty I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I have also imposed a condition requiring the submission of further details with regards external materials to ensure the proposed development maintains the character and appearance of the area.
22. The Council has proposed restricting the hours of operation of the outdoor space to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, given the proposed development constitutes the installation of a retractable awning, and given the limited information before me on this matter, I do not consider such a condition to be necessary or relevant to the development permitted.
23. Equally, whilst the appellant has suggested a condition limiting the hours whereby the awning could be extended, as I have not identified harm arising from the proposed development I do not consider such a condition to be necessary.
24. The officer report and other parties reference a potential condition limiting the extent of permissible enclosure in relation to public health matters. However, I am mindful that the Council's Environmental Health team did not object to the proposal and in the absence of additional information, I do not consider such a condition to be necessary or relevant.

Conclusion

25. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D Marley

INSPECTOR