
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 October 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/C/25/3365895

101 Farrant Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 6PD

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
 - The appeal is made by Amna Barok against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The notice was issued on 31 March 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, changing the material of the roof tiles, the painting of the boundary wall, the brickwork of the front elevation, and the front entry door.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 1. Restore the main roof and rear outrigger roof to their condition before the unauthorised development took place, ensuring that the new slate tiles match the original (as shown at Annex 1)
 2. Restore the porch roof to its condition before the unauthorised development took place, ensuring that the fish scale clay tiles match the pattern of the original porch roof, (as shown at Annex 2).
 3. Remove paint from the brickwork and coping of the front boundary wall.
 4. Remove paint from the brickwork of the property's front elevation.
 5. Restore the front door to its condition before the unauthorised development took place (as shown at Annex 3)
 6. Make good any damaged to the premises as a result of carrying out the steps above.
 7. Remove from the land any debris resulting from carrying out the steps above
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 9 months
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matter

1. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. In addition, and prior to the making of this recommendation, a revised National Planning Policy Framework was published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and that proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases.
2. Step 4 of the notice requires paint to be removed from the brickwork of the building's front elevation. However, the ground floor of the front elevation was previously painted red. The notice therefore needs to be corrected to require the building to be restored to its former condition, before it was painted grey, in accordance with section 173(3) and (4)(a) of the Act, which would allow the red paint to be reinstated. This correction can be made without causing injustice to any parties under the provisions of section 176(1) of the Act.

Main Issue

3. The main issue whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a mid-terraced dwelling sitting centrally within Farrant Avenue. The building in terms of the form and forward-facing features is homogenous with the wider street scene. However, it has since been altered on the front elevation including painted brickwork and a change in the roof tiles.
5. Farrant Avenue forms part of a well-ordered and uniform streetscape which has long sections of unbroken terrace which together have an important architectural quality. The CA is a planned estate built at the time using high-quality materials including red and yellow bricks with slate roof tiles. Together, the dwellings were designed to house workers and thus they have, collectively, an important role to play in the social history and resultantly the significance of the estate. Moreover, the area primarily retains its homogenous appearance which tend to be slate tiled period properties even where there are altered examples. These features in combination contribute to a well-designed and preserved character and appearance for the CA.
6. The red clay tiles on the roof replacing the original slate tiles stand out against the terraced row. Generally, red tiles feature on dwellings of a larger stature at the corner of junctions. The sloping roofs featured on the majority of standard terraced dwellings include grey slate tiles. The new tiles detract from the pleasant consistency of the simple row and are a highly obvious feature in the street scene. The removal of the original fish scale clay tiles results in a loss of an important feature which was a defining period one of the front elevations. Whilst the neighbouring property has also replaced their porch tiles, their colour and modernness nonetheless detract.
7. Painting of brickwork to both the facade and boundary wall is not uncommon along the street. However, and where there are instances, they are on the ground and first floor and are generally red or a neutral shade. Where painting has migrated to the upper levels, they generally follow the traditional red hue and respect the continuity of the street scene. Together there is still an established consistent character. The full painted grey façade is stark against the prevailing properties and detracts from the pleasant consistency of the surrounding street scene.
8. The front door has also been finished in grey. There has been a significant level of change in terms of door type and colour. To which there is no uniform character. This change can therefore be more readily absorbed. Notwithstanding that some of the dwellings in the locality have been altered including the adjacent 103, I am unaware of their planning status and therefore I can only give limited weight to the presence of these examples. Moreover, whilst there have been some changes, the majority of the street scene retains the original features as described above.
9. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area. Nationally speaking, Policy HE6 of the Framework places emphasis on substantial weight being given to the assets conservation. By virtue of the above assessment, there would be harm to the CA in

a failure to either preserve or enhance its character or appearance. In which this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

10. Neither main party has provided any public benefits of the scheme, however this doesn't mean there aren't any. There would have been some economic benefit during the replacement stage, however this would have been limited given the scale and length of time of construction. Resultantly, I could give no more than limited weight to the public benefits overall. They would not therefore outweigh the substantial weight given to the conservation of the CA.
11. Overall, the changes detract from the period quality of the homogenised features of the CA. As such, there is conflict with Policies D1 of the London Plan 2021, HC1 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and DM1 and DM9 Development Management Development Plan Document 2017. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and as a minimum conserve the historic environment.
12. As development within a settlement, Policy S4 of the new Framework would be relevant. It is clear from my earlier assessment that the adverse effects of the appeal scheme would carry substantial weight and the benefits (public for the sake of a heritage case) would not be sufficient to indicate a planning permission should be forthcoming. The position of Policy S4, and specifically a balance of adverse effect vs benefit would not therefore alter the outcome of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the above reasons the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole, other than the painting of the front door, and other considerations do not indicate planning permission should be granted other than in respect of the front door. I therefore recommend that the appeal should succeed in part only, and that planning permission should be granted for the painting of the front door, but otherwise the notice should be upheld with a correction and planning permission should be refused in respect of the changing of the roof tile materials and the painting of the boundary wall and brickwork to the front elevation. By virtue of section 180(1) of the Act, the requirements of the notice will cease to have effect so far as they are inconsistent with the planning permission to be granted.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and, on that basis, it is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by the deletion of the text 'remove paint from the brickwork of the property's front elevation' at Step 4 of paragraph 5 of the enforcement notice and its substitution for the text 'restore the brickwork of the property's front elevation to its condition before it was painted grey by removing the grey paint'.
15. Subject to the correction, the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the front entry door and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act, for the painting of the front entry door at 101 Farrant Avenue, London N22 6PD.

16. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld as corrected insofar as it relates to the roof tiles, boundary wall and brickwork of the front elevation and planning permission is refused in respect of the changing of the material of the roof tiles and the painting of the boundary wall and the brickwork of the front elevation at 101 Farrant Avenue, London N22 6PD on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR