



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3306957

110 Old Park Ridings, Southgate, Enfield N21 2EP

- 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 Yogo Group against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01319/HOU, dated 15 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension with extension to loft at rear. Replacement of uPVC windows with hardwood windows throughout. Changes to front garden to create additional soft landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor rear extension with extension to loft at rear. Replacement of uPVC windows with hardwood windows throughout. Changes to front garden to create additional soft landscaping at 110 Old Park Ridings, Southgate, Enfield N21 2EP in accordance with the terms of the application, 22/01319/HOU, dated 15 April 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan – drawing no. 01243-P-A01 REV A; Proposed Layout Plans, Elevations & Section – drawing no. 01243-P-C01 REV A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made retrospectively and I observed on my site visit that some works to construct a first floor extension have commenced. I have duly determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Grange Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No.110 Grange Park Ridings (No.110) is a detached two-storey dwelling with rooms in the attic, located on the east side of Old Park Ridings close to its junction with The Chines. No.110 is within the Grange Park Conservation Area (CA) which is relatively tightly drawn around three principal roads: The Chines and Old Park Ridings, two long, broadly parallel roads; and The Grangeway which bisects them toward their southern end.
5. The *Grange Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (June 2015)* (CACA) describes the significance of the CA as derived, in large part, from its cohesive group of houses built between 1910 and the 1930s, one of the first high quality planned suburbs in the Borough. No.110 was built in the first phase of the Grange Park Estate, constructed around 1913/14 when many of the designs of dwellings were of two broad types. Consistent with one of these types, No.110 has an Arts and Crafts influence style, with hipped tiled roof, constructed in red brick with a stone mullion canted bay window and timber framed porch to the front elevation.
6. To the rear is a gable with hipped end element and a two-storey lean-to projection that meets the half-hipped projection from the roof at attic level. Across the full width of the rear elevation, a ground floor extension, the same depth as the lean-to projection, is under construction. This is being built pursuant to a planning permission granted by the Council in March 2021 (ref. 20/03830/HOU).
7. It is proposed to extend the rear elevation at first floor around 3m in depth following the existing flank but off set from the rear elevation of the recent ground floor extension by around 1.9m. The extension would infill the space up to the original lean-to, and has been designed with a hipped end pitched roof which would be lower in height than the existing. I am aware that a previous scheme for a part single, part two storey extension was dismissed on appeal in October 2020 (APP/Q5300/D/20/3248787). That scheme replaced the original lean-to with a centrally sited two-storey element with a flat roof and first floor window. In contrast, the current proposal would retain the lean-to projection (with rooflights) which is more modest in its proportions.
8. Further, I observed that the lean-to projection is a feature of the original building type of No.110 and its immediate neighbours, and its retention would ensure no dilution in the architectural features of these dwellings. Combined with a palette of materials to match the existing, the scale and massing of the proposed extension (reduced from the previous scheme), means that the original rear elevation would still be appreciable and it would not be subsumed or overwhelmed. Rather, the proposal would appear a proportionate and sympathetic addition to the host dwelling.
9. I acknowledge that the significance of a conservation area is more widely experienced and that proposals must be judged according to their effect on the area. However, I observed on my site visit that the garden of No.110 is well enclosed and screened from Bush Hill Park Golf Course by mature planting on its eastern boundary. Because of the close spacing of the dwellings, there is very limited opportunity to appreciate the rear elevation of No.110 save from the gardens of the neighbouring dwellings on either side. In this case, the cohesiveness of the planned Grange Park Estate, which contributes to the significance of the CA, is predominantly appreciated from the public realm of

Old Park Ridings. The proposed rear extension would not be at all prominent and I find that, at worst, it would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA.

10. The CACA recognises that whilst the residential part of the CA is well maintained, one issue is non-traditional joinery and the loss of well planted front gardens. At the time of my site visit, the front drive of No.110 was being used for the storage of construction materials but the evidence submitted by the appellant shows a resin finish with a central low brick wall on the frontage and small areas of planting to the front of each bay window. It is proposed to incorporate additional planting within the front driveway and to replace all uPVC windows with hardwood. Although not reinstating a front garden, the proposals would address (in part) an issue identified in the CACA and would therefore enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
11. On the main issue I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or CA, or have a negative effect on its significance as a designated heritage asset. Consequently, it would meet the statutory requirements of the Act, and accord with Policy 31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) (CS), Policy DMD 44 of the Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (LP). It would further comply with CS Policy CP30, DMD Policies DMD6, DMD11 and DMD 37 and LP Policy D3 and D4 which together require development to be of high quality design, of a scale and form appropriate to its setting and respects the locally distinctive or historic pattern of development. I do not find DMD Policies DMD13 and DMD14 to be applicable to the proposals before me because they relate to side and roof extensions respectively.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard condition imposing a time limit for commencement, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring materials to match those used in the existing dwelling (save window details) is also necessary to ensure a high quality design.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR