The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2023

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3322922
15 Old Park Ridings, Southgate, Enfield N21 2EX

- 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 Ms Virginia Goode against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
- The application Ref: 22/03936/HOU, dated 23 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2023.
- The development proposed is the creation of vehicular crossover and associated hardstanding for parking.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the creation of vehicular crossover and associated hardstanding for parking at 15 Old Park Ridings, Southgate, Enfield N21 2EX, in accordance with the terms of the application 22/03936/HOU, dated 23 November 2022, 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: 15OPR 001, 9J32-6159-001, J32-6159-002 J32-6159-003, J32-6159-005, Section Through Drive and Details of Proposed EV Charging Point.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

    - The character and appearance of the local area, with reference to streetscene and Grange Park Conservation Area (the CA); and
    - The effective use and safety of the highway.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house with front garden enclosed by a low boundary wall to the highway and neighbouring properties. It

is located on a road in a residential area made up of similar semi-detached properties.

4. It is located within the CA, formed of a cohesive group of houses and shops developed as part of an arts and crafts influenced planned suburb between 1910 and the 1930's. The appeal dwelling reflects this local character and appearance and contributes to the significance of the CA.

5. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

6. The proposal is a revised design of a previously refused proposal for a vehicular crossover with associated hardstanding. The design of the appeal proposal includes for the vehicular crossover of the footway to the front of the appeal dwelling, the retention of part of the existing side boundary and front boundary walls and the provision of areas of planting. To allow for the retention of an existing small cherry tree, retained bricks from removed areas of existing walls would be used to replace a retaining side boundary wall to the neighbouring property at 17 Old Park Ridings.

7. The CA appears to be made up of properties that had a mixture of houses with front gardens without driveways and others with attached garages and driveways. Many of the original gardens without driveways have been altered to accommodate parking on areas of hardstanding. This includes the vast majority of the front gardens in the part of the road within which the appeal dwellings sits. In this regard the appeal dwelling as existing, in retaining its front garden without parking provision, is an outlier.

8. The adopted CA character summary (2015) (the CS) recognises the harm to the character and appearance of the CA resulting from the many examples of the alteration of the front gardens, especially where this has been carried out with hard standing that is too extensive, little planting and no boundary walls.

9. The proposal does, however, retain much of the existing boundary walls and reconstructs one with retained bricks to allow for the retention of an existing cherry tree. It also allows for areas of planting that appear to be similar to that of the existing front garden.

10. In doing so, I find that the design of the proposal would appear as a sensitive design solution to allowing for off street parking, whilst substantially retaining the appearance of a front garden. This would reflect the character of the local area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, thereby, resulting in no harm to the significance if the CA as identified above.

11. In this regard, and for the reasons given, I find that the proposal would accord with policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), policies DMD8, DMD37, DMD44 and DMD46 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) the EDMD, policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan) and section 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). These collectively seek development that is high quality and design led, reinforce locally distinctive or historic patterns of development, has no negative impact on streetscene and has regard to the special character of heritage assets.

Effective Use and Safety of the Highway

12. Policy DMD46 of the EDMD states that crossovers and dropped kerbs for vehicular access onto A roads and other busy classified roads will not normally be permitted. Old Park Ridings is classified by the Council as a category C Road with a 30mph limit and is considered to be one of the other busy roads. The road is wide with the majority of front gardens in the area of the appeal site having been converted for off street parking. Areas of on street parking are noted on both sides of the road, including to the front of the appeal dwelling, whilst still allowing for the free flow of traffic in both directions.

13. The proposal allows for a vehicle to reverse into the proposed parking space and to leave in a forward direction. Given the width of the road and the presence of existing on street parking, this manoeuvre would present no greater delay to traffic than a vehicle accessing the existing on street parking space in front of the appeal dwelling. As such, I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the efficient use of the highway.

14. The generous width of the road and its limit to 30mph appears to provide the space and time to allow for significant visibility and the appropriate reactions required adjust to the normal movements of other road users. Although the majority of properties on the road have off street parking arrangements similar to that proposed, from the information before me, it would appear that no collisions between vehicles or other more vulnerable road users associated with manoeuvres related to these off street parking areas have been reported in the previous 10 years. For this reason, I am satisfied that the proposal for a single off street parking space, in this part of the road, would not result in any significant harm to the safety of road users, and as such, represents an exceptional case.

15. Policy DMD46 of the EDMD also sets out the requirements, listed a. to h., for the design and location of crossovers and dropped kerbs to be generally acceptable. I am satisfied that the design of the proposal meets these requirements in all regards, and find, for the reasons given, that the proposal would, therefore, fully accord with this policy, as well as policy CP24 of the Enfield Core Strategy (date), policies T1 and T2 of the London Plan and Section 9 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure safe and sustainable transport outcomes.

Conditions

16. Along with the standard condition for the timing of implementation, in the interests of design quality I have attached a condition requiring compliance with approved drawings.

Conclusion

17. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR