



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2024

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/24/3342384

18-24 Chase Side, London N14 5PB

- 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 Brookway LP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 23/01593/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a single storey roof extension to provide two additional self-contained residential units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note the difference in postcode within the submitted application form varies from that of the Council's decision notice and appellant's appeal form. For clarity, I have carried forward the postcode within the original application form to the banner heading. The address otherwise remains consistent with all submitted forms.
3. As the proposal relates to the settings of statutorily listed buildings, I have had special regard to section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). Also, the site is located within a Conservation Area and therefore I also have had special regard to section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (the Act).

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the settings of the heritage assets of the Grade II* Southgate underground station, including surface building and platforms (List entry number 1188692, listed 17 February 1971) and Grade II* listed station pylons to north and south of Southgate Station (List entry number 1359011, listed 19 February 1971), and the Grade II listed 1-8 South Parade including eight lamp posts east and west (List entry number 1079481, listed 11 March 1985), and whether or not it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area;
 - Whether or not the proposal would lead to on-street parking stress to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, and whether or not there is acceptable cycle parking; and

- The effect of the development on the living conditions of the future occupants with particular regard to access to outdoor space.

Reasons

Heritage Assets

5. The Grade II* listed building of the Southgate underground station is also complemented by the Grade II listed 1-8 Station Parade including the eight lampposts, and Grade II* listed station pylons. As a complex of statutorily listed structures and buildings, they have an interrelationship between one another that strengthens their integration as listed assets.
6. Intentionally designed to function as a transport hub with mix of shops and services, Southgate station as a whole conveys the Modernist style of architecture that has become the hallmark for several other underground stations designed in the 1930's by the renowned architect Charles Holden, for London Transport.
7. The significance and special interest of the assets are derived from the use of clean and simple geometry and sweeping curves, materiality that is largely consistent of red/brown brick, concrete and curved overhanging eaves. The above ground booking hall is constructed of stock brick with deep eaves provided by the concrete canopy to the ground floor, over which the clerestory rises providing a light and spacious double height indoor concourse. Its distinctive cylindrical shape is a fine example of early 1930's Modernist style favoured by Holden. As an integrated design, the concourse is surrounded by shops at ground floor level with display windows facing outwards. Further shops are designed in a complementary curved two storey parade, Station Parade which encloses the bus interchange on one side and faces Crown Lane on the other; pedestrian concourse, external space and traffic island completing the composition. The overall design of the complex is derived from the Modernist movement and as a holistic group of buildings and structures they form an architecturally distinguished cluster and a striking centrepiece within the town centre.
8. Southgate Circus CA encapsulates a mid-20th century aesthetic with the prestigious listed underground station, buildings and structures at its centre. Most buildings within the CA are retail and commercial in character to embody the typical town centre functions, of a retail vernacular of that time. They largely represent a rectilinear form, three storeys in height with some noticeable architectural detail to their primary elevation. The parades form a predominantly continuous run flanking Chase Side with a strong vertical emphasis with red or brown brick finish with parapets a unifying element. These buildings form the backdrop to the listed heritage assets they observe, and do not compete with their special interest. In addition, the significance of the CA is largely derived from the fine Modernist example of the underground station complex.
9. Number 18-24 Chase Side is the former Burtons department store and occupies a prime location within the town centre. The building was, according to the Councils' Southgate Circus Conservation Area Character Appraisal, built sometime between 1921 and 1935. It displays the characteristics of a retail building with full width fascia separating the ground floor from the floors above with large windows framed in decorative stone. Some white coloured stucco is

applied to break up the horizontal emphasis of the fenestration pattern, and a parapet wall enhances the sense of scale and massing to the building. Although some modern intervention has occurred, from my external examination of the building, it exhibits some influences from the Arts and Crafts style, popular in the early 20th Century.

10. Barclays bank occupied the ground floor until more recent times and is now vacant with residential flats accessed via a side door from Chase Side. The building is four bays wide and very deep as it extends to fill its perimeter to Nichol Close. I could see that the rear yard has encountered further development as another building has been erected to its rear perimeter. All of the former Burtons building is flat roofed with different levels only visible from the rear.
11. The proposal before me seeks to extend behind the front parapet wall by virtue of building above an existing flat roof and removing the existing conservatory style extension to create a more conventional extension of brickwork. The proposal would create two new self-contained flats, Units 1 and 2, with a mansard style roof with a glazed walk-out balcony.
12. The parapet wall to the front elevation wraps partly around the side of the building and conceals the flat roof behind, as is generally the traditional function of parapet roofs. This proposal would create a new mansard style roof that would be positioned directly behind the parapet wall and whilst it would be angled away from it, it would nonetheless be closely located to the existing parapet. The parapet is not of one continuous height as it is stepped. The new mansard would be continuous in its height and would span virtually the full width of the existing building.
13. The new mansard roof would, according to the plans before me, sit above the height of part of the existing parapet. Although it would be angled away from the parapet, I am not convinced that part of this new roof would be entirely screened from view from street level at both close and long range views. Furthermore, the wrap-around that the existing parapet roof provides is limited. As a consequence, the proposed extension would appear exposed within the street scene made more severe as the adjacent building at Number 16 Chase Side is substantially lower in height. Therefore, a large portion of the new extension would be highly visible from within the street scene and not screened by the parapet wall that is its function.
14. Parapets are a characteristic feature within the town centre and in some instances, the roofs behind are visible. Whilst there is no substantive information before me of their particular circumstances, the former Burtons store is not the same situation. In this instance, the new roof that would be seen behind would break the continuous roofline of the parapet that has purposefully been designed to complete the building. Although this parapet is new and may not be precisely as per the original design, it is by and large a replacement of the historic parapet, and to my mind appears appropriate to the scale and design of the host building.
15. Whilst the appeal building is not statutorily listed, it is located within close quarters of the listed assets and is therefore within its setting. The Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. The Framework explains that its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.

16. The complex of listed assets sits in close relation to the appeal site and dominates the local townscape. Its setting is experienced through a series of strategic road junctions and populated by buildings all constituting a key gateway into the transport hub of Southgate. The surrounding urban grain typifies post World War I urban development with the expansion of the underground a further catalyst for development here. This has given way to a built environment of some mixed scale including modern late 20st century additions. Although there is some variation to buildings' architectural style, age and detailing, they do not compete with the architectural complexity of the complex of listed assets, but rather remain subservient to it. Indeed, the Council's Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies the appeal building as having a neutral effect upon the significance of the heritage assets.
17. The distance the appeal site is from the assets and the planned complex they have been designed around all create a sense of separation and spaciousness that frames the setting of the heritage assets, allowing their significance to be positively appreciated and experienced. This side of Chase Side frames perspectives of the assets contributing positively to ones' ability to appreciate their interrelationship in this context.
18. From my assessment I can see how the proposal is designed to respond to local vernacular incorporating a mansard roof and a palette of materials and other design cues that would broadly reflect the characteristics of the host and surrounding buildings. However, as part of it would be viewed from behind the parapet, it would be experienced as a new and uncharacteristic feature to the building and would be in clear conflict with its character. In this high-level position upon a large-scale building, this proposed extension would add additional bulk and mass to the building, adversely affecting its appearance. It would not respond positively to the settings of the assets and would compete for attention and draw attention away from these highly graded and nationally important designated heritage assets, undermining their importance. Therefore, as a visually intrusive architectural form, the proposed scheme would directly and negatively affect their settings and detract from the special interest of all designated heritage assets.
19. In addition, I not only find that the proposal would harm the special interest of the listed buildings, but also the significance of the CA where this building I consider has a neutral effect upon the significance of the conservation area. This proposal would negatively change this effect resulting in a degree of harm to the character and appearance of the CA and therefore would lead to some weakening of the historic integrity of the CA.
20. Paragraph 205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 206 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification. Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, paragraph 208 requires this is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Given the scope of the works and development proposed, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.

21. It would create two new dwellings within the Borough in a location close to local amenities, services and employment opportunities. It would be built to a sustainable criteria to off-set carbon emissions and a green roof incorporated. The internal sizes would meet or exceed those of the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) with dual aspect to some rooms and access to some private outdoor space. The appellant states they would be built to a high quality.
22. Two new homes of one bedrooms to add to the local housing stock would be an advantage, however this is only a small increase in number and I apportion it only limited weight in the balance. It would be located within a sustainable location in terms of access to amenities although this is afforded only a modest degree of weight. Energy efficiency measures and reduction of carbon emissions including a green roof, at the level proposed I apportion moderate weight to as a benefit. There is no substantive evidence before me to concur with the appellant that the units would be built to a high quality, even if dual aspects are achieved. It would meet or exceed the internal NDSS requirements although I afford this only some moderate weight in the balance.
23. As a whole, the weight that I afford to the public benefits that would accrue from the proposal is not sufficient to outweigh the material harm to the settings of the heritage assets. Nor would it preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
24. Given the above and in the absence of public benefits that would outweigh the harm that would be caused, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the statutorily listed heritage assets, and that the character or appearance of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area would be neither conserved nor enhanced. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 203 of the Framework and conflict with Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Core Strategy (2010), policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD37 and DMD44 of the Development Management Document (2014). These policies amongst other things seek for quality improvement initiatives, a broad design led approach to development, and to protect heritage assets. I also find it would not meet the objectives of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015). It would not safeguard heritage assets in accordance with policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), or the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in its objectives to achieve well designed and beautiful places and to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Parking stress and cycle parking

25. The proposed development is required to be car-free and the appellant is required to enter into a legal agreement to prevent the future occupiers from obtaining parking permits to park on-street within the local streets with a designated Controlled Parking Zone. This is in order to control on-street parking stress to local roads in the interest of the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety. The legal agreement would also secure a financial contribution towards on-street cycle parking provision. I note the appellant's intention to provide incutillage cycle racks as part of the development. They inform me these would be located to the rear of the property. However, I cannot be sure that these would be located in the most circuitous or commodious location for the occupants given the distance from the proposed units. On this basis I am not persuaded that to impose a planning

condition in this regard would satisfactorily meet the tests of paragraph 56 of the Framework.

26. The appellant has submitted a unilateral undertaking (UU) as a commitment to achieving sustainable transport at the site. The Council has been consulted on this draft agreement. However, the Council have brought to my attention some discrepancies with the financial figures of the UU as well as some uncertainty regarding financial contributions to be advanced by the appellant, as well as referring to a different local authority within the document. Also, I am not convinced that the obligation would satisfactorily prevent future occupiers of the development from acquiring on-street parking permits.
27. Therefore, on the basis of the draft UU before me, I am not satisfied it has been demonstrated that the proposal would cause no undue harm to highway and pedestrian safety, and cycle parking would be adequately provided in the interest of sustainable development. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not comply with policies DMD45 and DMD47 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) in their aims to encourage car-free developments, and only in so far as cycle access applies. Neither would it meet the objectives for healthy streets, mitigate transport impacts and accord with parking standards of policies T2, T4, T5 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021). It would not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in so far as promoting sustainable travel. However, I find no direct relevance to London Plan policy T7 as this is more akin to delivery/servicing and construction or Core Strategy (2010) policy CP24 as this relates to improvements to the road network, or CP25 as this is a more strategic policy. Nor do I find the proposal to directly relate to Council Policy DMD 48 as this relates to transport assessments.

Living conditions

28. The site would provide some external space for the future occupants by way of a terrace. However, this would fall short of the NDSS for units of this size. The appellants have offered no further advancement on the size of this space.
29. The local public park is Grovelands Park and is the closest public open space to the appeal site. However, it may be in the region of around seven minutes walk according to the appellant, I was able to walk to the park in just under fifteen minutes from the site. It also entailed crossing some busy roads. Even though one unit may exceed NDSS with south facing windows and balconies, this does not mitigate the inadequate amount of external space that would be available to the occupiers. Therefore, it would not lead to acceptable living conditions for future occupants.
30. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers and would not accord with Enfield Development Management Document (2014) policies DMD6, DMD8, and DMD9 in so far as they aim to achieve high standards of accommodation and Policy DMD37 only in so far as development should connect well with other places. It would not align with policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in their objectives to secure housing standards and to protect amenity. However, I find no direct relevance to policy CP30 of the Core Strategy (2010) as this does not relate to living conditions.

Other Matters

31. Although there is nothing before me to disagree with the Council's findings that the new units would cause no harm the living conditions of local residents, this is neutral in the overall scheme of things and does not weigh for or against the proposal.
32. Any complaints expressed by the appellant about the Council's service should be directed to them in the first instance and is not within my remit to comment upon.

Conclusion

33. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which lead me to determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with it. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

Enfield Development Management Document (2014)