

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3152891
813 Green Lanes, London, N21 2RX

- 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 Mr Appleby against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/01737/HOU dated 18 April 2016 was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development is described as proposed crossovers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the availability of on-street parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a double fronted two storey semi-detached property located on the western side of Green Lanes. The road is a classified road (A105) and is wide and straight in the vicinity of the site. The property is located between Berry Close and Radcliffe Road, which have parking restrictions around the junction with Green Lanes, although such restrictions are not in place across the frontage of the appeal property.
 4. The proposal seeks the creation of two vehicle crossovers which the appellant states would enable the parking and overnight charging of an electric car on the forecourt of the property which already comprises of hardstanding. The Council raise concerns in relation to the consequential loss of on-street parking. I recognise the difficulties the appellant has in parking his vehicle, and I note the reference to the increased parking demand following the opening of a doctor's surgery opposite the site. My site observations confirm the appellant's stated difficulties and the Council's reference to there being limited on-street parking provision in the area. Consequently, I consider the reduction in on-street parking spaces would lead to an increased demand for parking, as there would be less parking available on-street for residents and other visitors to the area.
-

5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable reduction in the availability of on-street parking and it would be contrary to Policy DMD 46 of the Council's Development Management Document, and Core Policy 24 and Core Policy 25 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy which seek, amongst other matters, to prevent vehicle crossovers where they would result in an increase in on street parking pressures in areas already experiencing high on-street parking demand.

Other Matters

6. Concerns have also been expressed that the proposal will lead to vehicles joining traffic on a busy classified road, which is a bus corridor, and close to a junction and busy 24 hour garage. However, whilst I acknowledge these factors, given the proposal has been designed with two crossovers to allow for vehicles to enter and exit in forward gear, I do not consider that the development would give rise to adverse harm to road safety or to the free flow of traffic.
7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other vehicle crossovers in the vicinity of the site as well as a development at Green Dragon Public House which is stated to result in the loss of four on-street parking spaces. Reference has also been made to the inconsistency in decision-making by the Council in relation to the installation of a cycle lane scheme that would result in the loss of a large number of on-street parking spaces. I am not however aware of the full circumstances of these cases and whether they are comparable to this appeal development and in any event, I am required to determine this appeal on its own merits.
8. I note the reasoning for the proposal is to provide a safe and convenient charging point for an electric vehicle. Although I have not been provided with details of the relevant policies, I accept the proposed development may receive support from The London Plan in terms of encouraging the use of environmentally friendly electric vehicles. However, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.
9. I also acknowledge that there would not be any loss of street trees, garden or traditional boundary features. These are however neutral considerations and not benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the reference to the parking demand on other nearby roads, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR