
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3165164
28 Carterhatch Road, Enfield EN3 5LS

- 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 A Filarmonico against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 15/05364/FUL, dated 15 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing garage and the erection of a 2 storey 2 bedroom end of terrace house with two new vehicular crossovers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the loss of on-street public car parking provision.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling with an attached garage. It falls within a predominantly residential area with most of the car parking on-street. It is proposed to demolish the attached garage and to erect a two storey two bedroom terraced dwelling which would be similar in appearance to the host dwelling. Two car parking spaces would be formed in front of the proposed dwelling (where there is an existing access/vehicular cross over) and one car parking space would be formed within the front garden of the host property. The latter would include the formation of an additional vehicular crossing.
 4. I agree with the Council that the proposed dwelling would be acceptable in terms of design, internal and external space and its effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties. The principal issue relates to the formation of the additional vehicle cross over and the effect that this would have on on-street car parking provision.
 5. I note that an appeal was determined for a dwelling on this site (Reference APP/Q5300/W/15/3121522) in September 2016. Whilst the dwelling was different in terms of design, the Inspector considered the effect of such a proposal upon on-street car parking provision as a result of the formation of a vehicle cross over. The Inspector commented "*I noted during my site visit that*
-

space was severely restricted in these areas indicating a high demand for on-street parking. This leads me to the view that there is a compelling justification to apply policies that seek to avoid the loss of on-street parking in order to manage the local road network”.

6. Whilst acknowledging that my site visit was only a snap shot in time, I also noticed that most of Carterhatch Road was being used for car parking purposes. This observation, including the observations of the previous Inspector, leads me to conclude that this is an area of high car parking demand. The appellant has provided no evidence to lead me to conclude any differently.
7. I accept that in numerical terms the on-site car parking provision for the host dwelling and the appeal dwelling is acceptable. However, the proposal would reduce the amount of public space on the main road which is currently shared by residents in the locality. Whilst visitors of the host and appeal properties may be able to park in front of the cross overs (a less than ideal situation), other residents in the street would not be able to do this. When considered as whole the appeal proposal would have the effect of unacceptably reducing the amount of car parking space on-street to the detriment of publically available car parking provision.
8. My concerns above are compounded by the fact that the appeal site is not in a particularly accessible location from a sustainable transport point of view: I have no reason to doubt the Council’s comment that the site has a PTAL score of 2. In addition, the erection of an additional dwelling in the area would undoubtedly place some increased parking demand on the main road, particularly during periods when the space in front of the vehicle cross overs was in use.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the on street car parking management aims of Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016; Policy 46 of the Enfield Development Management Document November 2014 and Core Policies 24 and 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan for the area. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR