

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3169211

53 Green Road, London, N14 4AP

- 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 Dr Mariya Stoilova against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/03989/FUL, dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is a vehicular access to the front garden and a hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a vehicular access to the front garden and a hardstanding at 53 Green Road, London, N14 4AP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03989/FUL, dated 30 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: untitled site/block plans; untitled plan showing dropped kerb, crossover and hardstanding.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on highway safety along Green Road by way of impact on on-street parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling situated on the southern side of Green Road. It would appear that the dwelling is a flat within a two-storey property, set well back from the road. It has a wide frontage and a large gap to the side between the dwelling and the adjacent dwelling to the east. It has a dwarf wall to the front boundary with a small hedge behind. Green Road is a residential thoroughfare with no parking restrictions other than at road junctions and at access areas to nearby schools, one small example of which is situated opposite to the appeal property. A small number of houses in the vicinity of No 53 has off-road parking facilities. The wide frontage of the plot at the appeal property effectively allows for two cars to park on the road outside.
-

4. The proposal would involve the construction of a dropped kerb at the western end of the frontage, along with a 2.4 metre opening in the front boundary wall, leading to a 5 metre deep parking space containing grass cellular paving within the front garden of the property. Policy DMD46 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD) indicates that vehicle crossovers and dropped kerbs that allow for off-street parking and access onto roads will only be permitted where there is no increase in on-street parking pressures in areas already experiencing high on-street parking demand as a result of introducing a vehicle crossover. The justification for this policy notes that in many areas of the borough demand for on-street parking is high due to a lack of off-street parking availability, and that permission will not be granted if surveys demonstrate that on-street parking occupancy is high.
5. The Council contends that the proposal would result in a reduction in on-street parking provision in an area already experiencing high on-street parking demand. I have before me no evidence of any surveys that indicate such a high parking demand. The appellant has provided some evidence that there are regularly parking spaces available on the road and, although this evidence is somewhat superficial, at the time of my inspection, which coincided with afternoon school closure times, there appeared to be a good number of spaces still available for resident parking.
6. In my opinion, there is no evidence to indicate that the proposed crossover would cause any significant increase in on-street parking demand, such that it would result in harm to highway safety along Green Road. It would take one car belonging to residents off the road at a point where there is room for two cars outside of the property. Moreover, it is conceivable that the crossover would allow for a second vehicle, whether belonging to the appellant's family or a visitor, to park across the opening with the appellant's agreement, such that no net loss of spaces need necessarily occur and that one additional space could, in certain circumstances, be created.
7. In conclusion, from the evidence before me, I find that the proposed crossover and hardstanding would not, in this case, be harmful to highway safety along Green Road by way of significantly increased on-street parking pressures. It would not conflict with Policy DMD46 of the DMD.

Conditions

8. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR