
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 8 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3167473

20 Brookside, Winchmore Hill, Southgate, London N21 1JT

- 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 Miss Androniki Neophytou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/04359/FUL, dated 9 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a vehicular crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises an end terraced maisonette in a block of six similar properties located at the head of a small residential cul-de-sac. Other than the maisonettes at No 10/11, none of the other properties situated around the head of the cul-de-sac have off-street car parking facilities within the curtilage of the property. On-street parking occurs at the front of the block containing the appeal property. At the time of my site visit this area was fully occupied by six vehicles that were closely parked to each other.
4. The proposal would involve the provision of a crossover, approximately 3.2m wide, in order to facilitate access to a proposed parking area for one vehicle that would be created in the front garden of the appeal property.
5. Owing to the constrained nature of available on-street car parking in this part of the cul-de-sac, and the need to maintain a clear access to the proposed parking area, the provision of the crossover would effectively result in the loss of two on-street car parking spaces. Consequently, the proposal would result in a net reduction of one car parking space and thereby further increasing the pressure on car parking availability on the street.
6. As a consequence of the small size of the front garden serving the appeal property the proposed parking area would be limited in size to accommodate one vehicle only with no available space for manoeuvring. As such, vehicles

would either have to reverse from the road in to the car parking area or enter it in a forward direction and reverse on to the cul-de-sac.

7. Owing to the alignment of the road and the existence of mature trees around the garden of the appeal property, visibility to the south west from the proposed parking area is compromised. A vehicle travelling along Brookside towards the head of the cul-de-sac would not be able to see a vehicle exiting the parking area until the turn into the head of the cul-de-sac had been made. Similarly, a vehicle exiting the proposed parking area would not be able to fully see any vehicles travelling towards the cul-de-sac. As a consequence of this limited visibility and the likelihood of vehicle manoeuvring occurring in the head of the cul-de-sac to access or egress the parking area, the proposal would result in vehicular conflict that would be detrimental to the interests of highway safety.
8. The current parking arrangements appear to result in vehicles overhanging the pedestrian footway in the proximity of the appeal property thereby narrowing its width. I observed at my site visit that pedestrians accessing properties in the cul-de-sac tend to walk on the road rather than the footway. Reversing movements on the road as a consequence of vehicles either entering or leaving the proposed parking area would result in a degree of pedestrian conflict. However, given the limited number of properties that are served from the cul-de-sac and the width of the road, I do not consider that such conflict would be of an extent that would cause demonstrable harm to pedestrian safety.
9. Notwithstanding my findings regarding the effect on pedestrian safety, taking the above factors into account the proposal would be detrimental to the interests of highway safety and would result in the reduction of parking availability on the street. As such it would be contrary to Policy DMD46 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014). This policy, amongst other things, states that vehicle crossovers and dropped kerbs that allow for off-street parking will only be permitted where there is no increase in on street parking pressures in areas already experiencing high on-street parking demand; there is no adverse impact on the road safety and that vehicles can enter and exit the crossover in forward gear.
10. The Council has also referred to a conflict with Policies 24 and 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 – 2025 (2010). However, these policies are of a strategic nature relating to the road network in the Borough and the maintenance of the quality of the built and open environment. I have no evidence to indicate how the appeal proposal would conflict with the requirements of these strategic policies. Consequently, I have attached little weight to their provisions in the determination of this appeal.

Other matters

11. Interested parties have referred to the presence of the garage court located behind the block containing Nos 4 to 9 Brookside and which accessed via a narrow road located between Nos 10/11 and 8/9. It is suggested that each resident on Brookside has access to garage in this garage court. Whilst this may be the case, I have no evidence to confirm or otherwise that the appeal property has access to such a garage. In any event, there would be no compulsion for the garage to be used for the parking of a vehicle and, as such, the availability of a garage has little bearing on the proposals before me. I have therefore attached little weight to this matter.

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to a permission granted in June 2015 for a vehicle access at No 19 Brookside (Ref 15/01901/FUL). This access had not been provided at the time of my site visit. This property comprises one of the maisonettes located in the centre of the block containing the appeal property and is in a position where there is a slight improvement in visibility along the road. However, I have no details of the nature of this vehicle access or the matters that the Council took into account in determining its acceptability. Consequently, I cannot be sure that it is wholly representative of the circumstances in this appeal. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own individual merits.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR