
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2018

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2018

Appeal Reference: APP/Q5300/D/17/3181985
923 Green Lanes, Winchmore Hill, London N21 2PB

- 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 N McNamara against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application (reference 17/01365/HOU, dated 21 March 2017) was refused by notice dated 22 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as a “new vehicle crossover”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed vehicle crossover on highway safety and convenience.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a closely built up part of London, facing Green Lanes, which is a busy through route (the A105). Green Lanes bears a steady flow of traffic, including buses, and the appeal site lies close to the junction of Green Lanes with Sherbrook Gardens and Firs Lane. Though the side roads are predominantly residential in character, the main road provides the location for a range of commercial enterprises along its frontages. In particular, the frontages to the south-west of the appeal site are more obviously commercial, though residential properties predominate along the northern frontage of Green Lanes, to the north-east of the appeal site. On-street parking is permitted along some sections of the frontages, no doubt serving the different premises.
4. Number 923 Green Lanes, is a two-storey, semi-detached house in a traditional style, with a pitched roof. It has a modest front garden, which is mainly surfaced with brick paving, and a larger rear garden, to which access is obtained by means of a private driveway that serves the rear parts of the properties that line the north-west frontage of this part of Green Lanes. Several of these properties have garage buildings facing the shared driveway. On the other hand, provision is made for on-street parking immediately outside

the frontage of the appeal site, with a cycle way between the parked cars and the pedestrian footpath.

5. It is now proposed that a new crossover should be constructed, to enable cars to be parked in the front garden of number 923. This would also involve some repaving of the parking area, due to the difference in levels between the appeal site and the highway, although the difference in levels is not great. The project would also lead to a loss of some parking spaces in the public highway.
6. Under the broad heading "Promoting sustainable transport", Section 4 of the NPPF deals with a number of transport related issues. One particular aim is to achieve "safe and suitable access" (paragraph 32). The Development Plan identifies similar aims. In particular, Core Policy CP24 of the 'Core Strategy' is aimed at improving the road network, in the interests of safety, convenience and environmental quality, among other things, while Policy DMD46 of the Council's 'Improving Enfield: Development Management Document' restricts the construction of new accesses onto A-roads and other busy classified roads. It points out the importance of highway safety and the need to maintain the free flow of traffic.
7. Cars parking at the side of the road evidently interrupt the free flow of traffic but the proposed crossover would introduce new turning movements on Green Lanes for vehicles entering and leaving the appeal site, even if they were to do so in forward gear. The site is located on a gentle bend, close to a road junction. On balance, I am convinced that the crossover would add to highway hazards and that it would be disruptive to traffic. In addition, it would lead to the loss of useful on-street parking that is publicly available at present.
8. Hence, I am convinced that the scheme would have a significantly adverse impact on highway safety and convenience, reducing the efficiency of this part of the network. In consequence, it would conflict with both national and local planning policies.
9. Moreover, the appeal site already has the benefit of an access at the rear that is adequate to serve the property. The benefits of the scheme would be very limited, therefore, and do not outweigh the objections to the new access.
10. In short, I am convinced that the appeal must fail and, although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

Roger C Shrimplin

INSPECTOR