



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3257729

131 Hedge Lane, Southgate N13 5BY

- 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 Kyriacos Panayi against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01634/HOU, dated 14 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is extending the current crossover by a further 1.4 meters.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey terrace dwelling with a driveway to the front, accommodating two vehicles. It is located in a built-up and urban environment on a busy road. The crossover onto Hedge Lane is currently 3.2 metres in width. The proposal would increase this width to 4.6 metres across an existing grass verge, reducing the level of on-street parking by one vehicle.
5. As the existing driveway is already capable of accommodating two vehicles, the proposed development would not be likely to intensify the use of the access. However, the current driveway and crossover requires vehicles to reverse from or onto the road and the proposed crossover extension would not alleviate this. Furthermore, as on-street parking is currently in high demand in this location, the reduction in an on-street parking space could result in an increased risk of some cars parking in unsafe positions which would jeopardise the safety of road users and pedestrians.
6. I understand from the comments by the Council's crossovers team that, in practical terms, the extension could only be 1.6m or 1.2m wide. I also note the appellant, and the crossovers team agree an extension of 1.2m wouldn't need planning permission. Nonetheless, the proposal before me is materially wider and would, as stated above, result in a loss of on-street parking.

7. Therefore, the proposed development would result in harm to highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies 6.10 of The London Plan (2016), Policy 25 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DMD46 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014). These policies collectively seek to provide a safe pedestrian environment with no adverse impact on the road safety or increase in on-street parking pressures in areas already experiencing high on street parking demand. It would also be contrary to the general highways objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
8. The Council have included Policies 6.3, 6.9 and 6.13 of The London Plan (2016) and Policies 24 and 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) within the reason for refusal. However these relate to transport capacities, cycling facilities, maximum parking provision, the road networks and the quality of the built environment, all of which are not directly relevant to the proposed development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR