



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3263328

71 Macleod Road, Enfield, London, N21 1SW

- 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 & Mrs Georgiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01866/HOU, dated 17 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is widening of existing vehicular access together with construction of hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for widening of existing vehicular access together with construction of hardstanding at 71 Macleod Road, Enfield, London, N21 1SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01866/HOU, dated 17 June 2020, 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: CR_001, CR_002, CR_003, CR_004.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.
3. The Council's reasons for refusing the application refer to policy 7.4 and paragraph 6.13 of the London Plan (2016), which relate to the quality of design and its contribution to local character and car parking, respectively. That plan has since been superseded by the London Plan 2021 (LP) which was published in March 2021. Policy D3 of the LP sets similar requirements for development with respect to design. However, policy T6 of the LP changed the maximum parking standards and both parties were invited to comment on the changes. The Council provided no further comment. I have taken the Appellant's comments into consideration and have determined the appeal with regard to policies D3 and T6 of the LP. I am satisfied that neither party will be caused an injustice by taking this approach.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon:

- the character and appearance of the area; and,
- car parking provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is in a residential area with a mix of housing and is part of the front garden of an end property in a short terrace of 3 storey townhouses. Most houses have off road parking in front of them. Narrow strips of privet hedges, grass or shrubs divide front garden boundaries between properties. Hedges, grass verges, trees, and green open space between groups of houses are important features of the area.
6. The appeal site front garden is slightly larger than most because of a lawned area to the side of it. This extends to the rear boundary of properties that back on to it. The lawn joins a grass verge which follows a curve in the road running between it and a rear garden wall. The proposed development would widen the crossover access and create an area of hardstanding for one car next to an existing car parking space in front of the appellant's house. Although part of the lawn would be lost, the contribution that such a small area of green space makes to the character and appearance of the area is not significant.
7. Furthermore, part of the lawn would be retained, as would the grass verge that extends from it along the road edge. The proposal would involve the removal of a hedge along the side of the existing parking space. However, compensatory planting is proposed along the edge of the remaining lawn and along the grass verge. In my view, retaining part of the lawn and the grass verge, and the additional planting would ensure that the proposal would not result in a negative impact on the existing character of the area and street scape.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area and there would be no conflict with policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (November 2010), policies DMD37 and DMD46 of the Development Management Document (November 2014) (DMD), LP policy D3 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which require high quality development that does not negatively impact on the existing character of an area or streetscape.

Car Parking

9. The Council contend that the proposal would result in an oversupply of car parking and therefore fail to promote sustainable travel modes. An existing garage and car parking space are referred to. However, the garage has consent for conversion which the appellant claims is being implemented and I have no evidence before me that this is not the case. It does not therefore contribute to parking at the appeal property but represents a net loss of one space.
10. According to the appellant the appeal site is in a location with a PTAL 1a to 1b. Table 10.3 of the LP sets a maximum of 1.5 car parking spaces in outer London PTAL 1 locations, although this relates to new residential development.

11. The appeal site is on a bend in the road where it is narrow. On street parking at this location would be potentially hazardous as cars approaching from different directions would not be visible to, or be able to safely manoeuvre around, each other. It is therefore reasonable to allow more than one parking space at the appeal property, particularly as there would be no net increase in parking provision beyond the level that existed prior to planning permission being granted to convert the garage.
12. The proposal would not therefore lead to an oversupply of carparking and would not conflict with the aims of policy DMD 45 of the DMD, policy T6 of the LP, the Framework and the Mayors Transport Strategy (March 2018) which seek to limit car parking taking account of existing parking pressure and public transport accessibility.

Conditions

13. The 3 year period in which the planning permission may be implemented is a statutory requirement and a condition should also be imposed to list the plans in the interest of certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR