



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3275239

507 South Ordnance Road, Enfield, EN3 6JD.

- 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 Mrs Emel Mestanoglu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00627/HOU, dated 24 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as crossover for drive way
-

Application for costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mrs Emel Mestanoglu against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area, the free flow of traffic, public on-street parking and highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 507 South Ordnance Road, is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on the western side of Ordnance Road, a classified road. The dwelling, as its neighbours, is set well back from the road. It has a large hardstanding area between the house and the footpath and grass verge. From the evidence I note that this is some 6.0 metres deep by approximately 4.8 metres wide.
5. The properties on the western side of the road face the canal. Like number 507, a number have front gardens laid to hardstanding. However, only a few currently benefit from vehicular crossovers. As I saw, on the occasion of my visit, on-street public parking is almost continuous along this side of the road.
6. The appellant proposes a new crossover to give access to an existing hardstanding for private residential off-street parking. Based on the size of the hardstanding there would, in my opinion, be sufficient space for two cars to

- park side by side at 90 degrees to the road without overhanging any part of the highway.
7. Policy DMD46 of the Enfield Development Management Document (November 2014) (DMD) sets out eight criteria against which applications for vehicle crossovers will be assessed. As identified by the Council the proposal would accord with criteria b., g. and h. and I find no reason to disagree with its findings. I shall therefore now consider the remaining five criteria.
 8. Criterion a. In this case the formation of the new crossover would result in loss of part of the existing grass verge. I therefore consider that in a small, but nevertheless material way, the development would denude the character of the area and streetscene.
 9. Criterion c. The proposed new crossover would in isolation reduce to some limited extent the available public on-street parking. However, the cumulative effect of a number of further crossovers being built along the road to serve even the existing front garden hardstandings, I saw on my visit, would inevitably result in a significant loss of public on-street parking.
 10. Criteria d., e. and f. The existing hardstanding would not facilitate on-site turning of vehicles. Accordingly, vehicles would need to either reverse on to or off the site. Further, the visibility of drivers leaving the site would be restricted by cars parked either side of the crossover along the kerb line. In my judgement overall this would result in an adverse impact on the free flow of traffic and highway safety, contrary to criteria d., e. and f.
 11. I conclude in respect of the main issue that, notwithstanding the Public Transport Accessibility Level applicable to this location, the proposed development would cause harm to the character of the area, the free flow of traffic, on-street parking and highway safety.
 12. To allow it would therefore be contrary to Policies T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan (Adopted 2021), Policy CP25 of the Enfield Plan – Core Strategy – 2010 - 2025 (Adopted November 2010), DMD Policies DMD45 and DMD46 and Enfield Council Technical Standards for Footway Crossovers (excluding Heavy Duty Crossovers) (April 2013) as they relate to the need to protect the character of an area, the free flow of traffic, provision of on-street parking and highway safety.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR