
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3284147

5 The Chine, London N21 2EA

- 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 Grant Eldred against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/01695/HOU, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of hard standing in connection with vehicular access involving electric vehicle charging point together with replacement front boundary wall and associated landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a hard standing in connection with vehicular access involving electric vehicle charging point together with replacement front boundary wall and associated landscaping, at 5 The Chine, London, N21 2EA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01695/HOU, dated 30 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans : Location plan and block plan – 607-1 Rev A Existing plans and elevations – 607-2 Rev A Proposed plans and elevations – 607-6 Rev A Proposed section – 607-4 Rev A.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including whether it preserves or enhances the Grange Park Conservation Area (CA) in which it sits and 2) highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. No. 5 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. The surrounding area comprises of detached and semi-detached houses set back from the highway. It sits within the CA with its significance derived from the suburban character, street layout and predominate Arts and Crafts architecture which contributes positively to the character and appearance of this part of the CA and the CA as a whole.
5. Whilst there is visual and architectural uniformity in the dwellings themselves, the numerous changes including hardstanding areas and boundary treatments to the front gardens results in an irregular pattern and now forms part of the established character of this part of The Chine.
6. The proposal seeks to provide an off-street parking area. The front garden would be relandscaped to include a hardstanding area, a vehicle charging point and in part the replacement of the front boundary wall.
7. The delegated report notes that the Grange Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2015) (CAA) identifies the loss of front gardens, and their replacement with hard standing for vehicles, as intrusive, too extensive, with very little planting and no boundary walls.
8. The proposal would retain an element of soft landscaping and, unlike some neighbouring examples where the entire front wall has been removed, a section of low front wall would be retained across a significant section of the frontage, an aim that the CAA seeks to achieve. Given the limited width of the opening, the proposed landscaping and retained wall, the car parking and driveway would not dominate the frontage which would retain the feel of a front garden. Furthermore, the area in which the appeal site is located has numerous paved surfaces to the front with variations in the overall design and siting of boundary treatments which as noted, now forms part of the established character and appearance of this part of The Chine. Whilst the proposal would result in a small addition opening to the street scene it would continue to preserve the established character and appearance of this part of the CA and the CA as a whole.
9. Given the above, the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would accord with Policies DMD37 and DMD44 of the Development Management Document (2014), Policy 31 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) (CS) and Policy HC1 of The London Plan (2021) (LP) , which collectively seek development to make a positive contribution to the area, be locally distinctive or reinforce historic patterns of development, and ensure the design of development affecting heritage assets conserves the asset in a manner appropriate to its significance. The development would also avoid conflict with the National Planning Policy Frameworks historic environment conservation requirements.

Highway Safety

10. The council note that the proposed parking area would require the parking of a vehicle to manoeuvre in a manner similarly required when a vehicle is parallel parked. This they note would give rise to excessive manoeuvring leading to highway safety concerns.

11. The area appeared to have a low volume of highway users and given the suburban, residential area, traffic in the area is required to travel at low speeds.
12. Within the immediate area there are a number of properties with similar hardstandings including where vehicles are essentially parked parallel to the highway. These parking areas require vehicles to manoeuvre in a similar manner to which is being proposed. However, there is no evidence that this form of manoeuvring creates highway safety issues particularly to other road users and or pedestrians.
13. Given that there is already frequent use of similar sized and configured hardstandings in the surrounding area and, pedestrian and traffic volume in the area is low, the proposed scheme would ensure the safe access and egress of a vehicle from the premises would not result in harm to the safety of highway users, primary considerations which the Council's Technical Footway Guidance (2013) seek to achieve.
14. For the reasons above, the proposal would not give rise to highway safety issues. As such it would accord with Policies DMD45 and DMD46 of the DMD which seeks to ensure off-street parking has no adverse impact on road safety and vehicles can manoeuvre safely.
15. The Council note the proposal conflicts with Policy 25 of the CS, however, this policy relates to improving the provision of routes for pedestrians and cyclists and, Policy T6.1 of the LP, which relates to residential parking provision in respect of new development. These are not considered determinative in this appeal.

Conditions

16. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. There is sufficient detail regarding the use of materials included within the approved plans, therefore a separate condition to control the use of materials is not considered necessary

Conclusion

17. The proposal accords with the most relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR