



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2023

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3309477
138 Hedge Lane, Enfield, Southgate N13 5ST

- 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 Minas Mina against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/02051/HOU, dated 1 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is vehicular access and construction of hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. For the sake of brevity and clarity I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety with regards to parking.

Reasons

4. The proposal would result in vehicles reversing from or onto the A111 carriageway and increasing the number of vehicle movements onto the classified road. The Enfield Council Revised Technical Standards for Footway Crossovers (TSFC) states that a vehicle parking area should normally be at least 4.8 metres (m) deep by 2.4m wide. The plans state that the proposal would be to accommodate two vehicles with a parking area shown as 4.5m wide. A parking area of 4.5m wide would introduce a cramped arrangement for the parking of two vehicles. This cramped arrangement would significantly hamper vehicle manoeuvring on and off the carriageway which would result in slow moving vehicles being a hazard on the highway to other road users.
5. The width of the identified vehicle parking area would result in restricted visibility, particularly when a vehicle is exiting and views of the footway and highway would be restricted by another vehicle parked directly adjacent to it. The restricted visibility would be unsafe to pedestrians when vehicles are exiting the site as well as motorists on the A111, that would also be to the detriment of the free flow of traffic.
6. The proposal relates to a single family dwelling and vehicle movements would likely not be intense and it is noted that vehicles would not overhang the public footway. The proposal would be sufficient distance away from other highway junctions and there are no bus stops or zig zag markings adjacent to the

appeal site. The appellant also describes that the speed limit on Hedge Lane is not high and that accident records for the locality do not include any incidents involving movements of vehicles to and from exiting vehicular accesses. Nevertheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the cramped parking area of 4.5m width for two vehicles, resulting in restricted visibility and manoeuvring for vehicles exiting and entering the site. The proposal would therefore be prejudicial to the free flow of traffic and have a detrimental effect on highway safety for pedestrians and road users.

7. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety with regards to parking. The proposal would not accord with the TSFC, Policy DMD 46 of the Enfield Development Management Document, Policies 24 and 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks proposal to not have an adverse impact on road safety, reduce congestion and promote safe neighbourhoods.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
9. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR