
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3325670

248 Nightingale Road, Edmonton, London N9 8PS

- 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 Jessie Amofah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 23/00078/HOU, dated 18 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal the effects on the safe and efficient flow of vehicles and pedestrians on the adjacent highway.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey terraced house which is set within a mainly residential area, although shops and a school are nearby. Nightingale Road is a classified road (B137) and accommodated a steady flow of traffic when I observed that area. It also accommodates a bus route with a stop opposite the appeal site.
4. Car parking takes place along much of the road and is accommodated partly on the pavement and partly on the carriageway, by signs and road markings. Currently car parking is indicated on the highway outside the appeal site. The proposal would mean that this on-street parking space, which is theoretically available to anyone to park on, would be lost due to the need to keep clear access to the appeal site. Although some properties have off-street parking, there were numerous vehicles parked along the road when I visited the area and I would estimate that demand for such spaces would increase in the evenings when residents return home. Although no surveys have been submitted, I consider that demand for on-street parking spaces would be high. In these circumstances, the proposal gives rise to conflict with Policy DMD 46 of the Council's Development Management Policies 2014.
5. The frontage of the appeal site is insufficient to allow a vehicle to turn within the site. Therefore, a vehicle using the proposed parking space at the appeal site would need to enter or leave the site by reversing. Taking account of the

traffic conditions which I observed, I consider that such a manoeuvre would be likely to be hazardous and would compromise the safety of road users, including those living at the appeal site. In addition, it is likely that such a manoeuvre would interrupt the free flow of vehicles on this classified road. Therefore, further conflict with Policy DMD 46 would arise.

6. I have taken account of the fact that a number of other properties have access onto this road. However, I have no details of the planning history of these matters, if such exists. In my judgement, the proposed access would be likely to have a prejudicial effect on the free and safe use of the adjacent highway and there are no matters which outweigh that harm.
7. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR