



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2024

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3346015

173 Chase Side, Southgate, Enfield N14 5HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mehmet Siringul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/1388/HSE.
 - The development proposed is for alterations to existing vehicular hardstanding and widening of existing access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to existing vehicular hardstanding and widening of existing access at 173 Chase Side, Southgate, Enfield N14 5HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/1388/HSE, 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 drawing H.E-01-PL02 and site location plan.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development has been taken from the decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposed development. I note this description has also been used in the appeal form.
3. The appeal proposal is for alterations to the existing hardstanding at the front of the property and the widening of the existing vehicle crossover. The Council have raised no concerns with the alterations to the hardstanding, based on the information before me I have no reason to disagree. The focus of the appeal is therefore on the extension to the vehicle crossover.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed vehicle crossover on highway safety.

Reasons

5. No 173 Chase Side currently has a shared vehicle crossover with the neighbouring property. I am mindful that the width of the existing crossover exceeds the limit set out in the London Borough of Barnet Domestic Vehicle Crossover Policy (2019) (VCP), and the proposal would increase this further. However, due to the position of the existing crossover relative to the access

point at the front of No 173, vehicles are not able to enter and exit the site at a right angle, unlike the neighbouring property and the majority of properties in the vicinity.

6. Whilst the Council consider the proposal would result in conflicting vehicle movements and prejudice highway safety, no substantive information has been provided as to why this would be the case. From the submitted information and from my site visit it was evident that the existing grass verge was being driven over, indicating that vehicles are having to mount and dismount the kerb in order to enter and exit the highway. In seeking to extend the width of the existing crossover further, it would avoid vehicles having to perform such a manoeuvre, allowing for a smoother transition on to the highway. It would also allow vehicles to enter and exit the driveway in the same manner as surrounding properties. In my view, the proposed layout would afford better visibility and better access to and from the site and would minimise the risk of conflict with other road users.
7. Although the proposal would exceed the maximum crossover width set out in the VCP and the London Borough of Barnet: Guidance Notes for Vehicle Crossovers and Highway Access for New Developments Requiring Highways Authority Approval (2016), I conclude for the reasons above, that the increased width of the crossover would not give rise to an unacceptable risk to pedestrian or highway safety. I therefore find no conflict with Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS9 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM17 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2012). These, amongst other matters, broadly seek to ensure development improves road safety for all road users and does not increase road danger. I also find that the proposal would not conflict with requirements within the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks safe and suitable access and places which minimise scope for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, nor would it conflict with the Residential Design Guidance (2016) in so far as relevant to vehicle-crossovers.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty.
9. A suggested condition requiring materials to match those used on the existing building is not necessary given the nature of the proposal and as such I have not imposed it.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would accord with the development plan when read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the attached conditions.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR