



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3356782

52 Winchmore Hill Road, Enfield, Southgate N14 6PX

- 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 Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/03106/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as front driveway and dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is set back from the highway by a small front garden. A number of vehicular accesses adjoin this section of the highway with a bus stop located within close proximity to the appeal site, requiring pedestrians to wait within the footway. During my site visit I observed the highway to be characteristically busy in relation to the number of pedestrians in addition to vehicular traffic along the classified road. I recognise these observations represent a snapshot in time.
4. The proposal would create a car parking area to the front of the appeal property, with the vehicular access adjoining the public footway. The configuration of the proposal would necessitate vehicles to reverse in or out of the site, limiting the driver's visibility in so doing, giving rise to potential conflict with vehicles travelling along the highway. Moreover, when combined with the appeal site's close proximity to the bus stop and aforementioned pedestrian numbers utilising the footway, the proposal would represent a hazard to the safety of pedestrians.
5. Whilst there are a large number of vehicular accesses along Winchmore Hill Road, I do not know the circumstances under which they were constructed or their status with regard to planning permission. Further, their presence does not justify the harm the proposal would cause to highway safety.
6. The appellant has indicated that any slowing down of free-flowing traffic, as a result of the proposal, would be beneficial, as would be the net increase in one car parking space as a result of the scheme overall. The gain in spaces is limited by the fact it would only be available for use by occupants of the appeal dwelling, rather than for public use. In any event, as a matter of my planning judgement,

such benefits (if they really are benefits) would not outweigh the harm identified above to the safety of motorists and pedestrians.

7. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have an unacceptable and detrimental effect on highway safety. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the relevant provisions of Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) (Core Strategy), and Policy DMD46 of the Development Management Document (2014), which when read together require new development to have no adverse impact on road safety. I have also been referred to CP24 of the Core Strategy, but it has not been explained how this is relevant to the main issue in this appeal and so I consider it weighs neither in favour of nor against the appeal proposal. The proposal would also be in conflict with advice contained in the Revised Technical Standards for Footway Crossovers (excluding Heavy Duty Crossovers) (2013) which seeks to ensure safe access to and egress from premises.

Other Matters

8. The appellant raises the loss of parking spaces on a nearby street following the sale of land by the Council. I have not been provided with full details of this and in any event, it does not justify the appeal development in light of the harm identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR