LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/1370 **Ward:** Highgate

Date received: 01/05/2015

Last amended date:

Drawing number of plans: EH/06/13/PAG/01, EH/06/13/PAG/03, 01 of 01.

Address: 77 Gaskell Road N6 4DU

Proposal: Construction of dropped kerb (householder application)

Applicant: Mrs Michelle Adams

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 21/05/2015

Officer contact: Valerie Okeiyi

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the construction of dropped kerb.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is located on the south-western side of Gaskell Road close to the junction of Storey Road and in close proximity to Highgate Infant and Junior School. The site is located within Gaskell Estate, which was built in 1902 as early Council housing scheme designed by Hornsey Borough Engineer, E. J. Lovegrove. The property is a mid terrace two storey dwelling house with pitch roof and front gable. The front garden is bounded by a low stone fencing, timber fencing and tall hedging. To the rear is a set of steps leading onto a raised patio followed by the garden which backs onto allotments. The application site is located within Highgate Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.4 HGY/2013/2013 - Installation of steplifts to front of property, raising of fence between Nos 77 and 79 Gaskell Road to front and rear - Grant permission – 21/11/2013

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal
1) LBH Transportation team
2) LBH Conservation Officer

4.2 The following responses were received :

Internal:
1) The Transportation team object and made the following comments;

- There is not enough space on-site to accommodate a standard sized parking bay. Current Haringey standards require that parking spaces measure a minimum of 4.8 metres deep, measured at a right angle to the footway, by 2.4 metres wide to allow perpendicular entry and to prevent vehicles from overhanging the footway and causing an obstruction to the public highway. The proposed ground floor plan indicates that the parking space would measure just 3.7 metres in depth, which is a very significant shortfall of approximately 1.1 metres.
- The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable as it is likely to give rise to hazardous highway conditions and prejudice the safety of vulnerable pedestrian groups using the adjacent highway conditions. In addition the proposal contravenes the London Plan Policy 6.10 which seeks to provide safe and attractive pedestrian routes that are easy to navigate.
- Therefore, the highway and transportation authority object to the above application in the interest of public safety.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 14 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:3
Objecting:3
Supporting:0

5.2 Crossover Group objects and made the following comments:

- The proposal is in conflict with Council policy on parking in front gardens (Policy SPG1b – Updated 2008), which is quoted in a footnote below. The Council's new Local Development Framework will continue to assert the principles of SPG1b – the key one being: "*Parking in front gardens is generally unacceptable and will not normally receive planning permission"*. It is incumbent on planning officers to uphold this principle.

- The proposal is for a front garden conversion that is only 3.7 metres in depth. The council's minimum requirement is for a depth of 4.8 metres. With a total loss of green-space, it also fails to meet the council's guidelines for the retention of at least 50% of the garden as green-space. Also, it looks as if there is no provision for drainage and prevention of water run-off onto the footway.
- Any claim that front-garden parking saves parking spaces is spurious. Experience elsewhere in Haringey shows this to be an inefficient use of road space. The fact that space outside the property is appropriated for exclusive use by the applicant is objectionable – it is in effect a land-grab for an amenity used by other residents.
- Thee are no notices on site to warn other residents who might want to object to this loss of amenity.

5.3 Highgate CAAC objects and made the following comments;

- Permission for this should be refused; in an area with very confined front gardens using them for parking is to the detriment of the street scene and only increases parking stress for the community since it involves the virtual privatisation of a section of kerb. There is also the issue of increased runoff from the large paved area where in this application no permeable surface is indicated.

5.4 Highgate Society objects and made the following comments;

- The Highgate Society fully supports Haringey's general policy on crossovers:"Parking in front gardens is generally unacceptable and will not normally receive planning permission." We see no reason to depart from the policy in this case. Indeed, there are strong reasons why Haringey's general policy should be applied. The front garden is significantly shorter in depth than the Council's minimum requirement of a depth of 4.8 metres.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:
1. Impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
2. Highway safety.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

6.2 London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 require development proposals to be of the highest design quality and have appropriate regard to local context. Local Plan Policy SP11 and Saved UDP Policy UD3 reinforce this strategic approach. The proposal must be assessed against Saved UDP Policy CSV5 and Local Plan Policy SP12 and London Plan policy 7.8 which seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to existing buildings in conservation area do not cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6.3 The proposal would include the removal of one of the front walls across the frontage of the site to allow for on-site parking. This front wall is of similar design and height to those along the nearby frontage, due to its design, height, and sense of

enclosure, it is considered that the demolition of this wall would fail to preserve the character of the Conservation Area, as such contrary to policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' and 7.8 'Heritage Assets' of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 'Design', SP12 'Conservation' of the Local Plan 2013, saved policy UD3 'General Principles' and CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas' of the UDP (2006).

Parking and highway safety

6.4 NPPF (2012) chapter 4 Promoting sustainable transport, saved policy M10 (Parking for Development) of the Council's UDP (2006) seeks to ensure that proposed developments do not adversely affect the free flow of traffic around the site and that they do not result in a material impact on existing parking levels.

6.5 The proposal is for the construction of the dropped kerb constructed in concrete. The Highway and Transportation authority team have assessed the proposal and object to the proposed development as there is not enough space on-site to accommodate a standard sized parking bay. Current Haringey standards require that parking spaces measure a minimum of 4.8 metres deep, measured at a right angle to the footway, by 2.4 metres wide to allow perpendicular entry and to prevent vehicles from overhanging the footway and causing an obstruction to the public highway. The proposed ground floor plan indicates that the parking space would measure just 3.7 metres in depth, which is a very significant shortfall of approximately 1.1 metres.

6.6 The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable as it is likely to give rise to hazardous highway conditions and would prejudice the safety of vulnerable pedestrian groups using the adjacent highway conditions. In addition the proposal contravenes the London Plan Policy 6.10 which seeks to provide safe and attractive pedestrian routes that are easy to navigate.

6.7 The proposal is therefore contrary to Haringey's Saved UDP Policies HSG11, Local Plan Policy SP7 and London Plan Policy 6.10 (Walking), 6.11 Smoothing Traffic Flow and Tackling Congestion)"

Conclusions

6.8 The proposed development is considered unacceptable as it would lead to hazardous highway conditions and would prejudice the safety of vulnerable pedestrian groups using the adjacent high. The proposal would fail to preserve the character of the Conservation Area. Given the above the application is recommended for REFUSAL.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2015/1370

Applicant's drawing No.(s) EH/06/13/PAG/01, EH/06/13/PAG/03, 01 of 01.

For the following reason(s)

1. The proposal is likely to give rise to hazardous highway conditions and prejudice the safety of vulnerable pedestrian groups using the adjacent highway by way of the parking arrangement, contrary to Saved Policy HSG11 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan, Local Plan Policy SP7 and London Plan Policy 6.10 (Walking), 6.11 Smoothing Traffic Flow and Tackling.

2. The proposed development lies in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within a Conservation Area. The proposed development if approved would seriously detract from the important character to the detriment of the vicinity and fail to preserve or enhance its character or appearance contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2011, Saved Policies CSV1 and UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.