



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0332
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	31 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8LH
Proposal:	Part renewal, repair and lowering of existing brick boundary wall to match existing brick work and installation of sliding gate access in composite horizontal slatted boarding.
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie
Valid Date:	06/02/2026
Applicant:	Mr peter brown
Agent:	Mr peter brown

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two-storey end of terrace property on the junction of Ashford Avenue and Priory Road. The property has been subdivided into two flats being 31a and 32b. The site is not located in a conservation area.

2. THE PROPOSAL

This application seeks part renewal, repair, and lowering of an existing brick boundary wall to match the existing brickwork, together with the installation of a sliding access gate in composite horizontal slatted boarding.

The proposal also includes the provision of a new hardstanding within the rear garden and the creation of a new vehicular access onto Ashford Road, utilising a former crossover that has been redundant for at least 16 years, and likely for considerably longer.

It is noted that this is a resubmission following the refusal of a similar proposal under application reference HGY/2025/1691. However, the current application differs in that it proposes lowering the section of wall to be repaired, as well as reducing the height of the composite horizontal slatted gate.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2024/1537,
Address: 31 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8LH
Proposal: Proposed return of two ground & first floor flats, 31 A & B, back to two single family dwellings, with small side dormer and first floor rear extension to number 31B only.,
Decision Date: 28 August 2024
Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2025/2202,

Address: 31 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8LH

Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to Conditions 3 (External Material) of planning permission ref: HGY/2024/1537 dated 28/08/2024 for the proposed return of two ground & first floor flats, 31 A & B, back to two single family dwellings, with small side dormer and first floor rear extension to number 31B only.,

Decision Date: 29 August 2025

Decision: Approve

HGY/2025/1691,

Address: 31 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8LH

Proposal: To repair/renew fractured brick work which had collapsed and to replace a section with a fixed panel of fencing and sliding gate access in composite horizontal slatted boarding to height of 1.8m.,

Decision Date: 13 October 2025

Decision: Refuse

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

Neighbour Consultation

No representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application.

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

DPD Policy DM1 '*Delivering High Quality Design*' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 seeks the highest standard of design that respects local context, character, and historic significance.

Policy DM34 states that the Council will only permit parking on front gardens where a minimum of 50% of the existing soft landscaping is retained. All proposals must also appropriately manage flood risk in line with other plan policies, and any hardstanding should incorporate permeable materials.

Part of the existing boundary wall fronting Ashford Avenue is currently fractured. The proposal seeks to lower the wall to 900 mm in height and repair it by raking out loose mortar and repointing the facing bricks. The development also includes the installation of a 900 mm-high sliding gate constructed of horizontal composite slatted boarding and the provision of a new hardstanding within the garden to facilitate off-street parking.

While the location of the proposed hardstanding is indicated, no detailed information has been provided regarding the proposed surfacing materials.

Although the proportion of hard surfacing relative to soft landscaping would not be contrary to Policy DM34 (Part A), there is insufficient detail regarding the landscaping and materials of the proposed driveway. In this instance, a condition requiring approval of materials could be attached

should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant permission, as the proposal would not preclude the successful integration of the hardstanding area.

The proposed off-street parking space would measure approximately 5 metres in depth with a 3-metre-wide access. In accordance with highway guidelines, a minimum depth of 4.8 metres is required for a standard parking space, and the submitted plans demonstrate compliance with this requirement.

The proposed materials for the sliding gate and the repair of the existing wall are considered acceptable. No concerns are raised in relation to the lowering of part of the boundary wall, and as such the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the application site or the surrounding area.

Neighbouring Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

Due to the nature of the proposal, which comprises works to a rear boundary wall and the installation of a new gate of a similar height to the existing, no adverse impacts would arise in respect of neighbouring dwellings or adjoining sites.

Parking and highway safety

Policy DM32 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) states that the Council will support development proposals with limited or no on-site parking where there are alternative and accessible means of transport available, public transport accessibility is at least level 4 (as defined by the Public Transport Accessibility Index), a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) exists or will be implemented prior to occupation, parking is provided for disabled users, and parking is designated for occupiers of developments identified as car-capped.

Policy DM33 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) sets out that planning applications for crossovers or new vehicular accesses will only be supported where they do not result in a reduction in pedestrian or highway safety, a loss of on-street parking capacity within a CPZ, or visual harm to the streetscene.

Policy DM2 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) further requires that proposals ensure developments can be used safely, easily, and with dignity by all users, while protecting and enhancing safe and accessible pedestrian and cycling routes, and not impeding pedestrian or cycle permeability.

The site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2. However, it is considered to be more accessible than the PTAL rating suggests. The site is within a short walking distance (approximately three minutes) of bus stops on Priory Road, served by the W3 and 144 bus routes. These services are frequent, with the W3 route providing connections to Finsbury

Park Station, a major Underground and National Rail interchange, as well as Wood Green Underground Station and Alexandra Palace rail station, all of which are a short bus ride away.

In the previous refusal under application reference HGY/2025/169, concerns were raised in relation to pedestrian and highway safety, specifically that the existing boundary walls, measuring approximately 1.8 metres in height, would obstruct visibility of pedestrian movement when vehicles were exiting or reversing from the site.

While the officer's report stated that boundary walls should ideally be reduced to a maximum height of 600mm to provide adequate pedestrian visibility, the current proposal seeks a reduced wall height of 900mm. Although this reduction would partially address the concern, it is considered that visibility would still be limited and may not fully mitigate potential conflicts between vehicles exiting the site and pedestrians using the pavement.

It was also previously established that the close proximity of on-street parking bays to the proposed crossover would significantly reduce driver sightlines due to parked vehicles. This issue remains. As such, the manoeuvring of vehicles entering or exiting the site, particularly when reversing onto the highway, is considered potentially hazardous and obstructive to oncoming traffic.

Overall, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed crossover is likely to result in increased highway safety risks. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy DM33 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

6. CONCLUSION

While the proposed works to the boundary wall and gate are considered acceptable in design terms and would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the site or the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, significant concerns remain in relation to highway and pedestrian safety. Specifically, the proposed vehicular crossover and associated parking arrangement would result in inadequate visibility and hazardous vehicle manoeuvres when entering and exiting the site, which would be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety.

As a result, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies DM33 and DM2 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). All other material considerations, including equalities impacts, have been taken into account.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission

Refusal Reasons:

Vehicles entering and exiting the proposed new vehicular access would, by reason of the close proximity of on-street allocated parking bays, experience poor visibility and obstructed sightlines, detrimental to the safety of pedestrians and other road users and would adversely affect the safe and free flow of traffic along this section of Ashford Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1, DM2, DM32, and DM33 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), and Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021).

