



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/3342
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Ground Floor Flat, 74 Palace Gates Road, Wood Green, London, N22 7BL
Proposal:	Creation of dropped curb to create vehicular access into front garden, with replacement hardstanding.
Case Officer:	Roland Sheldon
Valid Date:	18/12/2023
Applicant:	Ms K Hussein
Agent:	Mr D Black

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site contains a ground-floor flat within a two-storey mid-terrace building containing 2 self-contained flats, on the northern side of Palace Gates Road, N22. The surrounding uses are residential. The site does not contain a listed building and is not located within a conservation area.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for the creation of a dropped curb to create vehicular access into front garden, with replacement hardstanding.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

74 Palace Gates Road, N22

OLD/1983/1244: 21/11/83 Conversion of house into 2 self-contained flats – Approved 21/12/1983

HGY/1990/1017: Formation of vehicular crossover – Approved 14/11/1990

HGY/1996/0790: Provision of vehicular crossover – Approved 13/08/1996

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Transportation
- LBH Highways
- Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association

The following comments were received during the consultation period:

- LBH Transportation:
 1. The site has moderate public transport accessibility (PTAL=3) and is located within a CPZ.
 2. The proposal would result in loss on on-street parking within a CPZ. This would be contrary to Policy DM33.

These proposals are not supported for the transport reasons outlined above.

- LBH Highways Maintenance: Permission should be resisted there is less than 4.8 metres depth in the front garden.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies made representations:

Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association: The proposal would not meet the criteria of policy DM33. There would be a reduction in pedestrian and highway safety, would result in the loss of an on-street parking space for the rest of the community in an area suffering from high parking stress levels, and adverse impact on street scene. Unclear if proposal will provide soft landscaping.

The Crossover Group: The Crossover Group endorses and reiterates all the detailed objections relating to DM33 and DM34 already submitted by the Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association. In addition, we note there are numerous examples of dropped kerbs, crossovers and front garden parking near to 74 Palace Gates Road. All these examples will have been either unlawful DIY constructions or will have predated the council's policies. It is regrettable that there seems to have been no evidence of enforcement of remedial action against this proliferation. These examples do not form valid precedents and should not weigh in favour of the application.

Neighbour Consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 0

Objecting

Support

Neither

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The following issues are considered to be the material planning considerations in the determination of this planning application.

Parking, and highway safety

Policy DM33 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) (DMDPD) sets out that with regards to planning applications for a crossover or new vehicular access, the Council will only support a proposal where it does not result in:

- a A reduction in pedestrian or highway safety; or*
- b A reduction of on-street parking capacity within a Controlled Parking Zone; or*
- c A visual intrusion to the street scene*

The proposal would involve the creation of a dropped curb measuring 4.5 metres width at its outer edge of the pavement, reducing to 2.7 metres at the inner edge adjacent to the proposed vehicular access. The submitted drawing indicates that the area in which the parking space would be provided within the front garden area would measure 4.6 metres, which does not meet the minimum 4.8 metres required to accommodate a vehicle as set out in the Haringey VEHICLE CROSSOVER APPLICATION GUIDANCE NOTES produced by the Highways department.

This would give rise to stationary vehicles oversailing onto and partially obstructing the public highway. The site is located within a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in which there are restrictions on on-street parking Mon-Fri between noon – 2pm. There is a CPZ parking bay adjacent to the site that would be required to be removed as part of the proposal. This would result in a loss of on-street parking capacity within an area covered by a CPZ which is understood to be subject to high parking stress levels, and would run counter to part (b) of policy DM33.

As such, the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable impact on pedestrian and highway safety, and parking conditions within the locality, contrary to policy DM33 of the DMDPD.

Design & appearance

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

DM policy DM34 sets out that where planning permission is required, the Council will only permit parking on front gardens where a minimum of 50% of existing soft landscaping area is being retained.

The front garden area is already treated with 100% hardstanding. Notwithstanding this, an application of this nature provides an opportunity to mitigate some of the harm done to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the introduction of off-street parking in the front garden. The proposal does not provide any soft landscaping as part of the

proposal despite there being scope to do so. The absence of any soft landscaping provision in conjunction with the introduction of off-street parking in the front garden would result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP11 of the Local Plan and policies DM1 and DM34 of the DMDPD.

6. CONCLUSION

Taking the above into consideration, the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable impact on pedestrian and highway safety, parking conditions and the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal is considered. 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

The proposal is refused for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of the insufficient depth of off-street parking area, and the resultant loss of a designated on-street parking bay within a Controlled Parking Zone, would give rise to an adverse impact on highway/pedestrian safety and parking conditions within the locality, contrary to policy DM33 of the Haringey Development Management Plan DPD (2017).

The proposed development, by virtue of the absence of any soft landscaping provision, in conjunction with the introduction of off-street parking in the front garden, would result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the locality, contrary to policies SP11 of the Local Plan and policies DM1 and DM34 of the Haringey Development Management Plan DPD (2017).