



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/1128
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	37 Cranley Gardens, Hornsey, London, N10 3AB
Proposal:	Formation of vehicular crossover and creation of car parking space in front garden with a bin storage enclosure and installation of an electric vehicle charging point.
Case Officer:	Mercy Oruwari
Valid Date:	22/04/2024
Applicant:	Mr Nicky Collins
Agent:	Mr Andrea Cincotta

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse which sits directly opposite the bottom of Ellington Road. The site does not fall within a conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the formation of a vehicular crossover and creation of car parking space in the front garden with a bin storage enclosure and installation of an electric vehicle charging point.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

There's no previous planning history for this site.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

1. LBH Transportation Officer: Objection raised – Proposal not supported.
 - There's no policy supporting the introduction of a vehicle crossover to facilitate the need for an Electrical Vehicle charger. There are local EV bays on-street installed by the council near to the site or a lamp charging point could be installed.

- Cranley Gardens is a classified road, and has a 20 MPH speed limit, though vehicles have been known to proceed down the steep road at much faster speeds which is evident with the installation of speed humps on along the entirety of the road.
- Cranley Gardens gets very busy during peaks with congestion as it connects Muswell Hill Road to Park Road and is used as an alternative route to Muswell Hill when it becomes busy with traffic.
- The site is not located in a CPZ; therefore, permits are not needed to park on-street.
- The site is opposite to the junction with Ellington Road which is a steep road leading down to Cranley Gardens.
- The site fronting onto a classified road means vehicles will need to leave in forward gear and have to reverse into the space from the road.
- From examining the swept paths drawings, vehicles reversing into the site will need to complete complicated manoeuvres, which would create opportunities for a conflict of movement between vehicles on a steep incline and possibly a collision.
- From examining the drawings, vehicles would still be able to park near to the white bar line therefore vehicles leaving would have a poor line of sight once they have moved out from the hard standing.
- Vehicles would have to edge out from between parked cars, and they could be missed when approaching vehicles from the west. This would not be in accordance with Policy DM33.
- Due to the site being located opposite a steep junction and all the above concerns, the proposal could lead to an increase in highway safety risks.
- No parking stress survey to illustrate what current parking stress levels are like within 200m of the site. This is needed as the crossover's installation will lead to a loss in on-street parking capacity to allow for a private off-street space for the sole use of the site's residents.
- Contrary to Development Management DPD Policy DM34 due to the scale of soft landscaping.
- LBH Transport Planning would be unable to support the proposal for the above reasons.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies were consulted on the planning application:

Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association:

- A reduction in pedestrian and highway safety.
- A reduction of on-street parking capacity.
- The replacement of most of the evergreen boundary with hardstanding would result in a visual intrusion of the street scene.

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

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

Policy DM34 states that the Council will only permit parking on front gardens where a minimum of 50% of the existing soft landscaping area is being retained. All proposals must appropriately manage flood risk in line with other plan policies. Any hard standing should incorporate the use of a permeable material.

Cumulative loss of front gardens can also impact the character and appearance of the neighbourhood resulting in harm to established streetscapes and the uniform appearances of groups of houses.

In making a decision on this application the LPA need to be mindful of relevant planning legislation and in particular the scope of 'permitted development' rights. In this case the use of land for the parking of a car does not require permission as it is "permitted development" under Class F, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

While in most cases the formation, laying out and construction of a means of access/egress of a highway does not require permission, consent is required here as the road is a classified road (as per Class F, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015).

The proposal is for alterations to the front garden to facilitate a dropped kerb to provide vehicle access to an on-site parking hardstanding space. The front hedge would be removed to accommodate the opening for the new access along with the central green bed and the planting surrounding the bay window. To replenish the vegetation being removed the green area to the right of the property would be increased in size with new edging plants. Permeable paving blocks would be laid throughout the hardstanding space. The timber bin storage would remain in the same location but would sit nestled next to the new green area.

Although permeable paving would be used and attempts would be made to replace the removed vegetation, the scale of hard surfacing to soft landscaping would be contrary to Policy DM34 part A. This requires 50% of the existing soft landscaping area to be retained. The size of the garden would limit the opportunity to integrate both the hardstanding area for the new driveway and the required soft landscaping. In specific the works here do not find a balance between the needs to allow for off-street parking but also to retain landscaping and respect the character of an area, as required by Policy DM34 part B.

The off-street parking space would be approximately 5.2 metres deep and the entrance to the parking space would be 3 metres wide. As per Highway guidelines, the forecourt must have a minimum of 4.8 metres (minimum) required for a standard parking space. The plans submitted indicate that the depth would meet these criteria.

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

Concerns have been raised regarding the safety for both pedestrians using the adjacent footway and passing vehicles. The host property is located immediately opposite a steep junction at the bottom of Ellington Road. Although Cranley Gardens is speed limit of 20 MPH cars do speed down the road, hence the installation of speed bumps throughout the road. Also being the road that connects Muswell Hill Road to Park Road, Cranley Gardens gets very busy during peak times with congestion as it is used as an alternative route.

With the site fronting onto a classified road vehicles would need leave in a forward gear and reverse into the space when coming off the road. The swept paths show that vehicles reversing into the site would need to carry out complicated manoeuvres. In addition, other vehicles would still be able to park near to the white bar line. This would result in poor sight lines when exiting the drive. The vehicle would have to edge out between parked cars and could easily be missed from vehicles travelling from the west. Combined with the other issues and being situated at the lower end of a steep incline this gives rise for opportunities for collisions.

Overall, due to the situation and issues discussed above, the proposed crossover could lead to an increase in highway safety risks. Therefore, the proposal would not be in accordance with DM33.

Lastly, the site is not in a CPZ and therefore permits are not needed to park on-street on this road. However, with the loss of on street parking capacity in exchange for a private off-street parking for sole use, a parking stress survey to illustrate the current parking stress levels within 200m of the site has not been provided.

Although the vehicle crossover which assist in facilitating the installation of a private Electrical Vehicle charger, There's no policy to override the other concerns and issues that would come about from the creation of the crossover.

6. CONCLUSION

Given the location of the application site directly opposite a steep junction and being on a busy road with associated manoeuvring in and out an off-street car parking space is viewed to represent a hazard to both vehicle and pedestrian traffic. In addition, the deficiency in space for adequate soft landscaping would not be in accordance with DM34 Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017.

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 absence of sufficient soft landscaping provision, 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).

Given the location of the application site directly opposite a steep junction and being on a busy

road with associated manoeuvring in and out an off-street car parking space is viewed to represent a hazard to both vehicle and pedestrian traffic, contrary to policy DM33 of the Development Management Plan (2017).