
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/20/3250173

248 Park Road, Hornsey, London N8 8JX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Freeman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/3070, dated 5 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers and on-street parking on Park Road (A1201).

Reasons

4. The proposal involves the creation of a vehicular crossover to facilitate one off-street parking space at the front of the appeal property. The hedge and wall to the front of the site are to be removed, while hardstanding and a turntable would be installed in the parking area.
5. Park Road is a single lane carriageway lined with houses and on-street parking on both sides of the road. On the site visit I observed the road to be heavily trafficked, despite the early afternoon time outside of morning and afternoon rush hours, although I appreciate that this was a snapshot in time. The site lies close to a bend in the road and near to the junction of Park Road and Park Avenue South.
6. In this context, in order to prevent danger from vehicles manoeuvring in the road, it seems to me to be reasonable that the Council requires vehicles to enter and leave in the site a forward gear. It is also reasonable to require the provision of adequate visibility sightlines.

7. In this case the plan does not appear to have been drawn to the scale indicated and there are insufficient dimensions to demonstrate that adequate visibility splays could be achieved. Furthermore, no pedestrian visibility splays have been shown on the plans and it is not clear that such splays would be fully within the control of the appellant. The hedges lining the adjoining boundary with No.246 and the hedge to the front of No.250, would mean views of the footway would be obscured from the proposed parking area. As such, I cannot be sure that vehicles egressing the site would have the required visibility to ensure a safe and suitable access.
8. I acknowledge that as a result of the volume of traffic and presence of speed restriction measures, traffic on the highway is likely to travel at low speeds. However, there is no dispute that the visibility splays required by the Council have not taken this factor into account. I also acknowledge that vehicle movements into and out of the site during the course of a day would be limited and I note the appellant's contention that accident records do not show any incidents associated with the use of private driveways. However, this does not demonstrate that the introduction of a new crossover in this location would be safe.
9. As it currently stands, there is insufficient space within the driveway to allow a vehicle to enter and leave in a forward gear. The proposed turntable would allow this to happen without the need to turn around within the site, and I do not doubt the appellant's intention to use such a facility. However, it seems to me that such a situation may not necessarily be the case in perpetuity, and I am unconvinced that the matter could be successfully enforced. Any vehicles reversing on to or off the highway amongst parked vehicles and close to a bend in the road, would result in a reduction in highway safety and this adds to my conclusion.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's need for the use of a family vehicle. Nevertheless, on-street parking is available and whilst there might be high demand for such space, I am unconvinced this situation justifies the proposal.
11. My attention is drawn to dropped kerbs installed at No.153 Park Road. I have limited details regarding this. However, I note this was undertaken without planning permission. I also observed No.153 has an existing crossover. As such, this is not directly comparable to the proposal before me. Regardless, each development is assessed on its own merits.
12. The sight line plan indicates the loss of some on-street parking space to facilitate the new access. I observed the vicinity of the appeal site had limited available space to meet the demand at the time of my visit. Conversely, the site is not within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and from all I have seen and read there are no plans to introduce this level of control. Furthermore, while the development would lead to a loss of on-street parking it would create one space off-street. As such, while there would be a loss of on-street parking, this in itself would not necessarily be harmful to highway safety.
13. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 108(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as the proposal fails to demonstrate that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. As such, the proposal would also be contrary to Policy DM33 of the DPD, which requires that development does not result in a reduction in pedestrian or highway safety for the same reason.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, including representations of support, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR