



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3285780

Flat B, 298 Alexandra Park Road, Wood Green, London N22 7BD

- 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 Mrs Sophia Stock against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2409, dated 9 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is introduction of a car port providing one car parking space to the front garden of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on highway and pedestrian safety, and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Highway Safety

3. At present outside the site there is provision for on-street parking. It is controlled such that only permit holders can park there between noon and 2pm. Part A b. of policy DM33 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) (the 'DMDPD') states that crossovers would only be supported where they would not result in a reduction of on-street parking capacity in a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). To allow access to the proposed parking space on the site, it would be necessary to remove a section of the on-street parking provision. As such the proposal would conflict with this part of the policy.
4. I conducted my site visit between noon and 2pm. At that time there was some space available for on-street parking. However, I would anticipate that after 2pm when parking restrictions are lifted, and especially in the evenings, many more cars would be parked here. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I consider that the loss of public on-street parking space in this CPZ would be detrimental to the availability of parking. This could subsequently result in cars parking in unsafe positions.
5. The Council also raise concerns that there would be insufficient pedestrian visibility from the parking space. Whilst a visibility splay of 1.5m x 1.5m could be achieved to the right side of the parking space as a driver may be able to see across the pedestrian access to the property, the same splay to the left

would be obscured by the retained boundary wall and hedge. Without sufficient visibility, drivers of cars manoeuvring out of the space may not be able to see pedestrians on the pavement and vice versa. This would compromise pedestrian safety even if there was only a limited number of vehicle movements each day. The appellant suggests the other parking spaces nearby are not unsafe, but there may be better visibility from them. Even if they are similar, that does not alter my view that the space proposed would have insufficient visibility.

6. In summary, the proposal would conflict with part A b. of policy DM33, as set out above, and part A a. which says crossovers should not reduce pedestrian or highway safety. It would also fail to accord with DMDPD policy DM2 which requires that developments can be used safely, policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan (2013) which promotes road safety, and policy T4 of The London Plan (2021) which states that proposals should not increase road danger.

Character and appearance

7. The site is located on the south side of Alexandra Park Road which is a suburban street mainly containing terraced dwellings. The houses on the south side are on higher land than the street and hence the development would involve some excavation to provide a parking space level with the road.
8. At the front of the appeal site there is a low wall with a hedge behind. A substantial portion of this would be removed to facilitate the provision of the parking space. Low front boundary walls and hedges are a common feature at many of the properties nearby, such as Nos. 302 and 304, and Nos. 285 and 287 on the opposite side of the road. Another common feature is front gardens used for parking, such as at Nos. 308, 310 and 312, and No. 289 on the north side of the road. Further to the east along the road, walls and hedges on the front boundaries predominate, but around the appeal site off-street parking spaces and front boundary walls contribute fairly equally to the character and appearance of the area.
9. I accept that many of these parking spaces may not benefit from planning permission. Nonetheless, they contribute to the character of the area. The development would be similar in scale to many of these other examples, providing space for just one car, and would involve a similar amount of excavation. As such the proposal would preserve, and not contrast with, the character and appearance of the area.
10. Therefore, the proposal would accord with DMDPD policy DM1 and Local Plan policy SP11 which both aim to ensure that development respects its context and contributes to the distinctive character of the local area. It would also comply with part A c. of policy DM33 which supports crossovers that are not a visual intrusion in the street scene.
11. The Council also refer to London Plan policy D6, but this relates to housing quality and standards and has little relevance to the proposal.

Other Matters

12. I recognise that the proposal would facilitate electric vehicle charging. However, as it would not be reasonable to restrict the use of the space to only electric cars, this cannot outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. Although the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, it would compromise highway and pedestrian safety to which I give substantial weight. It therefore would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations to suggest the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR