



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3307688

24 Downhills Way, Tottenham, London N17 6BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Premhans Bheenick against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/1201, dated 13 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is to widen an existing crossover to allow vehicle access to the driveway area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site accommodates a mid-terraced property located within a row of other residential properties that are set back from the street with small garden areas to the front. A public footpath and green verge run across the front of the properties and separates the properties from the main public highway.
4. There are some driveways to the front of a number of properties along this side of Downhills Way which cut across the green verge including the neighbouring property at 26 Downhills Way. However, these are few and far between and the largely uninterrupted green verge which is interspersed with mature trees is an attractive and pleasant feature within the street scene creating a sense of openness whilst visually softening the built form.
5. The proposed development would extend the existing crossover at No. 26 to provide an additional access from the highway to the appeal property which would extend across part of the green verge between the highway and footpath. In doing so, the proposed development would further interrupt the green verge and would remove a section of this attractive and pleasant feature within the street scene. The modest width of the crossover and the appellant's

suggestion of specific materials would not adequately mitigate this visual impact as it would still increase the physical break in the green verge introducing materials at odds with its general form.

6. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DM1, DM20 of the London Borough of Haringey's Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 (DPD) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (LP) which together, amongst other things, requires development to achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area.

Highway safety

7. At my site visit, I observed the movements of vehicles along Downhills Way and while only a snapshot in time, I saw that the road was relatively busy with a consistent flow of traffic.
8. The appeal site accommodates car parking to the front of the property. However, it does not benefit from a formal crossover and there would be new vehicular movements onto and off the public highway despite the proposed development relating to an extension of the existing crossover. Given the limited space for turning within the site, vehicles would not be able to enter and exit in a forward gear which would result in vehicles reversing onto the public highway which would be prejudicial to the free flow of traffic movement along this section of the highway to the detriment of highway safety. I note that movements onto and off the driveway would be modest, and speeds would be low as well as the level of visibility and accident levels. However, this would not outweigh the harm as it would still result in vehicles reversing onto the busy public highway.
9. Additionally, there is insufficient space to accommodate parking for two cars whilst maintaining an unobstructed pedestrian path to the dwelling which would be prejudicial to the safety of pedestrians.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would be prejudicial to highway safety and would therefore be contrary to Policies DM1, DM2, DM32, DM33 of the DPD and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the LP which together, amongst other things, prevents development which increases road danger or reduces pedestrian or highway safety.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no other considerations that individually or cumulatively outweigh this harm and development plan conflict. The appeal should therefore be dismissed

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR