



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **L Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3366635

225 Shelbourne Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 9YD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ms Ramatulai Ngum Arouni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref is HGY/2024/3366.
- The development proposed is formation of a vehicle crossover to facilitate off road parking.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the formation of a vehicle crossover to facilitate off road parking at 225 Shelbourne Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 9YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2024/3366, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TRICON/225SR/102 Issue A, TRICON/225SR/104 Issue A and Location Plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the appeal form and decision notice as this is a more accurate description of development than that given on the application form, and ensures that it captures the scope of the proposal.
3. There is a discrepancy in the evidence with regard to the hours during which the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) applies to the appeal site (No 225). For clarity, I have taken the day and times from the sign immediately in front of No 225, which states in within Zone THN ED, parking is for permit holders only between Monday to Friday 5:00 pm – 8:30 pm, and Saturday, Sunday and Public Holidays Noon – 8:00 pm.
4. The Council have provided limited information to demonstrate how many on-street parking spaces would be lost by the proposal. I have therefore made my assessment using my observations on site, submitted plans, and the figure provided by the appellant, that the proposal would result in the loss of one on-street parking space.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal in respect of a) on-street car parking in the area, and b) pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Parking

6. No 225 and properties on the same side as the appeal site are set back from the pavement by frontages of varying lengths. The front of No 225 is currently hard-paved with a drainage channel running parallel to the pavement. The CPZ applies to the frontage of the appeal site. I saw that there were similar CPZs to the wider area, all of which relate to Tottenham Hotspur Football Stadium and seek to ensure that residents, visitors and local businesses have access to parking during event days.
7. The proposed crossover would result in the provision of one off-street parking space to the front of No 225 and the loss of one on-street parking space. The reduction of on-street parking capacity within a CPZ would be contrary to Policy DM33 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) (DMDPD).
8. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that all applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As detailed above, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM33 of the DMDPD, and thus, this appeal turns on whether there are material considerations which outweigh this conflict.
9. The appellant has undertaken two parking stress surveys¹. These were undertaken on event days and covered an area on Shelbourne Road between Rosebery Avenue (south) and Lansdowne Road (north).
10. Given my site visit was undertaken on a non-event day, and without any evidence from the Council to the contrary, the appellant's observations provide a useful indication of on-street parking on event-days, for when it is anticipated parking to be at its highest.
11. The appellant's surveys state that there were on average between 7 and 12 on-street car parking spaces available. Based on the limited information from the Council, I have no satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the loss of one parking space would have a detrimental impact upon on-street parking or would result in parking stress during event days.
12. I acknowledge that the loss of one existing on-street parking space would result in the permanent loss for all other residents, visitors and businesses, and that the proposed development would only benefit the appellant. However, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary and, being mindful that in the absence of an unacceptable impact on highway safety, there is no conflict with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). This is therefore a material consideration weighing in favour of a grant of planning permission.
13. Accordingly, whilst the proposal is in conflict with Policy DM33 of the DMDPD, for the reasons detailed above, I conclude that in this instance there are material considerations in favour of the proposal that outweigh this conflict.

¹ Sunday 5 and Thursday 10 April 2025

Pedestrian safety

14. The Decision Notice sets out that the proposal would create a point of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, contrary to Policy DM33 of the DMDPD. However, the Council has not quantified their concern.
15. I saw that the adjoining property (No 223) and other properties on Shelbourne Road had dropped kerbs to the front. Pedestrians would therefore likely be aware of the potential for vehicles crossing the pavement in this area. The Council has not provided any details of accidents to demonstrate collisions between vehicles utilising an off-street parking space and pedestrians along Shelbourne Road, or to demonstrate that an additional vehicle crossing in this location would be unsafe.
16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that in the absence of any satisfactory evidence, the proposal would not materially affect pedestrian safety. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy DM33 of the DMDPD.

Conditions

17. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty. I note that the Council suggests the submission of further details to demonstrate that the hardstanding is permeable. However, as the hardstanding is in situ and the proposed development only relates to the installation of a vehicle crossover, such a condition would not meet the tests set out in the Framework. In this instance, no other conditions are therefore considered necessary.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR