

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3373967

92 Palmerston Road, Wood Green, London N22 8RF

- 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 Mrs Terri Hassan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application reference is HGY/2025/1403.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb and external alterations to front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The planning application form included a very long description of the proposed development, much of which might reasonably be described as explanation or justification rather than description. A shorter wording was used on the decision notice issued by the Council, and by the appellant on the appeal form; I have used it here in the interests of brevity as it provides a perfectly clear description of the proposed scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the provision of on-street car parking, the safe movement of pedestrians, and highway safety in general.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three-storey Victorian terraced house on the east side of Palmerston Road. The proposed development is alterations to the front garden to create an off-street parking place – the Design and Access Statement (“DAS”) described it as the “formalisation” of a parking space, but I saw nothing to indicate that the garden is currently used informally for that purpose – along with the installation of a dropped kerb and footway crossover.
5. The site is within a controlled parking zone (“CPZ”)¹, which operates between 10am and 1pm from Mondays to Fridays. Policy DM33 of the 2017 Haringey Development Management DPD (“the DM DPD”) says that proposals for a crossover or new vehicle access will only be supported where, among other things, it would not result in a reduction of on-street parking capacity within a CPZ. The crossover would lead to the loss of the entire “general” CPZ bay between the disabled badge holder space outside No 90 and speed table at the junction of

¹ Permit zone BGE.

Palmerston Road and Lascotts Road, a space occupied by two (admittedly quite closely-parked) cars at the time I visited.

6. The appellant carried out two parking counts on Palmerston Road during the controlled hours on 11 and 16 September 2025, and further observations between 9 and 11am and 1 and 3pm on 19 September 2025 (all weekdays). On all occasions they found between five and 12 available spaces². However, while those figures suggest that the CPZ is doing its job in deterring commuter parking in the middle of the day, I cannot assume that there is no parking stress at other times. Indeed, given the apparent effectiveness of the CPZ, its operational hours may well in reality represent the times of *least* parking stress in the area – the surveys all took place during the typical working day, when many residents' vehicles may well have been elsewhere. In any case, the development plan is clear, and the loss of two spaces would reduce the parking capacity within the CPZ, during and outside its operational hours.
7. The front garden of the appeal property is not large enough to allow a vehicle to be turned around within the site. Vehicles would therefore need to be reversed into or out of the site across the footway, potentially several times a day. The proposal is small in scale, and manoeuvres would be likely to take place at low speeds, and I have no reason to dispute the appellant's assertion that there are no records of accidents involving other crossovers on Palmerston Road. Even so, the development would increase the risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using the footway.
8. The footway crossover would be only 10m or so south of where Lascotts Road joins Palmerston Road at a T-junction. The Council describes Palmerston Road as a busy road; although it was not especially busy at the time I visited, I recognise that it would be likely to be at peak times. The site is within a 20mph speed limit zone, and the Council acknowledges that traffic speeds are generally fairly low. Nevertheless, drivers and cyclists on the road, especially those turning left into Palmerston Road from Lascotts Road, may not be anticipating a vehicle emerging from a driveway in an area where on-street parking is the norm and relatively few properties have footway crossovers. The development would therefore be likely to lead to some reduction in general highway safety.
9. The DAS referred to the appellant's "need" for off-street parking, but no compelling evidence was put forward which demonstrates a need. An earlier response from the appellant during the consultation period for the planning application referred to their vintage campervan having been vandalised and stolen when parked on the street; while I am sympathetic on that point it is not a "need" which would carry significant weight in favour of the scheme.
10. In the same consultation response, the appellant referred to a Council proposal to extend the disabled badge holder space outside No 90 by redesignating the parking bay outside the appeal property (both as described in paragraph 5 above), a proposal apparently put on hold while the planning application for this scheme was being dealt with. There is no further information about this proposal before me, but my understanding and experience is that disabled badge spaces within residential CPZs are generally created only where there is an identified need for

² It is not entirely clear how much of Palmerston Road was surveyed; the statement refers to "the west and east frontages", which might imply only the part between Lascotts Road and Myddleton Road which includes the appeal site. It could, on the other hand, refer to a longer stretch of what is quite a long road.

them. In this light, the appeal scheme would be likely to further increase parking pressure in the area, rather than relieving it as the appellant has suggested.

11. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the provision of on-street car parking, the safe movement of pedestrians, and on highway safety in general. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM33 of the DM DPD, the principal relevant provisions of which I have set out above. It would also conflict with Policy DM2 and DM32 of the DM DPD, and with Policies T4 and T6 of the London Plan 2021 which together, and among other things seek to create safe and accessible pedestrian and cycling routes, and to restrain car use and to improve road safety, including by supporting development with no on-site parking. I find no specific conflict with Policy T1 of the London Plan 2021, which is essentially a strategic policy, but this does not alter my overall conclusion.

Other Matters

12. The appeal site is within the Bowes Park Conservation Area. I therefore have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”) states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
13. I have not been provided with a character appraisal or similar assessment of the BPCA, though it was referred to in the submitted Design and Access Statement. I agree with the appellant’s description of it as being characterised by late-Victorian and Edwardian properties. Within that broad description I saw that there is considerable variety in the sizes and stylings of properties; while there have been some unsympathetic infill developments, and a number of properties have evidently lost some of their original detailing and features over the years, it is an attractive residential suburb of its time.
14. In determining the planning application, the Council was satisfied that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. None of the evidence before me, including what I saw during my visit, leads me to a different view on this matter. A lack of harm in this respect is a neutral matter in the overall balance.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
16. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector