

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3158794
267 The Drive, Ilford, IG1 3PN

- 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 Inderjit Singh Marway against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2226/16, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is to construct new driveway for 2nd car, also dropped kerb application.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that this is the effect of the proposal on highway safety on The Drive.

Reasons

3. The Drive is a classified 'C' road through a residential area. It connects two major 'A' roads and, at the time of my site visit (around midday), was reasonably well trafficked. The section of The Drive past the appeal site is straight, with good visibility, and vehicles were moving quite briskly. It is also a bus route. I observed that a significant proportion of residential frontages had been opened up for off-road parking, several houses having three spaces. There was also a good number of cars parked on the highway, partly on the what appeared to be a former verge (now tarmacked) and partly on the carriageway itself.
 4. The Council has produced no evidence that this situation has created safety problems locally for vehicular traffic, or that an additional off-road space and kerb-crossing would exacerbate matters. In addition, the combined width of the footway and former verge give reasonable visibility in both directions. Hence I am not persuaded that the one additional point of access that is proposed would cause a significant hazard to motorised traffic.
 5. The proposed new driveway would be at the far side of the frontage from the existing driveway, abutting the adjoining property. It would be next to the
-

neighbour's front wall, which is over 0.6 metres high, and adjoining a bush in the neighbouring front garden. Both these features would impede inter-visibility between a driver coming out and pedestrians approaching along the footway past the next door property. The necessary visibility splay could not be secured in this direction, without cooperation from the neighbour, which has not been mentioned. The wall along the appeal site frontage could no doubt be lowered through imposing a planning condition. However, this would not compensate for the lack of visibility in the other direction, which I consider would create an unacceptable risk to the safety of passing pedestrians.

6. The Council is also concerned that providing the capacity for a third off-street parking space would be contrary to the maximum parking standard set by Policy T5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies (2008) [BWPP]. However, in so far as it would appear to be possible to create an additional parking space on the paved forecourt, using the existing access, I give this consideration little weight.
7. The appellant has said that a second space is needed to transfer a relative safely to a parked car. The proposed driveway would be of similar dimensions to that already on site, so I don't see why this manoeuvre could not be achieved using the existing space. Damage by passing vehicles has been given as a further reason for additional off-road parking. However, this does not seem to deter other car owners nearby. Consequently I give only limited weight to these personal circumstances cited in favour of the appeal.
8. Overall and on balance I conclude that the proposal would create an unacceptable risk to the safety of passing pedestrians on The Drive. Such an outcome would be contrary to BWPP Policy BD1 which, among other things, seeks to create safe and secure environments.
9. Thus planning permission should be withheld and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR