

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3163742
184 Grange Road, Ilford, IG1 1HB.

- 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 N Manzoor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 4304/16, dated 9 September 2016 was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garden wall and proposed driveway with porous tile finish and flower bedding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling with a garden forecourt which it is proposed to use as a parking space. Because of the limited depth of the forecourt this would be used for parking parallel to the road. However, using the space in this fashion would be likely to result in multiple manoeuvres, not least due to the bay window and porch at the front of the property, as well as the lamp post in the pavement to one side. Using it would prove more difficult still if vehicles were parked on the road to either side of the proposed space, as they were at my visit. Because of difficulties accessing the space, I also consider there would be a real risk of larger vehicles being parked in a fashion which partially obstructed the pavement.
 4. Drivers attempting to manoeuvre a vehicle into position in such circumstances would be likely to prove hazardous to passing pedestrians, particularly those with young children, prams or the infirm. The plans do not depict pedestrian visibility splays at either side of the parking space. Nonetheless, had I been minded to allow the appeal, their provision could have been secured by a condition. However, even with such a condition, this would not outweigh my
-

fundamental concerns about the inherent difficulties of accessing the proposed space.

5. However, given the slow speed of vehicles travelling on this road and multiple front driveways in the vicinity, I consider drivers on the road itself would be likely to pass with care, to the extent that the proposal would not compromise their safety.
6. I fully accept the appellant's point that there are numerous examples of similar driveways being used as parking spaces in the same street. However, I saw at my visit that their use in many cases leads to haphazard parking arrangements, with vehicles overhanging the footway or parked at odd angles, as a result of difficulty manoeuvring into them. It is unclear whether these driveways benefit from planning permission, but they do serve to demonstrate the inadequacies of forecourt parking in similar circumstances.
7. Overall on the main issue, whilst I have found that the proposal would not compromise the safety of vehicular traffic, it would be likely to prejudice the safety of passing pedestrians. Whilst I find no conflict with the requirements of Policy T5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008) (as the size of the parking space meets the technical specification therein), the proposal would conflict with Policy BD1 of the same document and Strategic Policy 3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008), which amongst other things, seek to secure safe and secure environments. Policy BD5 of the former document which the Council have also supplied, relates to residential extensions and is not relevant to the appeal proposal.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR