



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3233425

273 St Barnabas Road, Woodford Green IG8 7DW

- 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 Naeem Goraya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1760/19, dated 23 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the installation of drop kerb and front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, the existing frontage appears to have been altered recently and does not appear to be consistent with either the existing or proposed plans. However, as it is the proposal before me, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

4. St Barnabas Road features lines of buildings to each side of the road that are consistently set back. Many of the frontages feature extensive hardstanding that provide off-street parking areas which are accessed using dropped kerbs of inconsistent width.
5. The appeal site contains a terraced dwelling that has a large frontage which is covered almost entirely by hardstanding. The proposal would see the reduction of the amount of hardstanding at the site and the provision of two parking spaces, a pathway leading to the house and soft landscaped areas. An altered dropped kerb access would be provided which would span the majority of the frontage of the site, thereby being wider than the combined width of the two proposed parking spaces.
6. By being wider than the two proposed parking spaces, the dropped kerb would be unnecessarily wide. This would reduce the amount of footpath that is not also used as a point of access. A vehicle crossover represents a point of potential conflict between pedestrians and other road users and in this case the

safe route that is currently afforded to pedestrians would be reduced. There is no benefit in terms of additional off-street car parking being provided and there would also be a net reduction in terms of on-street parking availability. As such, there are no highway safety benefits arising that outweigh the harm caused by the reduction of the priority of pedestrians.

7. There are several other dropped kerbs within the locality, most of which are narrower than this proposal. A single dropped kerb serves 6 properties at St James Terrace which is significantly wider than this proposal. However, as it serves several properties and the whole dropped kerb appears to be necessary to enable access to off-street parking, I find that the circumstances are different to this proposal where the dropped kerb is unnecessarily wide relative to the parking spaces it would serve. Therefore, unlike the St James Terrace example, the harm arising from potential conflict with pedestrian movements is not off-set by the benefit of providing access to parking.
8. Policy RLP23 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (RLP), Adopted 2018, requires a developer to demonstrate that any loss of off-street parking will not cause there to be insufficient parking within the locality. The policy does not however require a loss of on-street parking to be justified. Although the proposal would be likely to prevent parking in the highway adjacent to the dropped kerb, this would only lead to the loss of the equivalent of one parking space. Parking is not restricted within surrounding roads and I observed on-street parking opportunities within the street at the time of my site visit, which I have no reason to believe is unusual in this locality. I therefore do not find that the loss of a single on-street parking space would have such a detrimental effect on on-street parking provision that unsafe parking would be more likely to occur.
9. Whilst the loss of an off-street parking space is acceptable in terms of pedestrian safety and there is no conflict with policy 23 of the RLP, the proposed access would have an unacceptable effect on pedestrian safety that is not outweighed by other benefits in terms of pedestrian or highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy LP26 of the RLP which requires that development represents high quality design that creates an accessible environment.

Other Matters

10. Notwithstanding the above, the appellant appears to have advanced this appeal on the grounds that the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. No objection has been raised by the Council in this regard and I have no reason to reach a different conclusion, particularly as additional soft landscaping would be introduced to the frontage of the site. However, this does not outweigh the harm that has been identified above in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR