
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3240212

117 Woodford Avenue, Ilford, Essex IG2 6UY

- 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 Praveen Kalluri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1939/19, dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is formation of vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of proposed development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form is more precise than that shown on the planning application form. I have therefore used this description in the banner heading and determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) vehicular and pedestrian safety in Woodford Avenue, and (ii) the provision of on-street parking in the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, which is located in a predominantly residential area. It has a paved front garden and the front boundary is open. The appeal scheme proposes the formation of a vehicular access to facilitate on-site parking on the paved front garden. There is a wide footpath to the front of the properties, and the part closest to the road is used as marked unallocated street parking.
5. The proposed vehicular access would be located on Woodford Avenue (A1400), which is a busy road with 2 lanes of traffic and a cycle lane in each direction. It is subject to a 40mph speed limit. The road forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and is classified as a 'red route' which is recognised as a key strategic traffic route in London's road network.
6. Transport for London (TFL) states that it does not allow vehicles to reverse on to, or reverse off the TLRN. In this respect, it states that a minimum unobstructed area of 10 metres x 8 metres within the property boundary is usually required for a vehicle to be able to turn on site. The proposed plan shows that the front parking

area would be 7.3 metres wide and 7.7 metres deep. As such, TFL regards there to be insufficient space on the paved parking area for vehicles to turn to enable entry to and exit from the site in forward gear. Therefore, it is concerned that there would be potential for vehicles to reverse on to or from Woodford Avenue.

7. Whilst I have not been made aware of Council standards in respect of the size of parking and turning areas, I observed that the size of the paved area to the front of the appeal property is modest. It would be difficult for vehicles to turn within the site to enable entry to and exit from the site in forward gear. Furthermore, I am mindful that the use of the paved area for the parking of more than one vehicle could not be precluded. This would prevent vehicles turning within the site.
8. Taking these factors into account, it is likely that the proposed development would result in vehicles reversing on to, or from, Woodford Avenue. Any such vehicle movements across the pavement and between parked cars on to the busy and relatively fast moving road would be hazardous. It would be likely to lead to an increased potential for conflict between vehicles, and between vehicles and pedestrians, and to interrupt the efficient flow of traffic. This would have an unacceptable impact on this main strategic route through London and be detrimental to the safety of drivers and pedestrians.
9. Whilst there are examples of existing dropped kerbs at other properties along Woodford Avenue, there is no information before me as to whether they have planning permission or how long they have been in place. In any event, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own planning merits, and the existing examples do not justify development that I have found to be harmful.
10. In respect of the second main issue, the appeal property is located close to shops, services and bus stops. Gants Hill underground station is also nearby. It is therefore in an accessible location where there are passenger transport options available other than the private car. There is no substantive evidence before me to show that the removal of an unallocated street parking space would cause significant parking problems in the surrounding area. On this particular matter, the proposal would not cause harm.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to vehicular and pedestrian safety in Woodford Avenue. The Council's decision notice states that the proposal would fail to comply with Policy LP24 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030. However, this policy relates to pollution and I do not consider that it is relevant to the main issues. Nonetheless, paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. As set out above, I find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
12. I have had regard to the appellant's statement, which sets out their need for the proposed vehicular access. However, this does not outweigh the harm to vehicular and pedestrian safety that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR