



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3252416

49 Beehive Lane, Ilford, IG1 3RH

- 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 Ahmed Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 4558/19, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on pedestrian and highway safety.

Reasons

3. No.49 Beehive Lane is a mid-terraced house with a small area of land fronting the highway. The layout of the terrace has been designed so that houses at each end of the terrace of Nos. 41 and 57 have the largest areas of front garden or paved front garden. The former front gardens for each house then diminish in size towards that of the central dwelling of No.49. Many of the houses at this part of Beehive Lane have paved their front gardens for use as off-street car parking and have a drop kerb access from the highway.
4. The application for a drop kerb has been refused by the Council because it does not meet the minimum size of 4.8 m in length x 2.4 m in width. This requirement is indicated in criterion (g) of policy LP23: Cycle and Car Parking of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030. A length of 4.8 m for a parking space between the front of a house and the footway would allow most cars to park without encroaching on to the footway.
5. Submitted architect's drawing No.PA1318-03 indicates that the area to the front of the house measures around 4.88 m from the back of the footway to the main front wall of the house. However, the front projections at the house reduce this available length for straight parking on a paved area to only around 4 m. The appellant has proposed a 4 m wide crossover and advises that this would allow him to park diagonally in front of the house and avoid overhanging problems.

6. The Council has its own Highway Footpath Crossing Requirements which would allow a vehicle to park parallel to the road and in a forecourt. However, the Council has drawn my attention to appeal ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3229934 concerning a proposed drop kerb at 181 Maybank Road, South Woodford, and which was dismissed by the Inspector because it had not been demonstrated that a minimum parking area of 4.8 m x 2.4 m could be provided. In that appeal the Inspector determined that the Highway Footpath Crossing Requirements did not form part of the development plan and should be given little weight. I see no reason to disagree.
7. The appellant refers to not recalling a single pedestrian or highway incident since moving in many years ago and advises that most of his neighbours park straight or diagonally. However, the space available at the front of No.49 would not meet the minimum size standard required by Local Plan policy LP23, with the possibility that a parked vehicle could partly obstruct the footway. Even if a car parked diagonally, parking a car would involve manoeuvres in and out of a restricted space to cross the footway and access Beehive Lane. This could cause conflict with pedestrians using the footway and oncoming traffic.

Conclusion

8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would result in an inadequate parking layout and would be harmful to pedestrian and highway safety, contrary to Local Plan policy LP23. It would also conflict with Local Plan policy LP26 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development respects the existing layout of buildings, surrounding spaces and patterns of development.
9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR