



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3262194

636 Chigwell Road, Woodford Green IG8 8AF

- 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 Thirunavukkarasu Senthuran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0799/20, dated 6 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a retail premises in use as an off licence located in a parade of shops in a local centre. There are a number of other retail and similar uses within the parade, most with forecourt areas, some of which have been set out to provide outdoor seating and some, such as the appeal site, which appear to be used informally for parking. There is a pavement / footway running along the front of these premises. The area between the pavement and the road is set out to provide parallel public pay and display parking spaces.
4. The forecourt of the premises is hardstanding and at the time of my site visit a car was parked there. However, there is no dropped kerb to allow access to it and cars have to drive up over the kerb and across the public parking spaces and pavement to gain access; it is thus only an informal arrangement currently.
5. The location of the proposed dropped kerb would result in the loss of two of the pay and display parking spaces in order to allow access to the parking space to the front of the appeal premises. These spaces are available generally for the public and for those visiting the local centre and its facilities. However, the parking space to the front of the appeal site would be for use only by persons associated with it. The proposal would therefore result in the loss of parking to serve the general public.
6. Policy LP23 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) states that where development results in the loss of existing off street parking, the developer will need to demonstrate that sufficient parking remains to serve local needs. Whilst I saw on my site visit that there is further parallel parking to the front of

the adjoining parade to the east and a car park to the rear of that parade, the appellant has not provided any evidence to show that the remaining provision would be sufficient overall.

7. The appellant contends that the loss of public parking should be considered a sustainability benefit by encouraging the use of non-car modes. However, I consider that the proposal is unlikely to result in any significant benefit in this regard and in any event the formalisation of the off street parking arrangement as proposed would effectively cancel this out.
8. In addition, the creation of the dropped kerb to provide a formal access to the forecourt would result in conflict with pedestrian movements along the pavement to the front of the parade as it would be likely to result in the more frequent use of the parking area. In addition, as referred to by the appellant, this could include use by delivery vehicles. The proposal would therefore have an adverse impact on a highly sustainable form of transport.
9. At the time of my site visit I noted that cars were parked outside some other premises within the same terrace of properties but these also appeared to be informal arrangements as the pay and display parking extends along the whole of the frontage of the parade.
10. Therefore, I find that the proposal would conflict with LP Policies LP22 and LP23 which seek to encourage sustainable modes of transport and ensure that development is served by an adequate level of off street parking.
11. The appellant suggests that the parking space created would enable service and delivery vehicles to more safely access the premises as currently they have to park along Chigwell Road. However, there is no evidence that such arrangements result in any significantly adverse impacts in respect of highway safety. I do not find that this or the other claimed benefits of the development are sufficient to outweigh the above policy conflict and overall it would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development such as to satisfy policy within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

12. The site lies in the Woodford Bridge Conservation Area and the appeal is supported by a heritage statement that concludes that the proposal would not result in any additional harm to the character of the conservation area. Given the existing situation as referred to above with hardstanding areas already in place, I would concur that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusions

13. Overall, for the reasons set out, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR