



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by R Walmsley BSc, MSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3279003

174 Roding Lane North, Woodford Green IG8 8LJ

- 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 Saad Muddasser against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1292/21, dated 26 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a dropped kerb, maximum 565 cm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a dropped kerb, maximum 565 cm at 174 Roding Lane North, Woodford Green IG8 8LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1292/21, dated 26 March 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Proposed Plan: Address 174 Roding Lane North. IG8 8LJ (A4).

Procedural matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been agreed by the Main Parties and is included as it provides a more accurate description of the development proposed.

Main Issues

3. These are the effect of the proposal on the availability of on-street parking and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Availability of on-street parking

4. It was apparent from my site visit that Roding Lane North supports on-street parking on both sides of the road. It was apparent from my site visit that drivers can park on the street with relative ease; there was an availability of spaces, helped by off-street parking and the absence of any parking restrictions.

5. The dropped kerb would result in the loss of an on-street parking space. However, as it currently stands the appellant parks on the road, occupying an on-street space. Moving the car to the front of his property and installing a dropped kerb would not change the competition for car parking. If anything, the cross-over would allow more than one car to be parked on the appeal site, lessening any competition further. Furthermore, based on the availability of on-street parking I saw on site and in the absence of any parking survey data before me to suggest otherwise, the development would not result in a competition for parking that could be considered unduly harmful to traffic flow or highway safety.
6. I find, therefore, that the development would not be contrary to the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy T2 of the Local Plan (2018) which seek, amongst other things, development that does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Pedestrian safety

7. The width of the pavement would remain unchanged and vehicle speeds on and off the site would be slow. Crossovers are common in the area and so there would be a level of expectancy by pedestrians and drivers for vehicles moving on and off site. I do not envisage a conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, therefore, for the development to be considered harmful to pedestrian safety. The development would not, therefore, be contrary the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy T2 of the Local Plan (2018) which seek, amongst other things, development that does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

8. Having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to conditions. The Council has suggested conditions to be imposed if permission is granted which specify the time for implementation and plan. I have included both these conditions because it provides certainty over the timescale for implementation and that the development will be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of proper planning. Kerb stones will be of a particular material and therefore a condition to this effect is not required.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR