



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3285739

25 Fencepiece Road, Ilford, IG6 2LY

- 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 C Mistry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2607/21, dated 21 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is increase width of existing dropped kerb to allow for light vehicles to be parked on the front curtilage of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for increase width of existing dropped kerb to allow for light vehicles to be parked on the front curtilage of the property, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2607/21, dated 21 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan; 25FR(02)Rev A; 25FR(01) Rev A.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Fencepiece Road runs along part of the A123 which is a busy road. The appeal site lies along a stretch of road comprising a mix of semi-detached and short terraces of housing. Houses are set back behind the footway with front garden areas paved and used for off street parking. Most properties along the road near the appeal site have dropped kerbs in front of part of their property. Gaps between the dropped kerbs enable on street parking.
4. The Council concluded that widening the dropped kerb and vehicle crossover would increase conflict between pedestrians and vehicles and lead to a reduction in on street parking impacting negatively on highway and pedestrian safety.

5. I appreciate that crossovers cause conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. However, most properties nearby, including the appeal site, already have crossovers so pedestrians will be aware that cars cross the footway in this location. Furthermore, the proposal does not involve increasing the number of off street parking spaces at the appeal site. As such, it would not necessarily lead to an increase in vehicles crossing the footway and its impact on the safety of pedestrians would therefore be negligible.
6. The parking space in front of the appeal site that would be lost because of the proposed development lies between crossovers serving the host property and its neighbour. On street parking at this point restricts visibility for cars entering and leaving the appeal site, particularly when turning right onto the A123, and requires manoeuvring around any parked vehicle when turning left onto the road. This must, to an extent, adversely affect highway safety. Also, vehicles parking directly in front of the appeal site prevents safe access to both parking spaces at the property thus creating additional pressure for on street parking. As such, widening the crossover would not necessarily increase pressure for on street parking and would improve visibility for vehicles entering and leaving the appeal site and thus may improve road and pedestrian safety.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm pedestrian or highway safety and would not therefore conflict with the aims of Policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and Policy T2 of the London Plan (2021) which seek to reduce road danger and provide safe, convenient, and accessible footpath networks.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. The Council's suggestion of a condition requiring materials to match that of the host property is not necessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR