



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3283958

11A Exeter Gardens, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3LA

- 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 Mrs Bianca Rexha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1703/21, dated 20 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is widen existing vehicular access and alterations to driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - pedestrian and highway safety; and,
 - vegetation and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Highway safety

4. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey house in a residential street. The house is the end property in a small terrace of three houses. Along with most houses in the street it is paved to the front providing off street parking for 2 cars. It is accessed by a crossover and through a break in the front boundary wall.
5. There is a gap between the dropped kerb at the appeal site and the dropped kerb serving the neighbouring property providing 1 on street parking space. The road is narrow, and signs indicate that vehicles can park partly on the kerb. The proposed development is to widen the existing crossover from 3m to 5m. The Council are concerned it would harm highway and pedestrian safety.

6. Despite the amount of off street parking in the area there were cars parked along the road at the time of my site visit, indicating a demand for on street parking. Whilst there were spaces available this was mid-morning when demand would not be at its peak. At other times of the day, I expect there would be pressure for parking. Insufficient on street parking can lead to traffic movements being interrupted as drivers search for suitable spaces or park where it impedes other vehicles, particularly on a narrow road such as Exeter Gardens. I therefore share the Council's concern that the loss of an on street parking space at this location could adversely impact on traffic safety.
7. The existing crossover already provides safe access to the off street parking on the appellant's front driveway. I do not therefore consider the risk to highway safety that would result from the proposed development to be justified. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would conflict with Policy LP23 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (RLP) which seeks to ensure the availability of on street parking. The Council in its decision referred to the over provision of parking and Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) which seeks to restrict parking. Given that the proposed development would not increase off street parking I see no conflict with that Policy.

Pedestrian Safety

8. Vehicle crossovers can lead to conflict between pedestrians and vehicles however, in this case, there is an existing crossover and there would be no increase in off road parking provision. As such, the proposed development would not lead to an increase in vehicles crossing the footway and would have no effect on pedestrian safety. As such there would be no conflict with Policy LP22 of the RLP with regard to providing safe, convenient, and accessible footpath networks.

Character and appearance

9. There is a tree set in from the kerb on the footway in front of the appeal site which is owned by the Council but not shown on the submitted plans. According to my measurements there would be no need to remove the tree to accommodate the crossover. I also noted during my visit that there were numerous examples of healthy trees within the street, closer to the edge of crossovers than would be the case with the proposed development. Furthermore, the Council have indicated that its permission would be required for its removal which would be against its footway policy. As such I am not convinced that the proposed development would cause any harm to the tree or that it would be removed. The Council also referred to damage to vegetation within the appeal site. The front of the house is paved and surrounded by a brick wall with no vegetation that I could see. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not harm trees or vegetation and would thus have no effect on the character and appearance of the area and would not therefore conflict with Policy LP38 of the RLP and G7 of the LP which seek to retain trees.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR