



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3275347

355 Ilford Lane, Ilford, IG1 2SH

- 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 Regal Law Solicitors against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0356/21, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the formation of vehicular access and driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would impede pedestrians, having regard to the size of the proposed parking space.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property, with a short front garden, no longer walled off from the relatively wide, well-used pavement to the front, with a well-used bus stop and pedestrian crossing nearby.
4. I acknowledge the width of the pavement to the front of the site, but the local development plan supports sustainable transport, including walking and cycling, and I do not consider it appropriate to reduce the width of the footway available for the use of non-car means of transport for the storage of a private motor vehicle.
5. I also note that there is frontage parking at neighbouring properties, but do not agree that they offer support for the proposal, as at the time of my visit, and indeed, in the supporting photograph submitted with the appeal, cars in those spaces were overhanging the footway.
6. The appellant suggests that the proposal would be used by a small car, and indeed, a small car parked diagonally. However, neither of these matters can be ensured or controlled in the long term through the planning process. Allied with that, I also note the concern of the Highways Officer that diagonal parking could impede pedestrian access to the house itself.
7. I therefore find that the proposal would impede pedestrians and would be contrary to policies LP22(e), LP23 and LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, which seek, amongst other things, to promote sustainable transport, including the active encouragement of walking by proving attractive,

safe, convenient and accessible routes, as well as the provision of suitable parking and the overall achievement of good design.

Other Matters

8. I note the suggestion that the proposal could benefit a disabled person, however, without further details of how, I am unable to give this suggestion any weight in my decision.
9. The appellant has suggested a legal agreement to ensure that any vehicle parked on the driveway would not overhang the footway, with penalties within it for failure to comply. However, as no such agreement is before me I am unable to give it any weight in my decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR