



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3293990

63 Coventry Road, Ilford, IG1 4QT

- 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 Ms Noor Jehan Begum against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 4650/21 dated 18 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing drop kerb (fast track service).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension of existing drop kerb (fast track service) at 63 Coventry Road, Ilford, IG1 4QT in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 465/21 dated 18 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following approved plans: Unreferenced Location Plan, ZAAVIA/63CR/203 (Proposed Plans), ZAAVIA/63CR/204 (Proposed Plans) and ZAAVIA/63CR/206 (Proposed Site Plan).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey terraced property within a residential area. The proposed extension of the existing drop kerb to allow for vehicular access would be 2.5 metres in width. This would result in a total width, including the existing drop kerb of 7.39 metres.
4. At the time of my site visit I noted that the existing drop kerb at the appeal site is a shared, continuous, drop kerb with 57, 59 and 61 Coventry Road respectively. The Council's delegated report states that this arrangement encourages vehicles to drive on the footway to avoid other vehicles and that no further extension of the continuous drop kerb should be considered in either direction. It is stated that this would compromise the safety of the existing limited pedestrian amenity.
5. At the time of my site visit I noted that adjacent to the boundary of the appeal site there is a fixed sign post on the footway which indicates the nearby junction

with Bathhurst Road as well as, slightly further down the road, bollards barrowing the road around the cycle lane. The road is straight and I found that it offered good visibility for all users and the appellant has provided evidence, in the form of crashmap, that there have been no incidents outside the appeal site for the twenty plus years across all casualty and vehicle types with the existing continuous dropped kerb arrangement.

6. I find that the existing arrangement of the dropped kerb could already be deemed to limit pedestrian amenity as a result of already allowing vehicles to drive on the footway. Despite this I find that the presence of the sign post on the boundary of the appeal site would in fact prevent and discourage vehicles driving through/over the proposed extension to the dropped kerb itself due to its very close proximity. As a result this I do not find that the additional 2.5m proposed would, in this case, cause further safety issues with regard to pedestrian safety nor would it create an additional conflict point for pedestrians using the footway which would warrant refusal.
7. I note comments from Highways Consultees that single units in this area should not have more than one space per dwelling, however, the reasoning or policy basis for this is not evidenced or clarified before me within this appeal. Further comments are made regarding drainage, however, the proposal to extend an existing dropped kerb is not one which I find would alter or impact upon the site in terms of existing drainage. There would be no additional hardstanding or surfacing as a result of the proposal me and the Council's refusal reason is focused upon pedestrian safety which I have discussed above.
8. The Council state that the proposal would be contrary to Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy LP22, however, I do not find that the policy is of direct relevance given that the proposal simply seeks to facilitate safe access to an existing property/property frontage. LP Policy LP22 seeks to promote sustainable transport and I do not see that an extended drop kerb would realistically change the site in terms of sustainable transport or vehicle movements. I note comments re: potential subdivision but that is not a current consideration within this appeal before me. I can only assess the proposal on the basis of the submission and not what may or may not be applied for in the future. Similarly LP Policy LP23 relates to cycle and car parking for new development meaning the policy is of limited direct relevance.
9. Whilst the starting point for determination is the Local Plan in accordance with S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) is a material consideration. The proposal would be consistent with paragraph 110 b) of the Framework which seeks to ensure safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users and paragraph 111 which confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR