
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2024

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3339415
170 Beehive Lane, Ilford, IG4 5EE

- 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 Sultana Parvin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref. 2724/23, dated 29 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is extension of means of access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension of means of access at 170 Beehive Lane, Ilford, IG4 5EE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 2724/23, dated 29 September 2023, 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 the following unnumbered approved plans: 1:1250 Scale Location Plan; View of the Location Plan; Proposed Plan for Dropped Kerb; After Dropped Kerb Proposal Completed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form. Whilst normally this would be taken from the original application form, the above is a more concise version of the detailed description included on that form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the strategy for sustainable transport; and (2) highway safety, with particular reference to pedestrians.

Reasons

Sustainable Transport

4. The appeal property is a dwelling located on Beehive Lane, which is a classified road. The front garden is fully paved for vehicle parking, and there is no front

boundary wall or other means of enclosure. The frontage width would accommodate two parking spaces to the Council's size standards, but the width of the vehicular access means that each space cannot be accessed independently.

5. Although there are parking restrictions around the road junction to the south, they do not extend in front of the appeal site. Within the area, signage allows cars to park half on the road and half on the footway, and these public spaces are dotted along the road between vehicular accesses serving the houses that line the road. One such space is located outside of the appeal site, between the access to No.170 and the neighbouring house to the north, which has a crossover spanning almost the full width of its frontage.
6. Policy T6.1 and the supporting Table 10.3 of The London Plan 2021 (TLP) set out maximum residential parking standards for new residential development. However, this proposal relates to an existing dwelling with existing on-site parking spaces, and the proposal would not facilitate increased occupancy of the dwelling; residents at the property would continue to park on the frontage regardless of this appeal. As noted by the appellant, TLP Policy T6.1 does not refer to, or make specific mention of, means of access or proposals concerning the widening of accesses.
7. Policies LP22 and LP23 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018) [RLP] seek to reinforce the transport strategy of the TLP, part of which identified in RLP Policy LP22 is to deliver a more sustainable and efficient transport network that reduces car dependency and encourages sustainable forms of transport. However, although RLP Policy LP23 requires adherence to the minimum and maximum parking standards of the TLP, again, it does not evidently apply to proposals which would not alter existing on-site parking levels.
8. I am mindful of the purpose of the transport strategy, and the location of the appeal site in a PTAL 3¹ area. However, as the proposal would not alter the amount of parking on the appeal site, I consider that this proposal would have a neutral effect on the transport strategy.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed widening of the crossover would not allow for additional parking that would undermine the strategy for sustainable transport, and would not conflict with TLP Policy T6.1, and RLP Policies LP22 and LP23.

Highway Safety

10. There are numerous vehicular crossover points on Beehive Lane, and a notable number which extend for almost the full width of the frontage of the property they serve. Visibility around the appeal site is not restricted. Drivers exiting and entering the appeal site, and pedestrians approaching the existing crossover, already have to exercise a degree of caution. It is already possible to park two vehicles on the site, but this could involve manoeuvring on the public highway by a second car if one is already parked on the area of the driveway in front of the crossover. The number of vehicles would not change, but there could be less hazardous manoeuvres if vehicles at the site could access it independently. I do not consider that the widening of the access to

¹ Public Transport Accessibility Level

No.170 would create additional risks and points of conflict for pedestrians, and would be consistent with the arrangements found at other nearby properties².

11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not create additional pedestrian-vehicle conflicts to the detriment of highway safety. It would not conflict with TLP Policy T6.1, or RLP Policies LP22 and LP23 cited in the reasons for refusal.

Other Matters

12. A third party representation has raised matters relating to land ownership, and has disputed dimensions given on the submitted plans. However, this is a civil matter between the parties, and does not alter my assessment of the appeal. A grant of planning permission would not override private land ownership matters.
13. Reference has also been made to the loss of one on-street parking space as a result of the proposal. However, on this point, I share the assessment set out in the Council's delegated report, that The London Plan makes clear that on-street parking controls are not issues for planning to control but should be managed through Controlled Parking Zones under the management of the Highway Authority.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. As the materials for the extension to the crossover would need to meet a specification determined by the relevant highway authority, it is not necessary to attach the Council's recommended condition for materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

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

H Lock

INSPECTOR

² Including the permission granted in March 2023 for 'extension of means of access to a highway' at 182 Beehive Lane, under ref. 0135/23, to which the appellant has drawn attention.