



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3353571

17 New North Road, Hainault IG6 2UA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Beverley Myers against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0657/24.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a means of access to a highway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The reason for refusal set out in the decision notice refers to Horn Road rather than New North Road, which I have taken to be an error. It appears to stem from the highway comments within the case officer's report, which do not correspond with the individual consultee response, which refers to New North Road. However, I note that whilst it has the correct application reference, the site address is wrong on the consultee response. Nonetheless, I have considered the proposal on the plans and details before me which relate to No.17 New Holt Road.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would impact highway safety.

Reasons

4. No.17 is an end of terrace property with an area of hardstanding to the front. The depth of the frontage is limited. None of the properties in the terrace have a crossover to access parking in front of the property. However, numerous dropped kerbs provide access to off-road parking along New North Road.
5. The intention is to park a car parallel to the house, and the dimensions are sufficient to accommodate a parking space with that orientation. The plans show the proposed crossover to be centrally positioned in front of the property with a footway crossover width of 2.4m with splays to each side. However, unlike driveway/off-road parking, where vehicles drive directly into the space, the arrangements would require parallel parking manoeuvres, wherein the angle of access from the road would be different and would consequently require a wider crossover.
6. Access via the proposed arrangements is likely to necessitate multiple movements across the pavement area, and there are no tracking diagrams or other information

to demonstrate that this is feasible. Furthermore, the road in front of the appeal property does not have any restrictions. During my visit to the site, I observed a line of vehicles parked along the road, and therefore access could also potentially involve manoeuvring between parked cars.

7. I acknowledge that the general layout reflects the details shown in the diagram extract from the *Guidance Notes for Applying to have Footway Crossing (Dropped Kerb) For Applicants* (Appendix A). However, the extent of the crossover is not the same, and the highway authority advises that an 8m wide crossover shared with the neighbouring property would be required to provide adequate space. The response does not indicate that entry and exit in a forward gear is necessary, and turning on site is not part of the parking arrangements for other properties along the road. Nevertheless, from the information before me, the proposal would fail to provide adequate or convenient access to the proposed parking without potentially prejudicing highway safety and, in particular, would fail to protect pedestrians from potential hazards.
8. The proposal would also not incorporate any soft landscaping within the frontage of the property. The Council indicate that a minimum of 20% is required in line with the Redbridge Footway Crossing policy. I have not been provided with a full copy of this, and its status in terms of planning policy is unclear. While landscaping would add to the visual amenity of the area and have environmental benefits, it is not a specific criterion under policy LP23 of the Local Plan¹, which relates to car and cycle parking, and I assume it is part of the requirements in relation to the separate highway application for a dropped kerb. Nonetheless, having found against the proposal on highway safety matters, this is not a determinative issue.
9. Each proposal is to be considered on its own merits, and while I recognise the extent of dropped kerbs along New North Road and the convenience and benefits for the occupiers of the property, the proposal fails to demonstrate that it would not conflict with other road users and that highway safety would be maintained.
10. The development would, therefore, be contrary to policies T2 and T4 of the London Plan, which together and amongst other things, seek to ensure that parking provisions are appropriate, support the integration of transport modes, increase walking, improve street safety and ensure that proposals do not increase road danger.
11. However, I have not found conflict with Policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018, which is focused on promoting sustainable transport and the delivery of transport networks rather than highway safety. Additionally, I also do not find a direct conflict with Local Plan policy LP23 or London Plan policy T6.1, which relate to parking provisions for new developments, and the parking space accords with the size requirements of policy LP23 1(g).

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

¹ Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 March 2018