



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3366029

365 Ilford Lane, Ilford, Redbridge, IG1 2SJ

- 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 Arul Philippiiah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0147/25.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new dropped kerb and vehicular crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon highway safety along Ilford Lane and local on-street car parking provision.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a mid-terraced dwelling on the east side of Ilford Lane, a moderately busy highway with residences to one side along this stretch and a commercial parade of shops and businesses opposite. At the time of my visit, I observed No 365 had an open fronted paved front garden measuring around 5.5m wide and bound to each side with low brick walls and piers built along the shared common boundaries with the neighbouring properties. Immediately in front of the appeal property was one half of an on-street parking bay with space for two cars reserved for residential permit holders. The proposal is for the installation of a dropped kerb at the highway's edge to create an access for a vehicle to cross the pavement and park within the property's frontage and parallel to the road. This would entail the loss of one on-street parking space within the existing bay.
4. The appellant points to the Council's *Policy for Footway Crossings* (PFC) and its stated minimum dimensions for a parking space within a residential frontage where a car would be parked parallel to the public highway. The proposed parking space would measure 5.5m wide and 2.4m deep in accordance with an illustrated guide taken from the PFC and which is replicated within the appellant's appeal statement. However, I take the illustration merely as depicting the space required for a vehicle to stand. I accept that a parked car within the frontage of No 365 could stand clear of the highway and in this regard the proposal would comply with the PFC.

5. Neither the planning application or the appeal were accompanied by a swept path analysis to demonstrate how a vehicle would manoeuvre into or out of the space. From my observations, it is evident that the existing side boundary enclosures, which in any case demarcate land within the appellant's control and curtilage of the appeal property, would severely limit the space available for any vehicle seeking to access or egress the parking space. Such a feat would require multiple manoeuvres that would involve a vehicle incrementally edging across the pavement. This would prove not only exceedingly difficult, but it would also be significantly hazardous and a major inconvenience to pedestrians along the immediately adjacent footway. Such manoeuvres would be further hampered by any vehicle that may be parked within the residual on-street bay which would remain in front of No 367, along with the position of a pavement mounted CCTV column directly in front of No 363. These would be additional obstructions and points of conflict that would contribute further to a degradation of the safe and efficient operation of the highway along this stretch of Ilford Lane.
6. The appellant refers to existing levels of parking stress within the area as support for the proposal. However, there is no substantive evidence provided to support this. In any event, any personal benefits that would accrue from an off-street parking space at No 365 would be outweighed by the harm that I have identified. Conversely, in the absence of any evidence to demonstrate the levels of parking demand in the area, I am also unable to conclude that the loss of an on-street parking space would be somehow detrimental to other highway users. Furthermore, I am unable to identify where any of the development plan policies that have been put to me seek to resist the loss of any existing on-street parking facilities.
7. I appreciate that the proposal would enable the occupiers of No 365 to provide an electric vehicle charging facility within the curtilage of the property and that this would create an opportunity for a more sustainable transport option. However, any such benefit would be strongly outweighed by the harmful impact of a vehicle manoeuvring into and out of the proposed parking space.
8. My attention has been drawn to other examples along Ilford Lane where pavement crossovers exist to give access to frontage parking. In every case I observed nearby, the space was set perpendicular to the road where the manoeuvre for a vehicle would be straightforward. None of the examples put before me are comparable to the current appeal proposal.
9. Overall, and notwithstanding my findings in relation to on-street car parking provision, due to the severe limitations of the proposed front parking area in terms of its size, orientation and setting, I find that the proposal would result in manoeuvres of a vehicle to and from the highway and across the pavement which would be significantly detrimental to highway safety. As such, there would be conflict with Policies LP22 and LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted in 2018, as far as between them they seek to ensure the creation of a sustainable and efficient transport network and safe environments. There would also be conflict with Policies T2 and T4 of The London Plan 2021 as far as they seek to reduce road danger and improve street safety. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR