
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3234262

962 High Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 4EL

- 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 Mr Nagesh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1129/19, dated 6 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the formation of vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of the development has not changed. However, the wording from the Council's decision notice has been entered rather than that from the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety in High Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house located within a row of 5 properties. The terrace group is set back from High Road with front gardens and 2 of the properties have dropped kerbs and front parking connecting onto the highway by crossing over the intervening public footpath. High Road is a busy main road with a variety of commercial and residential uses. A dedicated cycle lane runs along the road terminating at the bus stop to the west of the terrace group. Traffic movements along the road and using the nearby junctions were regular during my site visit.
5. Due to the size and nature of the proposed space, manoeuvrability within the site to enable vehicles to enter and leave in a forward direction would not be

- realistic. As a result, for reasons of convenience, vehicles would likely either reverse into the space, or reverse out.
6. The alignment of High Road gives good visibility, moreover, vehicles entering or leaving the appeal site would travel at slow speeds. However, any vehicles reversing onto or off the road at this location along High Road, in my view, would be to the detriment of highway safety.
 7. The close proximity to the bus stop and the cycle lane would lead to conflict between the use of the proposed access and buses and cyclists. I recognise that traffic would be at lower speeds when using the junctions at Reynolds Avenue and Montpellier Gardens. However, their location in relation to the appeal site would, nonetheless, still increase the potential for conflicts with vehicles associated with the proposed access.
 8. As a family home vehicle movements associated with the access would be relatively low. However, the proposal would still increase the intensity of vehicle movements onto the highway, which in my view, would compromise highway safety and impinge on the operation of the bus stop.
 9. Although 2 other houses in the terrace group have existing parking spaces to the front, I have no substantive evidence as to whether there have been any safety issues as a result of these spaces. Moreover, I note the Council's remarks that 1 of these is historic and 1 does not have consent. I do not have any evidence to demonstrate that either of these have been permitted under the existing national and local planning policy framework. In my view, these off-street parking spaces represent examples of unacceptable parking arrangements that should not be used as a precedent to permit further similar proposals.
 10. In conclusion, the proposed access would have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety in High Road. The proposal would be contrary to Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP) adopted March 2018 which seeks a high quality of design that functions well. The Council also refer to Policy LP23 of the LP, however this is more concerned with providing sufficient parking spaces in new development, and I therefore do not consider it to be relevant in this case. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on road safety.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR