



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3246399

328 Eastern Avenue, Ilford IG4 5AA

- 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 W. Ali against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3691/19, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a vehicular access and alterations to driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the header above is based on that used on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice and it is not disputed by the appellant.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a terraced dwelling that fronts onto Eastern Avenue (A12). It is a dual carriageway with heavy traffic and a 40mph speed limit. On my site visit I observed that a bus stop lay-by lies in front of No. 328. I also noted the property benefits from off-road parking to the rear of the dwelling which is accessed via a shared driveway off the A12 located to the west of the site and after the bus stop lay-by.
 6. The proposed dropped kerb and vehicular access would be formed at the end of the existing bus stop lay-by. I find that there would be limited space for manoeuvring within the driveway which would in all likelihood mean vehicles would have to reverse across the bus lay-by and on to the busy A-road. Although the appellant states that the new vehicular access would serve a
-

single residential use and so therefore vehicle movements would be low, and these movements would take place at slow speed and with adequate visibility, such reversing manoeuvres would be hazardous and would threaten highway safety by endangering other road users, cyclists and pedestrians. The vehicular access would also potentially disrupt the flow of traffic at a critical location in a bus stop lay-by and in proximity to a major junction.

7. The appellant also highlights that accident records for Eastern Avenue reveal that no accidents have been caused or contributed by vehicle movements to and from accesses however I have not been provided with this evidence. In any case, I am not convinced a lack of accidents gives credence to the proposed development and does not alter my view that it would threaten highway safety. This view is supported by Transport for London (TFL) who objected to the proposal.
8. I therefore find the proposal would negatively impact highway safety and conflict with policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan (the 'local plan') which seeks to ensure proposals improve the usage and safety of the public transport network and reduce car dependency. I do not find that local plan policy LP23 is directly relevant to this appeal as it relates to the provision of cycle and car parking rather than the effect of development on highway safety.

Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR