



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/19/3243228

R&Z Global Services Ltd, 142 High Street North, Eastham E6 2HT

- 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 Ramiz Ali on behalf of R&Z Global Services Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 19/01442/FUL, dated 18 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: "I just want to start cab/taxi services into my premises for this I am not doing any construction work or building changes. I am just adding this service into my premises for this I need permission."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - i) highway safety; and
 - ii) the living conditions for the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Highway safety

3. The appeal site is located within a busy town centre environment and is occupied by a commercial use. The site occupies a prominent location on the corner of a controlled junction with the main high street. The area is also subject to parking restrictions.
4. The proposal would seek to introduce a taxi service into the appeal site, however, based on the evidence before me, it is not entirely clear how it would be undertaken. The likely use has been broken down by percentages and it is suggested that only 30% of customers will be picked up or dropped off at the site. However, the evidence is not clear in relation to how many vehicular movements this would generate. In addition, the proposal has not been supported with any evidence in relation to existing parking stress and whether capacity exists to cater for the increased demand in parking spaces.
5. Although the proposed use would be a town centre use, it would increase vehicular movements in the locality and would require car parking spaces for the associated vehicles. Accordingly, it would increase demand in an area

which already experiences high demand due to its location and associated uses. In the absence of evidence to confirm that the existing road network could satisfactorily absorb the likely increase in demand, I cannot be certain that the proposal would not result in cars parked in areas that could harm the flow of vehicular traffic.

6. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would harm highway safety. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies SP2, SP3, SP9 and INF2 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018) (LP), Policies 6.1, 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016), and Policies T1, T4, T5 and T6 of the Draft London Plan. Taken together, these seek amongst other things, to smooth traffic flow and tackle congestion.

Living conditions

7. As identified above, the appeal site is located in a vibrant and busy environment. Although Clements Road has a more residential character, the presence of the town centre and its associated activity is clearly apparent from within this street.
8. The proposed use would likely increase comings and goings at the site. However, I have no specific evidence before me in relation to how this would be different to the existing activity associated with the town centre. In addition, I have nothing compelling before me regarding how the proposal would increase noise, disturbance, or anti-social behaviour. Instead, based on the evidence before me, this would appear to primarily be an assertion on behalf of the Council. Due to the lack of evidence on this matter, and due to the surrounding uses and associated activity, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. Accordingly, in this regard, it would comply with Policies S1, S6, SP1, SP2, SP3, SP8 and H1 of the LP, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, and Policies D1 and D2 of the DLP. Taken together, these promote amongst other things, high quality, neighbourly development.

Other Matters

9. The appeal site is located within the zone of influence of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. However, in light of my findings set out above, the appeal has failed and consequently, there is no need to consider the effect of the proposal on this matter.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR