



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by David English BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/22/3293760

49 – 53 (Unit 2) Burnside Industrial Estate, Roebuck Road, Hainault, Ilford, Essex IG6 3UG

- 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 Humayun Ahmad of Tectum Estate Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2707/21, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing warehouse then construct new warehouse with part five storey building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has provided a Transport Advisory Note ('the TAN') after the Council issued their decision notice. I note that the Council has seen and commented on this additional evidence, and therefore I am satisfied that it would not prejudice their position if I were to take account of the TAN in reaching my decision on the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is in a small courtyard of similar sized single-storey industrial buildings at the end of a cul-de-sac on a large and busy industrial estate. At the head of the cul-de-sac a footpath links the industrial estate to a residential area to the north.
5. Notwithstanding parking and waiting restrictions in place throughout the cul-de-sac, during my site visit I saw that many cars were parked on both footways either side of the carriageway, each taking over almost the full width of those footways; and large commercial vehicles were parked and left unattended on the carriageway. Pedestrians are therefore effectively forced to use the carriageway because of these obstructions, and forward visibility for motorists and cyclists in the area is likely to be regularly impaired. Given the size of some of the commercial vehicles servicing the appeal site and businesses nearby, and the widespread parking of cars and other vehicles on footways, a practise that appeared common throughout Roebuck Road, an

unsafe environment currently exists for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists in the immediate vicinity.

6. The single storey building on the appeal site is in use as a warehouse with associated office space. That building would be demolished to accommodate the proposal which comprises a substantially larger warehouse and offices. The Council confirms that their concerns regarding the adequacy of space within the courtyard serving the site to allow articulated lorries to turn and leave in a forward gear have been addressed through information in the TAN. However, the TAN does not address in any detail the likely realistic number and type of vehicles that would visit the site each day. The number of visits is likely to increase substantially given the large increase in the volume of storage space and ancillary office accommodation that the proposal would create.
7. Having regard to the current unsafe conditions for pedestrians and other highway users in the immediate vicinity of the site as noted above, it is reasonable to anticipate that the safety of all highway users would be further compromised through any significant increase in vehicle movements to and from the appeal site.
8. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I find that the effect of the proposed development on highway safety would be harmful. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy T4 of The London Plan (March 2021) which requires that development proposals should not increase road danger; and with Policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (March 2018) ('the Local Plan') which indicates that the Council will facilitate the safe movement of freight and servicing trips to, from, through and within Redbridge, and will require new development to provide a Servicing and Delivery Plan to ensure it can be adequately serviced.

Other Matters

9. The Council refer to Policy LP26 of the Local Plan in their reason for refusal. That policy relates to the promotion of high-quality design and, whilst the scale of the building and its effect on the character and appearance of the area is referenced in representations from neighbours, the Council confirm they have no significant concerns in this regard. It is therefore not a matter in dispute between the main parties.
10. The TAN indicates that a number of new jobs will be generated, but the precise number is not specified. Nevertheless, I recognise that the creation of new jobs is an important economic and social benefit. However, this benefit would not outweigh the harm I have identified in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David English

INSPECTOR