



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2023

by Chris Forreth BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3304890

1050 High Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 4BB

- 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 Ms Mercy Adewunmi against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0946/22, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the formation of means of access and alterations to front garden to create driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal differs between the application form and the Council's decision notice. I note that the appellant has referred to both descriptions on their appeal form.
3. From the documentation before me, the scope of the proposal is clear. For consistency with the Council's decision notice, I have therefore adopted this version of the description.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the south side of High Road which is a busy classified road. In the vicinity of the site, there are a mix of residential and commercial uses. The appeal property itself is a mid-terraced residential property, although the adjoining property to the east is used as a dental clinic.
6. To the front of the appeal property is a wide pavement area and the carriageway of the road includes a cycle lane. There are also bus stops located nearby on both sides of the road.
7. The forecourt to the appeal property appears to have been recently block paved and at the time of my site visit there was a vehicle parked in this area. As noted by the appellant there is adequate space for the parking of two vehicles in this area.

8. The key concern of the Council is whether there is sufficient space to manoeuvre within the site to allow vehicles to enter and exit in a forward gear.
9. Given the width and depth of the site, I share the Council's concern in this respect as it would appear extremely difficult to manoeuvre a vehicle within the site to enable it to enter and exit in a forward direction. This is particularly the case given the width of the appeal site, and the available area outside of the parking spaces. Whilst I note the appellants comments that such a manoeuvre would be possible, very little evidence to demonstrate this has been provided. Given the
10. In the absence of any convincing evidence to the contrary, in my view, vehicles using the site would be forced to manoeuvre on the pavement or the main carriageway which would in turn have an unacceptable increase in highway danger both in relation to vehicles using High Road and for non-motorised vehicles and pedestrians on the footpath and cycle lane.
11. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that there are two properties around 200 metres west of the appeal site which have dropped kerbs and where vehicles cannot enter and exit in a forward gear. I also acknowledge the other examples drawn to my attention in the wider area. However, none of these properties provide the same set of site circumstances of the appeal site. Furthermore, none of these examples provide for a compelling reason why permission should be granted for an otherwise unacceptable development.
12. The Council have referred to LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) in their reason for refusal. This policy is largely concerned with promoting sustainable transport and given the proposal before me I find no conflict with it.
13. For the above reasons, I find that there would be significant harm to highway safety and as such the proposal would be contrary to Policies T2 and T4 of The London Plan which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development proposals should not increase road danger.

Planning Balance

14. The appellant has set out that the proposal would enable the installation of an electric charging point, ensure that the forecourt is used to its full potential, and that the site is put in effective use. In addition, it is set out that the existing rear access/parking does not provide a convenient car parking area or would be an appropriate spot for the installation of a charging point.
15. Whilst I attach some positive weight to these factors, they do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR