



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3353160

305 Green Lane, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9TL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Jaswinder Chagger against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1676/24.
 - The development is a proposed drop kerb to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would impact highway safety, in particular pedestrian users.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is part of a row of terraced properties to the northern side of Green Lane. The frontages of these properties are being used for parking, although only some have dropped kerbs to the highway. Green Lane is a busy road (A1083) with a parade of shops immediately to the east.
4. To the pavement in front of No.305 is a denoted pedestrian crossing point with tactile paving and dropped kerb, with a central refuge island in the road. The proposal seeks to extend this existing crossover which extends partially across the front of the appeal property. Vehicular access to the property for parking would require driving partially over the crossing area, and due to the road layout, ingress and egress could only be achieved in an easterly direction and would require turning manoeuvres in close proximity to the island.
5. While the appellant suggests access can be achieved in and out of the appeal site in a forward gear, there is no evidence to suggest that this is achievable. The frontage has a limited width for turning, and from my observations, this is the type of arrangement where vehicles access directly. As such, while there are clear visibility splays, one of the manoeuvres would be reversing, and could potentially result in reversing directly behind pedestrians waiting to cross or over the route of the crossing.
6. There are a number of vehicle crossover points to individual properties along Green Lane. The background to all of these is unknown; however, the specific examples

of planning permissions granted referenced by the appellant do not have the same proximity to a pedestrian crossing, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.

7. The existing dropped kerb provides a level threshold to the denoted crossing, aiding pedestrian movement and safety, including for disabled users and those with prams, etc. It is not part of a driveway to the appeal property, and the proposal would directly conflict with the existing use. The Council's highway authority advises that it would be harmful to the quality of the pedestrian environment and prejudicial to road safety, and there is no other technical evidence before me which demonstrates that pedestrians would be safeguarded.
8. I acknowledge that there is support for developments which enable the charging of electric vehicles. However, the National Planning Policy Framework also seeks to ensure safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users with priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, and significantly that developments do not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed access arrangements would unacceptably increase the risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and would be contrary to policies T2 and T4 of the London Plan, which support and encourage walking, reducing the dominance of vehicles on London's streets and not increasing road danger.
10. As the proposal is for a dropped kerb only, and there is no indication that the parking itself would be insufficient, I do not find direct conflict with policy LP23 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018, which relates to parking provisions. Nor do I find conflict with policy LP22 focussed on promoting sustainable transport and the delivery of transport networks rather than highway safety.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR