



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3362485

115 Clayhall Avenue, Ilford, Redbridge IG5 0PN

- 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 Sukhbir Parmar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2532/24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Extension of means of access to a highway. Front boundary wall with gates.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the Council's description of the development proposed, which I have used in the bullet header above, as it more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety and on the availability of on-street parking.

Reasons

Highway and pedestrian safety

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling, within a predominantly residential area. It benefits from an existing dropped kerb and vehicle access from the carriageway, shared with the neighbouring property, and provides off-street parking for two vehicles within the front forecourt. A street tree is present directly in front of the site.
5. The appeal proposal seeks to introduce an additional dropped kerb and second vehicle access from the carriageway, alongside a front boundary wall and gates around 1.1 metres high. The proposed new access would be approximately 3 metres wide resulting, when taken with the existing access, in the majority of the frontage of the dwelling comprising of a dropped kerb.
6. The footway's primary function is to provide a continuous, unobstructed, and safe route for all users. The introduction of a second access point would materially increase the number of vehicle and pedestrian conflict points along the footway in

front of the appeal site. The repeated need for vehicles to cross the pavement increases the risk of collision. Visibility at the proposed new access would be restricted by adjacent on-street parking, reducing intervisibility between drivers entering the access and pedestrians using the footway. This raises the potential for accidents, particularly where vehicles need to edge across the footpath before they can see clearly.

7. When taken with the existing street tree in front of the property, which already constrains the usable width of the pavement and forces pedestrians to navigate a narrower space, the additional access would leave little clear space for uninterrupted pedestrian movement in front of the appeal site.
8. The cumulative effect of the proposal would be a footpath that is fragmented, less legible and less safe. Given that the property already benefits from a functioning vehicle access, there is no demonstrable need for a second one. The proposal therefore represents an unjustified intensification of vehicle movements across the public footway, to the clear detriment of highway safety.
9. The appellant has referred me to examples of similar developments in the area, but no substantive details have been provided regarding specific examples, the context or circumstances of any approvals. In any case, each proposal must be determined on its own merits. While I acknowledge the presence of other similar dropped kerbs along Clayhall Avenue this proposal fails to demonstrate that it would not adversely affect pedestrian movement or compromise highway safety.
10. While I acknowledge the appellant's personal circumstances and the proposed greening of the forecourt, which I note could take place irrespective of the creation of a second access, these do not outweigh the harm identified.
11. I therefore find that the proposed additional access would adversely impact highway safety. The development would be contrary to Policy T2 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) which amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development creates a healthy, inclusive environment which prioritises walking and pedestrian movement.
12. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to the advice contained within the adopted Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019), which seeks to limit the extent of a crossover across a frontage and ensure the design of a crossover mitigates its impact on the pedestrian environment, particularly for disabled people using wheelchairs, and people using pushchairs.

Availability of on-street parking

13. It was apparent from my site visit that this section of Clayhall Avenue supports on-street parking on both sides of the road. It was evident that drivers can park on the street with relative ease and there was an availability of spaces, helped by off-street parking and the absence of any parking restrictions.
14. The existing forecourt of the appeal property provides for two off street parking spaces. The appeal proposal would remove a parking space from the public highway. However, based on the availability of on-street parking I observed on site and in the absence of any parking survey data before me to suggest otherwise, the development would not result in competition for parking that could be considered unduly harmful to traffic flow or highway safety.

15. On this basis, I find that the appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety due to the availability of on-street parking. I find no conflict with LP Policies T6 and T6.1 or Policy LP23 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) (RLP).

Other Matters

16. The Council have not raised an objection to the proposed front boundary wall and gates and based on my observations on my site visit I agree. I find no conflict with Policy D3 of the LP and Policy LP26 of the RLP in this regard.
17. Although referred to in the Council's reason for refusing the planning application, RLP Policy LP22 is principally strategic in nature and therefore has not been decisive in my findings.
18. The appellant has referred to communications and advice from the Council during the pre-application and determination stages. However, such procedural matters do not carry determinative weight in the context of this appeal and do not alter the planning merits or policy compliance of the proposal.

Conclusion

19. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety due to the availability of on-street parking. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above, the development would harm highway safety associated with vehicles accessing the appeal property and footway users passing by it. Thus, on balance, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR