



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3363793

199 Goodmayes Lane, Ilford, Redbridge IG3 9PW

- 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 Mr Kuldip Sing against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3027/24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extension of drop kerb.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the safe use of the highway for pedestrians.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The road fronting the appeal site is a main thoroughfare. It is an active route for both cars and pedestrians. There is bus stop, recreation ground and school nearby. Off street parking is prevalent, with spaces to the front of dwellings served by existing drop kerb arrangements. The appeal site shares one with its neighbour. The scheme seeks to extend it.
5. Such an extension, to the degree proposed, would substantially increase the surface area of footway that vehicles would then be enabled to traverse. In the context of an already compromised footway due to other local crossovers, this would reduce (even further) the uninterrupted and thus inherently safer areas of pedestrian only sections of the public highway.
6. Due to the limitations of the plot width of the dwelling which the widened drop kerb would serve, most vehicles would have to either reverse into the spaces provided on the frontage or reverse out. Either way, this is a manoeuvre which affords reduced visibility for the driver, within an area which would have a greater exposure to pedestrians. This has the capability to be that much more dangerous in the above context, increasing the likelihood of vehicle and pedestrian conflict. Taking into account the nearby location of the school and recreation ground. Both of which

are more likely to attract young children who would be inherently more difficult to spot for the driver of a manoeuvring vehicle.

7. The widened drop kerb might allow further manoeuvring capability for drivers accessing the appeal site and potentially make it easier for them, but this would be at the unacceptable expense of more vulnerable users. This would not therefore be a sufficient justification for the appeal scheme. With this and the above in mind, the proposed development would compromise the safe use of the highway for pedestrians. As such, it would be at odds with Policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 and Policy T2 of the London Plan 2021 which are concerned with reducing road danger amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. Although I do not have the specific history of the examples provided, it is worth noting that such excessively wide accesses (over 6m per dwelling) are an exception to the norm on Goodmayes Lane and therefore that does not alter my findings above. Whilst the access has been reduced in width from a previously refused scheme, it is implicit in my findings that the amendment is not sufficient to overcome the harm to pedestrian safety that I have found above.
9. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area is not a contentious matter in the appeal. It is in any event a neutral matter which would be incapable of weighing against the harm I have found. Similarly, any compliance with on-street or off-street parking requirements does not materially change matters, given there are no changes to the proposed parking arrangements or capacity at the appeal site.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR