
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3363338

Commercial House, 406-410 Eastern Ave, Ilford IG2 6NQ

- 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 Attiq Islam (Nelson College) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3451/24.
 - The development proposed is installation of a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's name in the banner heading above reflects the spelling provided on the planning application form.
3. The description of the development has been shortened for clarity, omitting extraneous details that do not constitute acts of development.
4. Although the appellant has indicated willingness to reduce the width of the proposed dropped kerb, this appeal has been determined based solely on the scheme submitted and considered by the Council following public consultation. Should the appellant wish to address the Council's concerns through amendments, a new application should be submitted to the local planning authority.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located on the south side of the A12 Eastern Avenue, a major arterial route featuring an in-carriageway cycle lane and designated as a red route by Transport for London (TfL). Red routes are intended to minimise stopping and parking to ensure the smooth and safe flow of traffic, with priority given to public transport, taxis, and cyclists. The site is also situated adjacent to a college and near to a fast-food restaurant, both of which generate significant pedestrian activity, contributing to high footfall in the area.
7. The forecourt in front of the college is marked out for five parking spaces. At present, only one of these spaces is directly accessible via a narrow existing access point. The remaining spaces appear to be accessed informally, with vehicles mounting the kerb, thereby posing risks to pedestrian safety. Additionally,

the absence of turning space means that vehicles must reverse over the footway when entering or leaving the spaces, likely also obstructing the free flow of traffic on the A12.

8. The proposal seeks to install a new dropped kerb measuring 9.1m in width. While this may improve vehicular access to the forecourt spaces, it would result in a significantly widened crossover across the public footway, increasing the risk of vehicle-pedestrian conflict and disrupting continuous pedestrian movement in an area with high footfall.
9. No supporting technical documentation, such as a transport assessment, swept path analysis, or pedestrian safety audit, has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed access would be safe and appropriate in this context. Nor has it been shown that mitigation measures referenced in the appellant's statement, such as turning areas and designated entry points, could practically be implemented on site.
10. The appellant contends that the proposal would alleviate on-street parking pressure by enabling full and efficient use of the forecourt. However, parking is already prohibited along this section of the red route, and no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the wider surrounding area suffers from parking stress. In any case, enhancing parking provision and convenience should not come at the expense of pedestrian and cyclist safety. Paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that the safety and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists should be prioritised.
11. In addition, the site is well served by public transport, being close to Gants Hill Underground Station and situated on a main bus route. Promoting car-based access and user convenience in such a location runs counter to the sustainable transport objectives of the Framework; Policies T2, T4 and T6.2 of the London Plan 2021 (the LP); and Policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (the RLP).
12. The appellant states that the Council has granted planning permission for other similar dropped kerbs along the road. However, in the absence of specific details, a meaningful comparison cannot be made.
13. For all these reasons, I conclude that the development would have an unacceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety. It conflicts with the highway safety and sustainable transport objectives of Policies T2, T4, and T6.2 of the LP; Policy LP22 of the RLP; and the Framework. There are no material considerations that would justify a decision contrary to the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR