



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: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3361964

24 Fremantle Road, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 2AZ

- 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 P Pindoria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2835/24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Formation of means of access to a highway'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of means of access to a highway at 24 Fremantle Road, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 2AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2835/24 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: JND/1349/30 A, JND/1349/31 A, JND/1349/32 A.

Preliminary Matter

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 Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling, within a predominantly residential area. Properties within the street are generally set back from the road with front forecourts often used for off-street parking. Numerous examples of existing dropped kerbs of varying widths are present throughout the street, contributing to an established pattern of vehicular access from the carriageway.
5. The appeal dwelling shares a vehicle access from the carriageway with the adjacent end of terrace dwelling, 26 Fremantle Road (No.26), which provides access to the rear of the dwellings along a narrow space and what were likely

detached garages. I observed on my site visit that occupiers of No.26 use the shared access to park within the front forecourt of that property.

6. The appeal proposal seeks to introduce an additional, direct vehicular access from the carriageway to the front forecourt of the appeal property. The proposed dropped kerb would measure approximately 5.5 metres in width. When considered alongside the existing shared access and the access serving 22 Fremantle Road, the resulting frontage in front of, and adjacent to, the appeal property would be largely dominated by dropped kerbs of around 14 metres in width.
7. The introduction of an additional access point and the combined width of dropped kerb would increase the number of potential areas for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and would further interrupt the footway levels directly in front of the appeal site, albeit to a minimal extent. Nonetheless, in this instance, the pavement would remain sufficiently wide, and clear visibility would be maintained, for both drivers and pedestrians, unobstructed by street furniture or adjacent on-street parked vehicles. Refuges, albeit small and unguarded, for pedestrians between each access would also remain. Vehicle access points are a common feature in the locality, contributing to an established awareness among both pedestrians and motorists of the likelihood of vehicular movements across the footway.
8. Furthermore, the appeal site is not located in an area of high pedestrian footfall, and the proposed access is unlikely to generate significant volumes of vehicle movements over the footway. The site is not in close proximity to a road junction or designated pedestrian crossing and the presence of traffic-calming measures along Fremantle Road would reduce vehicle speeds when accessing and exiting the proposed access. These considerations diminish the likelihood of pedestrian and vehicle conflict.
9. The Council's Officer Report suggests conflict, in respect of the width of the access, with the *Redbridge Footway Crossing Policy* (2024). This document seeks to protect pedestrian movement and ensure safe entry to and exit from premises and, for the reasons set out above, I have found no demonstrable harm to highway safety arising from the proposal.
10. Although they are referred to in the Council's reason for refusing the appeal application, Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) Policies LP22 and LP23 respectively deal with the strategic provision of sustainable transport and sufficient cycle and car parking. Therefore, these policies have not been determinative in my decision. The same conclusions apply to London Plan (2021) Policy T.6.1.
11. For the reasons set out above, I find that the proposed access to the highway would not be harmful to highway safety. The development would not conflict with Policies D3 or T2 of the London Plan (2021), which amongst other matters, seeks to increase walking, reduce car dominance, and to improve street safety, comfort, convenience and amenity.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance: Use of planning conditions. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, I agree that a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty. Given the nature of the development a condition

relating to materials would not in my view be reasonable or necessary in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other relevant material considerations which indicate planning permission should be refused. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR