



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: 3rd July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3364216

Rear of Primrose Court, Barley Lane, Ilford IG3 8XG

- 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 Sukhdev Singh (Sky Star Estates Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2331/24.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garages and erection of Class B8 Storage unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to noise and disturbance; and
 - highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located to the rear of Primrose Court and is surrounded by residential properties on all sides. It currently hosts a block of five domestic garages, with boundary fencing of approximately 1.8 to 2 metres in height. Vehicular access is provided via a narrow driveway between Primrose Court and 93 Barley Lane.
4. The proposal would replace the garages with a flat-roofed storage building intended to serve a nearby plumbing business. Although the appellant has reduced the scale of the original proposal, the revised building would still occupy the majority of the site and be positioned close to all boundaries. Its size, bulk, and commercial function would be at odds with the domestic scale and residential character of the immediate surroundings. The existing garages are modest in scale and visually recessive in the site. In contrast, the proposed building would dominate the small site, resulting in a cramped and overdeveloped appearance that is inconsistent with the spatial character of this residential setting.

5. I therefore conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (the RLP), which seeks high-quality design that respects local character, context, and the relationship between buildings and spaces.

Living conditions

6. The appellant states that the proposed use would generate limited activity, with no more than two deliveries per day during standard working hours. However, a Class B8 storage use has the potential to be significantly more operationally intensive than the domestic use of the garages. Furthermore, as planning permission runs with the land rather than the applicant, future operators could introduce materially different patterns of use, potentially increasing activity levels beyond those currently proposed.
7. The proximity of the proposed building and its access route to neighbouring gardens and rear-facing windows, particularly those at Primrose Court and 93 Barley Lane, raises serious concerns about the potential for noise and disturbance. This includes noise from vehicle movements, loading and unloading operations, and general day-to-day business activity.
8. While planning conditions could, in principle, seek to restrict operational hours and delivery frequency, I am not persuaded that such measures would sufficiently mitigate the adverse impacts of the proposed use. Given the tight spatial constraints of the site and the absence of any meaningful separation between the operational area and neighbouring properties, even limited activity could give rise to noticeable and intrusive noise and disturbance. Furthermore, the effectiveness of conditions would be inherently difficult to monitor and enforce. For example, verifying compliance with delivery limits or hours would require ongoing oversight, which is unlikely to be practical or proportionate at this concealed site. There is also a risk that future changes in ownership or business practices could lead to intensification, further undermining the intended safeguards. As such, I do not consider that planning conditions would provide a reliable or enforceable means of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring residents in this instance.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents in relation to noise and disturbance. This is contrary to Policy D14 of the London Plan 2021 (the LP) and RLP Policies LP24 and LP26, in so far as they seek to safeguard residents from the adverse effects of noise and incompatible development.

Highway safety

10. Barley Lane (B177) is a classified road, a main bus route, and includes an in-carriageway cycle lane. It also serves the entrance to the nearby Hospital. Traffic volumes are likely to be high, particularly during peak periods.
11. The development would be accessed via a narrow driveway with no provision for on-site turning. As a result, delivery vehicles would be required to reverse either into or out of the site.
12. Although the appellant states that only small delivery vans would be used and that reversing manoeuvres are already common along Barley Lane, the absence of on-site turning space would increase the likelihood of obstruction to passing traffic,

including buses, emergency vehicles, and cyclists. This would heighten the risk of accidents and pose a significant threat to highway safety, particularly given the function of the B177 as a key access route.

13. Overall, the proposal fails to demonstrate that safe and efficient access could be maintained without compromising the safety of other road users. This leads me to conclude that the development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to LP Policies T4 and T7, which seek to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.

Other Matters

14. The appellant states that the storage facility is essential to the operation of the plumbing business and that alternative sites have been explored without success. It is also suggested that the development would reduce carbon emissions from shortened travel distances between the business and its storage facilities. While these economic and environmental considerations carry some weight, they do not outweigh the significant harm I have identified and the conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and no material considerations have been advanced that would justify a departure from it. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR