
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/24/3357107

118 Castleton Road, Ilford IG3 9QS

- 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 Martin Rigg against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1238/24.
 - The development proposed is the installation of fencing with metal gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the development's effect on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The site is located at one end of Castleton Road. Opposite the site is a one way street and adjacent to the site is a Public Right of Way footpath that leads through to a more primary street that benefits from bus stops. It was also noted on my site visit that next to the site was a pedestrian gate that served as an access point to the playing field of Goodmayes Primary School, with the main school building located further down Castleton Road. The site is therefore in an area where all types of road users are prevalent.
4. The proposal seeks to create a fence and metal vehicular gates, with the gates being located immediately adjacent the public highway.
5. The proposed location of the gates would result in vehicles having to stop on the public highway to open the gates on arrival or shut the gates on departure. This is very likely to cause an obstruction to other road users, who may choose to manoeuvre around stationary vehicles. This would put them at greater risk of collisions with other vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, and would have serious implications for the safety of all highway users.
6. The Council's decision notice refers to Policy LP22 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), which seeks to promote sustainable transport. I do not find this policy directly applicable to the proposal, because it is not development which falls within any of the relevant criteria. However, paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable

impact on highway safety'. For the above reasons I find that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to the Framework.

Other Matters

7. It is noted that fly tipping and anti-social behaviour could be an ongoing problem at the site. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would be the only solution to this problem or that this problem is great enough to warrant placing road users at unacceptable risk. I therefore give the benefits of the proposal limited weight.
8. The appellant has provided some examples of other gates in the local area. However, I have not been presented with evidence of when or if all of these have gained all the relevant permissions. Other examples of gates that place highway users at risk does not justify placing further people in unnecessary danger.

Conclusion

9. I have found that the proposal would not conflict with the development plan, but the Framework is a material consideration which indicates planning permission should be refused. On this basis the appeal is dismissed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR