
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2025 by E Clifford BA(Hons) MA

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3367976

110 Roding Lane North, Redbridge, Woodford Green IG8 8LJ

- 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 Tahir Noor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3236/24.
 - The development proposed is an extension of means of access to a highway.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Decision Notice as it is more succinct than that on the application form.
4. I have been provided with amended plans which have been proposed following the Council's determination of the application showing a reduced width for the proposed dropped kerb. However, these have not been submitted to the Council nor consulted on, and it is not the role of an appeal to attempt to evolve a scheme. Accordingly, I am unable to take these into account in line with the appeals procedure as I cannot be satisfied that other parties would not be prejudiced by my doing so. Therefore, I have considered this application on the merits of the original submitted plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on public safety having regard to ingress and egress onto Roding Lane North.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached property located in a residential area. This stretch of the road features predominantly semi-detached pairs of both two-storey dwellings and bungalows. An existing dropped kerb provides access to the parking area on its frontage and adjoins that of the neighbouring property, no. 112 creating a relatively wide and continuous section of dropped kerb.

7. Roding Lane North is a long road which connects the A1400, Southend Road, and the A113, Chigwell Road. It is primarily residential and also provides access to commercial and educational sites as well as green open space. The stretch on which the appeal site is located is predominantly residential and has a number of smaller roads accessed off of it, such as Kensington Drive near to the appeal site. There are no parking restrictions along this stretch of Roding Lane North and at the time of my site visit I observed a number of vehicles parked along the roadside.
8. The frontage of the appeal site is already accessed by a dropped kerb. The proposal to extend this to the full width of the frontage would conflict with paragraph 3.10.1 of the Housing Design Guidance SPD which states that the width of crossovers should not exceed 50% of the site frontage. Furthermore, it would increase the amount of pavement subject to vehicles crossing over and thus would reduce the safe use of this space for pedestrians. There is therefore little justification for the proposal in the face of additional pedestrian safety concerns that would arise. As such, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be in the best interests of highway safety.
9. Along the road, there are a number of existing dropped kerbs which occupy the entire width of their frontages. However, I do not have the benefit of the details for these examples and whether they were granted planning permission or were constructed in line with the current policies and guidance. I have determined this recommendation on its own merits and accordingly these examples do not justify the appeal proposal.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on pedestrian safety on Roding Lane North. This would therefore be contrary to the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) Policy LP23 which determines the minimum sufficient parking standards for residential properties and Policy T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) which seeks to ensure the provision of sufficient car parking. It would also fail to adhere to Policy T2 of the London Plan which seeks to reduce road danger. It would also conflict with the Council's Housing Design SPD. The Redbridge Local Plan Policy LP22 is referred to in the Council's reasons for refusal. However, as it has regard to the promotion of sustainable transport it is not directly relevant to the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

B Plenty

INSPECTOR