
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/25/3367886

55 Sewardstone Road, Chingford E4 7PA

- 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 Ilhan Ortas of Crossway Food and Wine against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref is 250431.
 - The development proposed is vehicle crossover in pavement to access side delivery yard area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council does not object to the demolition of the existing shed or removal of the boundary wall illustrated on the submitted plans. Based on the plans before me and my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree with those findings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property occupies a corner plot at the junction of the A112 Sewardstone Road and the A110 Lea Valley Road. The junction is signalised. Traffic lights and an associated cycle box are located to the south of the appeal property. There are double yellow lines around the roadside frontage of the appeal property. Existing vehicle crossovers are present in the vicinity of the site, including at the adjoining property 2 Lea Valley Road.
5. The appeal proposal would result in the creation of a new access onto the A110 Lea Valley Road in close proximity to the signalised junction. The Council raise concerns about the distance between the proposed development and the junction with reference to the standards set out within the Council's Vehicle Crossover Application Guidance (adopted in 2022). Based on the Council's measurement, the distance is less than the 8m minimum distance identified in this guidance. However, the appellant suggests that the measurement was undertaken incorrectly and, consequently, the distance to the junction is greater. Irrespective of the precise distance, the proposed development is undoubtedly close to the Sewardstone Road junction with Lea Valley Road.

6. Given the proximity of the proposed access to the signalised junction, its filter lanes and the position of the cycle box, it is likely that vehicles would, at times, queue beyond the proposed access when waiting at a red traffic signal. This would mean that users of the proposed access may have to wait, fully or partially, on the footway to access Lea Valley Road for extended periods of time. In addition, while the proposal includes the removal of the existing wall, stationary vehicles on the crossover would obstruct visibility for pedestrians. As a result, the proposed development would likely impede the free flow of pedestrians and vehicles, to the detriment of highway safety and comfort.
7. The Council also raises concerns about the ability to exit the driveway during a red traffic signal without entering the cycle box and the risks this poses for cyclist safety. I have no evidence before me, such as a swept path analysis, to demonstrate that this could satisfactorily be achieved.
8. I acknowledge that the appellant is seeking the vehicle crossover to enable access for delivery vehicles so that deliveries can be made without vehicles parking on the roads outside the shop and without deliveries needing to be carried across the pavement. The appellant suggests that, for these reasons, the proposed development would improve safety for pedestrians and road users. However, I observed on site that there are existing double yellow lines and restrictions on loading times which protect against loading where it would pose a risk to highway safety. Moreover, I have reasoned above why I have identified harm based on the proposals before me and my observations on site. Ultimately, the alleged risks posed by the current arrangements do not lead me to an alternative conclusion.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on highway and pedestrian safety. As such, it would not accord with the relevant provisions of Policies 60 and 66 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (2024). These policies seek, in summary, to create an environment which encourages and promotes active and sustainable travel, ensure accessible and adequate public space for all and manage traffic and parking.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has brought to my attention two examples of existing vehicle crossovers in the local area, on Kings Road and Station Road. The timing of the construction of these vehicle crossovers is disputed between the parties. As such, it is unclear whether they would have been considered against current development plan policies or the current Vehicle Crossover Application Guidance. Nevertheless, although located relatively close to the appeal scheme, the cases are fundamentally situated on different sites. Therefore, they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. I have considered the appeal on its own individual circumstances, including its proximity to the Sewardstone Road junction with Lea Valley Road. Ultimately, that these other examples exist does not mean that the appeal proposal should automatically be found acceptable.
11. I appreciate the frustration of the appellant in relation to the Council's approach to determining the planning application. Nonetheless, I have reviewed the information before me and have assessed the appeal on that basis. This matter, which would be best dealt with via a costs application, does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt
INSPECTOR