



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/24/3354861

Parking area adjacent to Abbey Road, Knaresborough, HG5 8HY

- 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 Zest Eco against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZC24/02431/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the siting of 3.no rapid electric vehicle chargers together with ancillary electrical equipment serving 6.no EV charging bays.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with specific regard to parking provision and the free flow of traffic.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an area of land situated alongside the River Nidd on Abbey Road which is a picturesque location. Roads along the river near to the site are narrow with only limited parking available. This section of Abbey Road serves a relatively small number of dwellings with no through traffic. At the time of my site visit, the appeal site was being used for the parking of seven vehicles albeit spaces were not demarcated. There are commercial and tourist facilities close to the site.
5. I have not been provided with any details of a mechanism to ensure that the parking would be available for all vehicles or limited solely to electric ones. Whilst it is alleged that any other vehicle would not be prevented from using the spaces, it would be reasonable to assume that users thereof would be dissuaded from doing so if they were marked up as Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points. More likely than not therefore, this would displace what appeared to be well used capacity elsewhere.
6. General parking, both restricted and unrestricted, in the area is at a premium and it can be particularly difficult to find suitable parking close to the appeal site along the River Nidd. I have no doubt that the need for parking would surge during the

summer months given the charming location and the tourist offer that is available. The loss of parking would result in more vehicles using other locations along the narrow streets close to the River Nidd which would inhibit the free flow of traffic and therefore harm highway safety. I do not disagree that there is an increasing demand for EV spaces but there are already provisions in the town, and I have not been provided with a compelling case to suggest why the EV charging bays need to be in this specific location.

7. Given the restriction for through traffic on Abbey Road, there would only be a relatively small number of vehicles that would pass the appeal site each day. The EV charging points would be in a similar location to the vehicles that were parked on the appeal site at the time of my site visit which would therefore still provide adequate space alongside the site for a driver of a vehicle to safely pass through. Combining both factors together, the proposal would not exacerbate the potential for vehicle collisions due to there still be adequate passing space available.
8. Nevertheless, given the harm that I have identified to highway safety above as a result of parking availability, the proposal would not meet the requirements of Policy T13 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2020 which is concerned with providing convenient parking amongst other things.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR