



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2025

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/24/3357882

Land Adjacent 1509 Great Cambridge Road, Enfield EN1 4SX

- 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 Robin Heap of Zest Eco against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/02547/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a community charging facility comprising 1.no rapid charger and 2.no charging bays.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address in the banner heading above has been taken from the appellant's appeal form and the Council's notice of decision, as it accurately describes the appeal site.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - Highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises part of a grassed verge to the side of no. 1509 Great Cambridge Road, it directly adjoins a narrow section of Capel Road. The grassed verge arrangement in this part of Capel Road is the same on the opposite side of the road, giving a symmetrical appearance. This approach is similar across the immediate layout of housing with verges to the sides and front of properties, that contributes to their distinctive and spacious layout and contributes to the character and appearance of this immediate area. Immediately behind the appeal site is a tall close boarded boundary fence along the side of no. 1509's rear garden.
5. The proposed development would significantly change the appearance of the grass verge, introducing a proposed pillar structure and charging hub, which would both be taller than the adjoining boundary fence of no. 1509, making them both prominent and dominant features in this immediate area. Their siting, scale and

functional design would introduce alien features onto the grassed verge, which would urbanise this immediate area, and they would be out of character with the suburban appearance of the appeal site and the area. Notwithstanding their set back from Capel Road, they would be seen when approaching the appeal site in both directions, including when cars would be parked in the proposed charging bays.

6. A substantial part of the grassed verge would be removed to accommodate the proposed charging bays, and although the functional use of the verge may be limited, it would nevertheless affect the character and appearance of the site and the area. The proposed EcoGrid E50 grass-filled eco matting surface may allow a natural grassed appearance, but with the proposed 2 no. parking bays likely to be in constant use, it is not certain that it would provide a grassed appearance across the entirety of the appeal site, with the subframe of the matting likely to be visible in areas where tyres are regularly driven across it. The appearance of the subframe amongst partly grassed areas would also be out of character with the area, and different to the verge on the opposite side of the road, which would create a discordant feature inconsistent with the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appellants have indicated that they would accept a condition regarding the ground surfacing materials and there would be opportunities for landscaping. However, these aspects could not adequately address the identified harm above.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and there would be conflict with Policy T2 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, dated March 2021 (LP), Policy DMD46 of Enfield's Development Management Document, adopted November 2014 (DMD), and Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010-2025, adopted November 2010 (CS), that amongst other things collectively require new development and interventions in the public realm to be high quality having special regard to their context, reduce the dominance of vehicles on streets, and for there to be no negative impact on the existing character of the area and streetscape as a result of the loss of grass verges. In addition, there would be conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it requires new development to enhance the overall quality of an area, be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history.
9. In its reason for refusal the Council referred to conflict with LP Policies T3, T4, T6 and T6.1 and CS Policies CP24 and CP25. Policy T3 is concerned with transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding, it is mostly a strategic policy, and Policy T4 is concerned with assessing and mitigating impacts on the transport network. Policies T6 and T6.1 mainly address parking requirements for new development. Policy CP24 is a strategic policy relating to possible improvements and aspirations for the road network, and Policy CP25 seeks to address strategic improvements for cyclists and pedestrians. I did not find these policies to be directly applicable to this main issue.
10. The Council also referred to its Revised Technical Standards for Footway Crossovers (excluding Heavy Duty Crossovers), dated April 2013 (RTSFC), in support of its reason for refusal. The RTSFC relates to the specification for new crossovers, such as visibility requirements and locations where they may not be

safe, including those situations when planning permission is not required and some of the practical considerations. In terms of this main issue, I also did not find it to be directly applicable.

Highway safety

11. I saw on my site inspection that this part of Capel Road was narrow, and it had cars parked along the opposite side of the road to the appeal site. Moreover, I saw that there was a turning spur partly in front of no.1509, with no through access for vehicles beyond that point, meaning cars must enter and leave this part of Capel Road at the same point (onto the longer section of Capel Road parallel with Great Cambridge Road). Although only a snapshot in time I also saw on my site inspection that Great Cambridge Road (A10) was very busy, and it is also said to be within 1 kilometre of the M25, so there could be a significant number of electric vehicles that continuously pass close to the appeal site, which could need to use the proposed charging points.
12. The appellant has said that the proposed development would offer fast charging points, and that it usually takes around 40 minutes to charge a vehicle, so approximately 1.5 vehicles could be charged per hour at each of the 2 no. charging points, and that real time data would be available through satellite navigation and other applications, so the availability of charging points would be known before drivers came to the appeal site to use them.
13. However, it is not certain that all drivers would use satellite navigation and other applications to find an available charging point, particularly if a driver is familiar with the area, or lives locally and wants to charge their vehicle at the appeal site, which could be realistic possibilities. Moreover, if a car is low on charge, or if other nearby charging points are also busy, drivers could choose to wait for an available charging space at the appeal site, particularly if one or more of the 2 no. charging bays is said to be available in a short period of time. It is therefore considered highly likely that drivers would need to wait in the adjacent highway for an available charging bay, as there would be no designated waiting area for vehicles.
14. Moreover, even if the road has few current traffic movements along it, and whether there are projected to be 3, 6, or 9 two way movements an hour, if there were cars parked on the opposite side of this section of road, it would not be a safe place for vehicles to wait for a charging space, and vehicles that want to enter or exit this section of Capel Road could be prevented from safely doing so, and cause significant congestion.
15. It is noted that the appellant has provided swept path analysis plans to show how a car can enter and leave each charging bay, although these appear to rely on their being no cars parked on the opposite side of the road. It could also mean that vehicles trying to access or egress from the on-street parking spaces are prevented from doing so by vehicles waiting or queuing in the road for charging bays. This could cause conflict between highway users, and vehicles reversing along this section of road to the junction with the longer section of Capel Road to allow vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of the charging bays and parking spaces. It could also displace parking to other parts of the nearby road network and either create or add to on-street parking pressure and congestion elsewhere. As such, it is likely that the proposed development would create conditions prejudicial to

highway safety, including congestion and adversely affect the free movement of traffic along the highway.

16. It is noted that the appellant says that the proposal would not be harmful to pedestrian safety. However, this is not certain, as I saw on my site inspection that pedestrians use this section of Capel Road as there is no designated pavement for them, which together with my findings above would likely add to the harmful highway safety impacts of the proposed development.
17. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to highway safety. In doing so, I find the proposal to conflict with LP Policy T4 and DMD Policies DMD46 and DMD47, insofar as they seek to ensure that new vehicle crossovers and dropped kerbs for off-street parking do not have an adverse effect on road danger or the free flow and safety of traffic, including pedestrians and cyclists on the adjoining highway, and do not increase road danger. In addition, the dismissal of the appeal would also be consistent with paragraph 115 of the Framework that says development should be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
18. The Council referred to the proposed development conflicting with LP Policies T5, T6 and T7, and CS Policies CP24, CP25, and CP30. Policy T5 is focused on cycling, Policy T6 is mainly concerned with parking for new development, and Policy T7 relates to the requirements for deliveries, services and construction, including freight and rail hubs. Policy CP24 is a strategic policy relating to possible improvements and aspirations for the road network, Policy CP25 seeks to address strategic improvements for cyclists and pedestrians and Policy CP30 addresses maintaining and improving the quality of the built environment. I did not find these policies to be directly applicable to this main issue.
19. The Council also referred to its RTSFC in its reason for refusal, the requirements of which are detailed above, I also did not find it to be directly applicable to this main issue.

Other Matters

20. It is noted that in support of the appeal the appellant has said, that the site has been chosen because of the likely need for the provision of fast charging options in the area; that the proposed development can help facilitate a transition to low carbon transport; that it contributes to the provision of charging equipment infrastructure for electric vehicle users; that the appeal site can be sustainably drained; that it can be effectively and efficiently managed remotely; and that it supports sustainable development. It is also recognised that it would encourage electric vehicle use; assist with the roll out of electric charging points consistent with policies within a consultation draft of an emerging local plan, and parts of the Framework; contribute towards improvements in air quality; promote carbon reduction and help tackle climate change and support local, national and international objectives in this regard. Whilst most of these factors weigh in favour of the proposed development, they do not outweigh the identified harms above in this case.
21. I have also had regard to objections from residents in addition to the main issues above, including but not limited to, the effect of the proposed development on living conditions; flood risk; possible crime and anti-social behaviour; and whether there would be unacceptable effects on community services. I note that the

Council's reasons for refusal did not relate to these matters and whilst I can understand the concerns, subject to planning conditions as appropriate, there is no compelling evidence before me that would lead me to come to a different conclusion to the Council on these matters.

Conclusion

22. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations, including the Framework and those raised by the appellant, that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR