



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3362153

244 Silver Street, Enfield, Edmonton, N18 1PJ

- 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 Matthew Worswick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/04013/HOU.
 - The development proposed is for a vehicular crossover and part demolition of a boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a vehicular crossover and part demolition of a boundary wall at 244 Silver Street, Enfield, Edmonton, N18 1PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/04013/HOU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: unnamed, unnumbered location plan and unnamed, unnumbered proposed front garden plan.

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 Matter

3. The description of the proposed development in the banner heading and Decision above is taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form and has been shortened from what was submitted on the application form to omit unnecessary information for the purposes of accurately describing the proposed scheme.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a mid-terrace dwelling with front garden located on Silver Street in Enfield which is a predominantly residential road. The front garden is laid to hardstanding with a low boundary wall and gate around the perimeter.

6. A number of dwellings on Silver Street, including properties near to the appeal site, benefit from off-street parking and vehicular crossovers. For other dwellings, including the appeal site, public on-street parking is available on Silver Street and surrounding roads. There are a number of public parking bays on the highway outside the appeal site which are positioned in a layby just off the main carriageway.
7. The layby provides additional highway width outside the appeal site. There is also a pedestrian footway between the appeal site and highway which is wider than average. There are bus shelters on either side of Silver Street near to the appeal site and a road junction with Lopen Street at least 10 metres away from the site.
8. Silver Street is a single carriageway highway with good forward visibility in both directions and a 30mph speed limit. There are no traffic signal junctions, roundabouts or pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the appeal site and so I consider the highway layout to be uncomplicated. Silver Street and the surrounding roads are part of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which restricts on-street parking to permit holders but which only applies between noon until 9pm on Tottenham Hotspur Stadium Event Days.
9. The proposed development is for the part demolition of the existing boundary wall and gate and for the installation of a vehicular crossover over the public footway to create a parking space for a single vehicle on the front garden of the appeal site. The size of the proposed parking space as shown on the drawings submitted is not sufficient for a driver to carry out a turning manoeuvre within the appeal site. As such, a vehicle could only reverse into or out of the space.
10. Policy DMD46 of the London Borough of Enfield's Development Management Document (adopted 2014) (DMD) states that planning permission for new access onto "A" roads and other busy classified roads will not normally be permitted. Footnote 6 associated with DMD 46 defines a busy classified road as a road carrying more than 10,000 vehicles per day (two-way). Although the Council refers to Silver Street as busy, with a high volume of traffic I have not been provided with evidence to show that Silver Street falls within this DMD definition. In any event, even if Silver Street is 'busy' for the purposes of Policy DMD46, the policy does not automatically prohibit crossovers on such highways.
11. Policy DMD46 goes on to set out the circumstances in which vehicle crossovers and dropped kerbs will be permitted for off-street parking. The Council only disputes whether criteria c, d, e, f and g are met, and from the evidence before me I agree that the other criteria are either not applicable or are complied with. Therefore, I will concentrate my assessment on the criteria in dispute.
 - c) *There is no increase in on-street parking pressures in areas already experiencing high on-street parking demand as a result of introducing a vehicle crossover.*
12. A large number of dwellings on Silver Street do not have off-street parking or driveways which indicates that there may be high on-street parking demand in the area. The appellant already has a vehicle which, when not in use, is parked in one of the on-street parking spaces in the area. Consequently, whilst the proposed development would result in the loss of one on-street parking space, that would be directly replaced by an off-street space. Accordingly, there would be no increase in on-street parking pressure as the appellant would no longer be parking in one of

those spaces. This would also apply on Tottenham Hotspur Stadium Event Days when the CPZ is in operation.

d) There is no adverse impact on road safety.

13. The Council's Revised Technical Standards for Footway Crossovers (2013) (Revised Technical Standards) states that as domestic crossovers are not generally intensively used, it may be acceptable for vehicles to reverse either onto or off the highway. Acceptability will depend on the level of visibility along both the carriageway and the footway, the volume of traffic, the width of the road and impact on pedestrians.
14. In this case, the simple highway configuration and wide carriageway and footway provides good forward visibility for pedestrians and drivers, which is only slightly obstructed by the existing bus shelter and cars parked on-street. The relatively low traffic speeds on Silver Street would give ample time and space for highway users to notice a vehicle entering or exiting the crossover. Therefore, for pedestrians and drivers, the layout would allow them to see a vehicle exiting the site and react accordingly.
15. Further, given the existing crossovers, on-street parking spaces and existing bus stops, highway users would already anticipate vehicles and buses slowing, stopping and manoeuvring on the highway and are likely to be driving with due care and attention on this stretch of road in any event. Consequently, while the proposal would introduce additional conflicting vehicle movements, in this context the provision of one additional crossover is unlikely to make the road more hazardous for highway users in any material way.
16. The Revised Technical Standards state that as a general guide, a crossover should not be provided within 10 metres of a junction. The appeal site sits more than 10 metres away from the junction with Lopen Road and so it has not been shown that there would be a hazard as a result of this proximity.
17. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would cause any material reduction in highway safety for highway users including drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.

e) There is no adverse impact on the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highway and in particular on the effective movement of bus services.

18. The supporting text to Policy DMD46 states that applications for crossovers are likely to be approved if there is sufficient road width for other traffic to manoeuvre safely past so as not to prejudice the flow of traffic. In this case, the extra width provided by the layby would allow a vehicle reversing onto or out of the site to do so within a single lane of the highway, without disrupting the flow of traffic in the other lane. If double parking occurs then, as the Council identifies, this can be enforced against, therefore this does not weigh against the proposal.
19. A vehicle slowing or stopping to park in one of the existing on-street parking bays would cause a similar temporary obstruction to traffic, especially if carrying out a parallel parking manoeuvre. Further, domestic crossovers are not intensively used, so the number of conflicting movements may well be less than from the public on-street parking which could be used by multiple people throughout the day. In

any event, such movements would occur for only a short period of time which would limit their overall impact on the flow of traffic.

20. Consequently, the provision of a single additional crossover is unlikely to materially affect the free flow of traffic on the highway, including for buses, compared with the existing situation.

f) Vehicles can enter / and exit the crossover in forward gear.

21. Given the restricted size of the proposed parking space, a vehicle could not enter and exit in forward gear. Nevertheless, the supporting text to Policy DMD46 states that all applications will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and that if it can be demonstrated that a vehicle can safely exit a driveway in reverse gear without detrimentally affecting the flow of traffic, particularly buses, then permission may still be granted. For the reasons set out above, I consider that this could be achieved, therefore the conflict with this criterion would not, in itself, justify refusing permission.

f) It has been shown that there are no alternative opportunities for safe access to the property (for example to the rear or side).

22. The Council has stated that there appears to be an opportunity to allow off-street parking to the rear of the property via an access road adjoining 240 Silver Street. However, having visited the site it does not appear that this access road is publicly accessible. Further, it is unclear who has rights over it or whether such access rights could be acquired. Additionally, given the mobility issues of two of the current residents, it may not be practical to park at the back of the property given this would be further away from the house than an off-street parking space in the front garden. Therefore, based on the information I have before me, it does not appear that this access road would provide a reasonable alternative to the proposed development.

g) The size of the off-street parking is large enough to ensure that vehicles do not overhang the footway.

23. The Revised Technical Standards set out a minimum size for a standard parking bay. The drawings submitted show a parking area larger than the minimum requirement. Further, from reviewing the size of the front garden on the site visit, it is clear that the proposed off-street parking area would be comfortably large enough to accommodate a vehicle without that vehicle overhanging the footway.
24. Therefore, the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact on highway safety. Consequently, it would not be contrary to Policy DMD46 of the DMD when read as a whole, or Core Policies 24 and 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (adopted 2010) which, among other things, aim to ensure developments are of high-quality design and do not have a harmful effect on highway safety or obstruct the passage of vehicular traffic.
25. The proposed development would also comply with the Revised Technical Standards and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which, among other things, seek to mitigate any significant impacts of development on the highway network and to ensure that developments impacting highways do not increase hazards for highway users and pedestrians.

Conditions

26. I recommend the standard time period for commencement of the development condition in the interests of expediency. I also recommend a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans as this provides certainty.
27. I note that the Council has also suggested a condition that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building. However, I recommend that this condition is not included as it is not applicable or necessary for this type of development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

28. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

29. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR