



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04 December 2025

by R Lawrence BSc (Hons), PGDip (TP), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/W/25/3368716

Side Street Parking, Brook Way, Chigwell IG7 6AA

- 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 Ltd against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/0021/25.
 - The development proposed is the siting of 1.no rapid electric vehicle charger together with ancillary electrical equipment to create 2.no rapid vehicle charging bays at an existing informal section of on-street parking as part of a community charging installation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for: Siting of 1.no rapid electric vehicle charger together with ancillary electrical equipment to create 2.no rapid vehicle charging bays at an existing informal section of on-street parking as part of a community charging installation at Side Street Parking, Chigwell IG7 6AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref EPF/0021/25, 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 drawing nos ZST-0000-03 (proposed layout); ZST-0000-07-05 (hardware details); ZST-0000-09 (site proposed elevation); ZST-0000-12 (finishes plan); ZST-0100-02 (swept path analysis) and ZST0500-03 (ductwork layout).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a narrow, two-way residential road near the junction with Chigwell Rise and adjacent to existing garages on Brook Way. Footpaths run along both sides of the carriageway, and the surroundings are predominantly residential. Brook Way provides access to several driveways, garages, and forecourts. There are no on-street parking restrictions. At the time of my visit, this section of road was busy with informal on-street parking, reducing the available carriageway to single width. I acknowledge this was only a snapshot during a weekday afternoon, and parking levels may vary at other times. However, the evidence before me also refers to regular use for on-street parking. There is no detailed information, such as a parking survey or other substantive evidence, to provide a fuller picture of parking conditions.

4. The proposal seeks to introduce two rapid vehicle charging bays and one rapid charger, which would reduce the carriageway width at this point to single width. Whilst I note that the dimensions of the proposed spaces would comply with Essex Parking Guidance 2024, this would prevent two vehicles from passing simultaneously. As a result, vehicles may need to wait in the carriageway when two vehicles approach from opposite directions and the spaces are occupied. This could lead to reduced vehicle speeds along this section.
5. This effect would be broadly similar to the existing situation caused by informal on-street parking. While the charging equipment would be permanent, there is no evidence to suggest that vehicles using the rapid charging facilities would remain for longer periods than those currently parking. The site is set away from the junctions with Chigwell Rise and Brook Mews, leaving sufficient space for vehicles to wait without obstructing those junctions, particularly Chigwell Rise. There is no evidence before me of a history of accidents linked to on-street parking or any existing highway safety concerns along this stretch. Nor is there substantive evidence that reducing the carriageway width would create a highway safety issue.
6. Given the residential nature of the road, the number of adjoining accesses, and the existing pattern of on-street parking, vehicle speeds are generally low. Drivers already anticipate the need to slow when entering or exiting side roads and parking areas. In this context, I am not persuaded that the proposed reduction in carriageway width would result in material harm.
7. In light of the above, I find that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effect on highway safety, such to accord with Policy T1 of the Local Plan 2011-2033¹ which requires that development does not compromise highway safety, a requirement which is also reflected in paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
8. The Council's decision notice refers to the Highway Authorities Development Management Policies. However, neither the Council nor Essex County Council Highway Authority has identified any specific policies or explained how the proposal conflicts with them. I have not been provided with copies of these policies or any information regarding their status. In the absence of such details, I have been unable to take them into account.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event of my allowing the appeal, I have considered these in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. I have edited some of the suggested conditions for clarity and enforceability.
10. A time limit and plan number conditions are necessary in the interest of certainty. Although the Council has recommended a materials condition, the proposed materials are clearly identified on the submitted plans and no objections have been raised. Accordingly, a separate condition is not required.

¹ Policy T1, accessed online at <https://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk>.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would accord with the development plan as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

R. Lawrence

INSPECTOR