



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3369380

197 Bury Street, Edmonton, Enfield N9 9JE

- 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 Mustafa Cetinkaya against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00570/HOU.
 - The proposed development is described as a dropped kerb and material amendments to exterior floor – hard landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house ('No 197'), which is set back slightly from the pavement, partly behind a boundary wall and a predominantly hard surfaced forecourt. The plot is located on a curved section of Bury Street, close to its junction with Warren Crescent.
4. As illustrated on the submitted drawings, there is a narrow gap between No 197's bay window and the front of the plot, such that a car parked here would need to be positioned broadly parallel, or at a slight angle, to the road to avoid overhanging the pavement. Given those tight dimensions, and in the absence of vehicle tracking diagrams, drivers would need to undertake awkward manoeuvres across the pavement in order to position a vehicle free of the highway and without encroaching onto adjacent plots.
5. Whilst the appellant claims that vehicles could 'technically' enter, turn, and exit in a forward gear, given the plot's dimensions that would appear to me to be highly improbable without undertaking multiple manoeuvres over the pavement or adjoining land. Consequently, the proposal would result in reversing manoeuvres to or from Bury Street.
6. I have not been provided with data from the automatic traffic counts undertaken by the appellant. However, on the basis that Bury Street does not carry more than 10,000 vehicles per day, it is not a 'busy classified road', as defined at footnote 6 of Policy DMD 46 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) ('EDMP').

7. Having regard to CrashMap data, he points out that there were just four 'slight' incidents within 200 metres of the site in the latest available 5 year period. He notes that 191, 193 and 195 Bury Street (amongst others) have vehicle accesses with no ability to turn a vehicle around; and continues that none of the recorded incidents resulted from the use of crossovers, although I have no detailed evidence underpinning that claim.
8. At the time of my visit, Bury Street was fairly busy, with a constant volume of traffic, including busses which I understand stop nearby. Whilst the carriageway is fairly wide, the space available for traffic movements is limited by parking on both sides of the road. Given the volume of traffic, the curvature of the road, and the proximity to a junction, I consider that awkward reversing manoeuvres to or from the site, often between parked cars, would be detrimental to the efficient and free flow of traffic, and would compromise highway safety.
9. The 3 metre wide access would result in the loss of one publicly available on-street parking space. I have no data regarding on-street parking pressures in the area. However, I observed that not all nearby properties have off-street parking and, whilst it represents just a snapshot in time, the majority of nearby on-street spaces were occupied at the time of my visit. Thus, I have no cogent reason to doubt the Council's claim that this is an area with high on-street parking demand.
10. The provision of an off-street space for the use of No 197 would be at the expense of an on-street space, which could be used by anyone, at any time. The scheme would therefore add to parking stresses in the area, to the inconvenience of other road users. At best, it would have a marginal impact on de-cluttering the highway, but none at all if the occupants of No 197 made use of the space in front of the crossover for additional parking as intimated at page 9 of the appeal statement.
11. In an appeal decision in 2017¹, an Inspector found that a vehicular access with a crossover at No 197 would have an adverse impact on highway safety. I have no persuasive reason to disagree with that conclusion, and I find that this scheme would also be detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users.
12. As Core Policy 24 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) is directed principally at the main road network, sustainable travel choices and infrastructure, it is of limited relevance on this issue. However, the scheme would conflict with its Core Policy 30; and with Policies T1, T2 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).
13. Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require development to mitigate impacts on London's transport networks, and create or maintain, safe and efficient environments. Whilst Bury Street may not be a 'busy classified road', as the scheme would add to on-street parking pressures and have an adverse impact on road safety, and as vehicles would not be able to enter and exit in a forward gear and there is a strong likelihood that they would overhang the footway, the scheme would also conflict with EDMP Policy DMD 46 parts c, d, e, f and h.
14. It would also conflict with paragraphs 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which set out the need to achieve safe and suitable access for all users, and to minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles; and with the advice in the Enfield Revised Technical Standards for

¹ APP/Q5300/D/17/3177562

Footway Crossovers (2013) which seeks to safeguard highway safety for all users and ensure that traffic flow is maintained.

15. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR