
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2017

by Veronica Bond LLB (Hons), Solicitor (non-practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/16/3159925

73 Southbourne Road, Bournemouth BH6 5AQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Rice against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-3463-E, dated 13 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use from House in Multiple Occupation (C4) to serviced accommodation (C1).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed off street parking provision on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a relatively large building sitting on the corner of New Park Road and Southbourne Road. The plot is of limited size relative to the building and accordingly, the area available for car parking on site is limited.
4. The appeal site is in close proximity to a row of shops on Southbourne Grove. Parking opportunities in the vicinity of the appeal site are significantly limited by the presence of vehicle crossovers, double yellow lines and other road markings and restrictions preventing or limiting the duration of parking. At my site visit, I observed that there were very few parking spaces available near to the appeal site. Although only a snapshot, this reflects the results of the Council's parking survey and is indicative of the pressure created by the proximity of the local shops and numerous parking restrictions in the immediate area.
5. The Council's Parking Supplementary Planning Document (adopted July 2014) (SPD) sets out zonal benchmark parking standards for differing types of development. This follows Policy CS16 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted October 2012) (CS) which aims to ensure that adequate off street parking is provided in new development. The SPD requires one space per unit of serviced accommodation and it is indicated that there is a shortfall of three parking spaces against this standard – meaning that only half of the required parking spaces would be provided.

6. In view of the significant parking pressure in the vicinity of the appeal site, this shortfall in off street parking provision against the indicated standard would have adverse impacts on highway safety in the vicinity of the appeal site. This is due to the potential for illegal and inconsiderate parking outside the appeal site, particularly where close to the junction, which could impede visibility. Potential footway parking would also pose a risk of vehicle/pedestrian conflict in view of the fairly high pedestrian flows nearby.
7. Very little justification is offered for this significant under provision – the appellant’s parking survey results are accorded only limited weight as they give very little information as to the location or suitability of the available spaces, nor as to the precise timing of the survey. The appeal site is close to shops and the beach, which might potentially limit the overall number of car trips by visitors. There is no firm evidence to suggest though that visitors are likely to come by rail rather than by car such as to decrease the likely parking demand.
8. Accordingly, I find in respect of the main issue that the proposed off street parking provision would have a harmful effect on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the locality. It would fail to comply with the underlying aims of Policies CS16 and CS41 of the CS which seek to ensure adequate off street car parking in the interests of highway safety, and good design and layout in the interests, amongst other things, of the safety of the public realm. As outlined above, it would fail to meet with the Council’s parking standards as set out in the SPD.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would provide new tourist accommodation in a fairly sustainable location and in accordance with the Council’s aims in Policy CS28 of the CS and the related Tourism Supplementary Planning Document (April 2016). Tourism is also clearly of real importance to Bournemouth’s economy and I acknowledge also the Government’s commitment to securing economic growth. These aspects offer moderate weight in favour of the proposal.
10. As to cycle storage, it would appear that there is adequate space on site to enable suitable storage. Accordingly, if appropriately conditioned, the proposal would make adequate provision for cycle storage. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy CS18 of the CS.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would offer some moderate benefits as outlined. These are though outweighed by the development plan conflict and harm that would result from the adverse highway safety effects. Given the harm outlined and the tri-partite definition of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, the proposal would not represent the sustainable development in respect of which the Framework creates a presumption in favour. For the above reasons, the appeal should fail.

Veronica Bond
INSPECTOR