



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3284324

32 Bournemouth Park Road, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS2 5LN

- 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 Ms Verity Hayden-Case against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01367/FULH was refused by notice dated 9 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is to lower the section of kerb directly in front of the house and driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on highway safety and the free flow of traffic in the local highway network.

Reasons

3. Policies DM3 and DM15 in the Southend on Sea Development Management Document (2015) seek to ensure highway safety and that development does not result in undue stress on local infrastructure. Policy CP3 in the Southend on Sea Core Strategy (2007) seeks to improve road safety.
4. Bournemouth Park Road is a classified road. At the time of my visit there was a constant stream of traffic. There are a number of premises with off street parking, although vehicles were parked on some frontages which did not have dropped kerb access.
5. The proposal is for a crossover to allow for parking on the frontage of the residential property. The width of the proposed crossover would not meet the vehicle crossover requirements as set out in guidance in the Vehicle Crossing Policy and Application Guidance (2021).
6. Highway safety has to be of utmost importance. In this particular instance, I see no reason to allow the width of the proposed crossover to be reduced from that specified in the guidance. To do so would be to the detriment of the safety of pedestrians and drivers as it would require a medium size car, or

larger car to make a number of manoeuvres whilst entering or leaving the parking area on the frontage. In addition, this would have an adverse impact on the free flow of traffic. At the time of my visit there were two small cars parked on the frontage. Nevertheless, if I were to allow the proposal it would not be possible to prevent larger cars from parking in that area.

7. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, including examples of other crossovers, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic in the local highway network. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in the Vehicle Crossing Policy and Application Guidance (2021) and contrary to Policies DM3 and DM15 in the Southend on Sea Development Management Document (2015) and Policy CP3 in the Southend on Sea Core Strategy (2007).
8. The above policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework where the Framework seeks to ensure highway safety.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR