



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/22/3303651

229 Bournemouth Park Road, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 5JR

- 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 A Loveless against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00608/FULH, dated 7 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a vehicular crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a vehicular crossover at 229 Bournemouth Park Road, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 5JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00608/FULH, dated 7 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos 2022/02/229BPR/01, 2022/02/229BPR/02 and 2022/02/229BPR/03.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a front garden that has a hard surface and which is open to the back edge of the pavement. Between the pavement and the roadside is a deep grass verge. There are on-street parking spaces immediately in front of the appeal premises to this side of Bournemouth Park Road and double yellow lines opposite. I saw many examples of frontage parking to both sides of the road, including where continuous kerbside parking bays were interrupted by dropped kerbs, and the grass verges were punctuated with hard surfaces. The proposal would include a dropped kerb to the roadside and a hard surface across the grass verge to provide a vehicular access to the front of the property. The works would result in the loss of a section of kerbside parking.
4. The Council is concerned that the loss of on-street parking space would increase demand for on-street parking which in turn would lead to additional

parking stress. However, whilst there may possibly be a slight increase in competition for fewer on-street parking spaces, there is no information to demonstrate either the levels of parking demand in the area, or the highway's parking capacity. The parking stress alleged by the Council's Highways and Transportation team is unquantified. In addition, they comment that the reason for the parking stress that they allege is due to the lack of forecourt parking between Stuart Road and Tennyson Road. This is significant as this is precisely the stretch of Bournemouth Park Road where the appeal site is located. The proposal would add forecourt parking in a location that is identified by the Council as lacking in such provision.

5. The appeal proposal would simply repeat a pattern of forecourt parking along Bournemouth Park Road that is commonplace. Even if the creation of a vehicular crossover at this point were to increase the demand for on-street parking, which is moot, there is no evidence to demonstrate how this might impact the free flow of traffic on the highway network. I can detect no potential for harm to highway safety as a result of the appeal proposal.
6. I have not been directed to any identified conflict with the Council's *Vehicle Crossover Policy 2021*, or with its published guidance. Neither have I been directed to any specific conflict with advice contained within the Council's *Design and Townscape Guide 2009* other than where it seeks to avoid the loss of planted verges, although the Council accepts in this instance that this would not be of significant detriment to the character of the area; a view I concur with.
7. In the absence of any harm to highway safety, I can find no conflict with any of the requirements of Policies KP2 or CP3 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) or with Policy DM15 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015). Neither do I find any conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for promoting sustainable transport by ensuring safe and suitable access to the site.

Other Matters

8. I have noted concern expressed by the neighbour. I am not persuaded that use of the site's frontage for car parking as opposed to any other use of the garden space would lead to an increased loss of privacy at No 231. There is no evidence to suggest that the movements of a car using a single residential space would generate exhaust fumes that would be harmful. The proposal would simply reflect a significant number of other similar arrangements along this stretch of Bournemouth Park Road. I note also that the Council raised no concern in this regard.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. The Council's suggested condition that would require the materials used in the external surfaces of the development to match those used in the existing building makes no sense given the nature of the proposal and would therefore be unreasonable.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR