



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3303886

72 Beaufort Road, Bournemouth BH6 5AW

- 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 Matthew Hodson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole (BCP) Council.
 - The application Ref: 7-2021-25509-A dated 15 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is to drop the kerb at the front of the house and create off road parking at the front of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to drop the kerb at the front of the house and create off road parking at the front of the house at 72 Beaufort Road, Bournemouth BH6 5AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 7-2021-25509-A dated 15 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Notwithstanding the details shown on plan 09/09/21 Rev. A, the off street parking space shall not be brought into use until further details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the hard and soft landscaping details, including the extent of the front boundary wall to be retained. These details shall be implemented as approved before the off-street parking space is first brought into use.

Preliminary Matters

2. An amended scheme proposal was submitted during the application process (09/09/2021 Rev. A) and my decision is based on the scheme as amended and determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety and on the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a residential dwelling within a predominantly residential area on the north west side of Beaufort Road, a classified road. Many of the surrounding properties have introduced forecourt parking and because of the depth of the forecourts this, in many cases, requires cars to park parallel to the property or at an angle, rather than perpendicular with the highway. There is a bus stop opposite the appeal property and there are double yellow lines around the corner of Beaufort Road and Kimberley Road as far as the private access which separates No 70 from the appeal property. Beyond this there is on-street parking and many of the parked cars park partly on the footway.
5. There is a dropped kerb outside No 70 and extending outside the private road adjoining the appeal property. There is also a dropped kerb outside part of the appeal property and part of the adjoining property at No 74. I understand from the information provided by the Appellant that the property used to benefit from off-street parking by using the shared dropped kerb with No 74, but that the front garden was subsequently re-instated, including with a boundary wall. The dropped kerb remains in place but the Appellant is seeking to widen this to facilitate easier access to an off-street parking space.
6. I recognise that the proposed off street parking space would not fully accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Parking Standards (2021), particularly in terms of the dimensions and form of the parking space to be provided. There is no information before me regarding the planning history of the surrounding off street parking spaces. However, many of these spaces include dropped kerbs which suggests some form of approval has been granted. The existence of so many off street parking spaces together with dropped kerbs will have created a reasonable expectation that similar proposals will be acceptable.
7. Moreover, I have been provided with no evidence to indicate that the parking arrangements which are commonly found up along this part of Beaufort Road have led to issues relating to the free flow of traffic or harmful impact on highway and pedestrian safety.
8. The Council's refusal notice also states that the proposal has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory design-led approach to the provision and layout of the car parking. Policy CS41 entitled Quality Design, of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy: Core Strategy (2012) has been cited in the refusal notice. However, this matter has not been elaborated in the Officer's report. The proposal would necessarily remove much of the frontage planting, including the boundary wall but there is a very mixed appearance to the frontages along the road, in part depending on whether the individual houses have introduced off-street parking across all or some of their front garden areas. The front gardens therefore range from being completely hard surfaced and open to enclosed and planted. It would appear that the Appellant was offering alternative options to optimise the car parking layout and it would be possible for a condition to be imposed to require a further plan to be submitted to control the details of the proposed works, including suitable hard and soft landscaping materials.
9. This could also address the extent if any of the boundary wall to be retained in order to maximise pedestrian visibility splays. From my site visit, there were a range of approaches to the frontage treatment, many of the properties having

open frontages in order to maximise visibility for vehicles accessing and exiting the space and for pedestrians walking along the pavement.

10. Subject to the submission and approval of revised details, I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway and pedestrian safety, and would be appropriate in terms of the street scene. There would be no conflict with Policies CS16 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy: Core Strategy (2012) (Core Strategy) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). As I have already set out the proposal would not fully accord with the provisions of the Council's SPD but in the particular circumstances of this case and for the reasons set out above, I consider that an exception should be made.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. In terms of conditions, and for the reasons set out above I consider that a further plan should be provided and once approved, implemented, before the parking space is first used to provide further details of the hard and soft landscaping including the extent of the boundary wall to be retained, to protect the street scene as well as optimise visibility splays for highway and pedestrian safety.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR