



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2023

**by N Perrins BSc (hons), MSc, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11 August 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/W/23/3317820**

**113 Woodmill Lane, Southampton, SO18 2PE**

- 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 Mark Finn against the decision of Southampton City Council.
  - The application Ref: 22/01436/FUL, dated 17 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is to install a dropped kerb to serve new block paving driveway.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice has a different description of the appeal proposal than that used on the planning application form. I have not seen any correspondence to confirm there was agreement to change the description of development so have used the wording from the planning application form in this appeal decision.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety by virtue of removing parking for visitors or other residents.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached property with an existing front driveway with dropped kerb access from Woodmill Lane, which is a classified road. The appeal site is set within an area with suburban character comprising a mix of similar two-storey detached dwellings and blocks of flats. Some of the properties along Woodmill Lane have converted their front garden areas to parking with access provided by dropped kerbs. On-street parking is available for residents and visitors along Woodmill Lane between crossover access to properties.
5. The appeal proposal seeks to widen the vehicular access to the property by extending the existing 2.7m dropped kerb by 4.5m, which would create a 7.2m long dropped kerb. There is an existing hard standing forecourt at the property that is large enough to accommodate at least 2 vehicles off-street.
6. Policy CS13 of the Southampton City Council Core Strategy (amended 2015) states that development should promote safe, secure, functional and accessible

Streets. Saved Policy SDP1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (amended 2015) requires development to not unacceptably affect the health, safety and amenity of the city and its citizens. Saved Policy TI2 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review states that vehicular access to new development from classified roads will not be permitted where road safety would be adversely affected. In addition, the Council's Highway Authority guidance states that dropped kerbs that are both longer than 4.6m and cover the full width of the property will not be approved in order to maintain available kerbside space for other residents and visitors to utilise.

7. The appeal proposal clearly conflicts with the Council's guidance on dropped kerbs both in terms of its length at 7.2m and extending across the full width of the property. The appeal proposal would result in the loss of an on-street parking space outside the property that would then not be available to other residents and visitors, which also conflicts with the Council's guidance.
8. At the time of my visit during a weekday afternoon, the road was generally busy and there were a number of users parking on the on-street parking although there were spaces still available.
9. I note that the appellant has provided information seeking to demonstrate that on-street parking provision would remain available for other residents and visitors. The evidence provided on the availability of parking during the day nearby is, however, a snapshot from only 3 days and in my view may not be representative of the situation if looked at over a longer period of time.
10. The appellant has also provided a list of properties that have dropped kerbs wider than the Council's current guidelines. However, the specific details of why these properties have dropped kerbs wider than the guidance is not before me and I can therefore only give them limited weight in my decision. I note the Council's dropped kerb guidance states that the Highway Authority's policy in relation to minimum widths has changed over the years and recognises that some properties along a street will have access that do not comply with the existing criteria. The guidance clearly states that notwithstanding the position of other properties, new proposals need to comply with the current standards, which the appeal proposal does not.
11. The Council's guidance seeks to retain on-street parking for all potential residents of an area so whilst the proposal would ensure sufficient visitor spaces are provided to serve the appeal property, it remains in conflict with the overall objectives of the guidance in terms of seeking to cater for a wider number of people. Moreover, the incremental loss of spaces in the longer term in the city would in my view result in increased parking displacement overtime that would negatively impact on traffic flows and highway safety along the road, particularly in a context where car ownership and dependency is increasing as referenced in the Council's Officers Report.
12. In conclusion, the Council is seeking to control parking and safeguard existing provision for all residents and visitors in view of increased car usage and level of car dependency in the city. The appeal proposal is contrary to this and therefore would result in harm to highway safety through the reduction of parking available to all residents and visitors contrary to Policy CS13 of the Southampton City Council Core Strategy, Saved Policies SDP1 and TI2 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review and the guidance contained in the Council's Residential Design Guide and dropped kerb guidance.

### **Conclusion**

13. I conclude that the works will result in the loss of on-street parking for visitors and residents of the area that will result in displacement and harm to highway safety in the area. There are no material considerations that outweigh the harm I have identified and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

*N Perrins*

INSPECTOR