



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3359580

116 Stanley Green Road, Poole, BH15 3AQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Roy Wyatt against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/01254/F
 - The development proposed is dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice as this is more concise and clearer in relation to the development for which permission is sought.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Stanley Green Road (SGR) and comprises a detached property with a large open frontage covered in hardstanding and used as parking for at least two vehicles. Access from the parking area to SGR is provided by a 6 metre wide dropped kerb located on the southern side of the appeal sites frontage. The appeal proposal involves extending this dropped kerb towards the northern end of the frontage by a further 6 metres, resulting in the dropped kerb extending across the whole width of the frontage.
5. The Council have referred to policies PP27, PP34 and PP35 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018) (PLP). Combined, these require development to ensure that road space and corridors are managed so as to improve safety, provide safe access to a highway, improve and maintain safety for pedestrians and cyclists through prioritising their needs, and requiring proposals to accord with adopted highway guidance. In terms of the latter, the Council have referred to its Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (January 2021) (SPD). Paragraphs 3.2.15 – 16 of this state that the excessive use of extended dropped kerbs, across site frontages, eliminates on street parking and creates greater potential for

- conflicts. It continues by stating that the Council's preference is for the provision of one single 4.6 metre crossover with two tapered kerbs.
6. The Council's Delegated Report (CDR) confirms that the Highway Authority (HA) objected to the appeal proposal due to the lack of compliance with the guidance within the SPD. This included the fact that SGR was a Classified Road and on a bus route, where on site turning was required to ensure that vehicles could exit their parking areas onto the highway in forward gear, even though vehicles already appeared to be reversing onto or off the highway. As it is the local highway authority, I attach significant weight to that objection.
 7. Within the above context, I consider that the extension of the dropped kerb would not create a suitable pedestrian environment on the footway (pavement) and would increase the potential for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. The SPD sets out clearly the preference for a single 4.6 metre wide crossover and the current crossover on the appeal site, of some 6 metres, already exceeds that standard. As I observed on site, the current layout allows vehicles to access the front parking area whilst limiting the potential for conflicts, and also for vehicles to exit the site away from neighbouring accesses.
 8. The Appellant contends that similar dropped kerbs have been approved by the Council's Inspector nearby, but the details given do not appear to relate to a planning approval and no further information has been provided. Reference has also been made to three other full width crossovers within the road. Whilst I observed these on my site visit, I have not been provided with any planning background and it's unclear as to whether they benefit from planning permission or are unauthorised. Even so, their existence does not, in my view, provide any justification for a proposal that would compromise highway and pedestrian safety.
 9. The Appellant also refers to the danger of vehicles parked on-street in front of their property within the area of pavement that does not benefit from a dropped kerb. As I observed on my site visit, this form of on-street parking exists all along the road and there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that it in any way impacts on highway or pedestrian safety. As the SPD states, one of the problems with extended dropped kerbs is that they eliminate the possibility for on-street parking, for which, in this case, there clearly remains a demand.
 10. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be contrary to policies PP27, PP34 and PP35 of the PLP and the guidance within the SPD, in that the appeal proposal would impact on the free flow of traffic and increase highway and pedestrian safety risks. All of these policies and guidance remain consistent with paragraph 115 b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) which states that in assessing specific applications for development, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR