



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by **E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/24/3350330

21 Bowers Drive, Burseldon, Hampshire SO31 8LZ

- 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 and Mrs Arakelian against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is F/24/97606.
 - The development proposed is convert garage into kitchen/dining including downstairs toilet.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of the application the Government has published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2024. Although I have made my determination against the updated national policy context, the relevant changes are not fundamental to matters which are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, and free flow of traffic with particular regard to parking provision.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-bedroom flat, situated above two garages, one of which is associated with the appeal site. In front of the garage is an additional parking space. The site is part of a modern development which is the subject of a condition which restricts the conversion of garages. It is proposed to convert the garage into living accommodation associated with the existing flat comprising a kitchen/dining room, WC, lobby and staircase.
5. The Council's parking standards are set out in the Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2009) (SPD). This states that for a 2/3 bedroom dwelling with 'on-plot' allocation, 2 parking spaces would be required. Presently the appeal property is served by the existing garage, which the evidence indicates exceeds 6m x 3m, and one parking space in front of the garage. As such the current provision fulfils the parking standards set out in the SPD.
6. The appellant has submitted photographic evidence that it is possible to park two cars on the space to the front of the garage. However, in order to achieve this, the cars would need to park very close together within close proximity to the site

boundaries such that it would not be possible to open the doors without encroaching over adjoining land. I am therefore not convinced that the driveway is capable of providing two adequate parking spaces.

7. The loss of the availability of the garage for parking would result in a level of parking availability which would not accord with the parking standards outlined in the SPD. There is no evidence before me which indicates that the level of parking sought by these standards is excessive in this location. Whilst I understand there are bus stops near to the site, I have not been provided with any information as to the quality or frequency of the service they provide. Consequently, the proposal has the potential to displace an off-street parked vehicle.
8. Bowers Drive is a residential street comprising a variety of house types. Private parking is primarily provided in designated parking spaces adjacent to the highway, although there is also some courtyard parking, driveways and garages for some house-types. There is some lay-by provision near to the site, however this is limited. The road is block paved, relatively narrow and has a tarmacked strip along its edge with low kerb stones.
9. In the absence of a well-defined, full-width pavement, I observed pedestrians walking in the carriageway to access the opening leading to Hamble Lane. The road appears to have been purposefully designed to accommodate pedestrians and for cars to be parked in garages and off-street spaces rather than along the roadside.
10. At the time of my site visit, which was admittedly a snap-shot in time during the middle of the day, there were some cars parked on the street. The photographs provided by the appellant also show cars parked on the street. Due to the relatively narrow dimensions of the road, parked cars straddle the highway and the narrow tarmac strip alongside the road. It is reasonable to assume that in the evening when most residents are at home, cars parked in this manner would be even more commonplace.
11. Even though Bowers Drive is not a through road, this has the effect of narrowing the carriageway, forcing pedestrians towards the centre of the road. It also makes entering and exiting individual plots and parking spaces opposite parked cars more challenging. Furthermore, it interrupts the flow of traffic, particularly with larger vehicles such as refuse and delivery vehicles.
12. Any vehicle displaced at the appeal site would be likely to park on-street. The laybys which are available nearby are limited in size and relying on them to provide a permanent replacement for the existing parking space would take these out of use by visitors. I saw no other realistic alternatives within reasonable proximity to the appeal site. Consequently, the proposal would contribute further to an already congested and poorly parked environment and would thereby exacerbate the impedance to the flow of pedestrians and vehicles. As such, it would result in an additional hazard for all road users, to the detriment of highway safety.
13. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety, and free flow of traffic with particular regard to parking provision. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) (Adopted April 2022) which seeks to ensure that appropriate levels of parking are provided.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR