
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **P Burley BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/W/25/3369654

21-35 St Denys Road, Southampton SO17 1GJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Miss Lauren Dinnick (Cruise Azure Parking Ltd) against the decision of Southampton City Council.
- The application Ref 24/00625/FUL was approved on 20 May 2025 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
- The development permitted is change of use from car sales and workshop to cruise car parking.
- The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that:

The operational use of the site shall comply with the parking and operation restrictions set out in the approved Highway Technical Note (Parking) and Operational Management Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, this shall include the following:

- That the use shall operate as parking for cruise passengers.
 - The site shall be used as a park and ride facility with vehicles being left by customers at the site and vehicles not being collected from the cruise terminal.
 - There shall be on site management presence at all times when the site is in use.
 - The entrance to the site shall be kept clear at all times and vehicles dropped off and collected from within the site.
 - Space shall be made available within the site, adjacent to the site entrance, for onsite turning and the manoeuvring of vehicles within the site.
 - Shuttle buses shall aim to depart the site once fully occupied in order to consolidate multiple car journeys into one mini bus journey.
- The reason given for the condition is: To provide safe access to the development and to prevent congestion on and obstruction of the highway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the appeal form differs from that on the planning application form and on the Council's decision notice. Given that the appeal form indicates that the description of development has not changed, I have used the description from the planning application form which also sets out a more specific description of the proposed development.
3. When I visited the site I saw that it is already in use for car parking and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed operations on the highway network.

Reasons

5. The appellant is seeking to vary Condition 3 of 24/00625/FUL which restricts operations solely to a park-and-ride model and prohibits meet-and-greet services, noting that it would like to be able to make full meet-and-greet use of the site and that the condition is unnecessarily restrictive, disproportionate and inconsistent with the approach taken by the Council where other sites have been granted more flexible permissions.
6. Notwithstanding that I have not been provided with details of those other permissions or of the particular circumstances of those sites, each proposal must be assessed on its own merits, also having regard to any supporting evidence.
7. Whilst the Council has said that meet-and-greet services would result in a significant increase in trips and that cruise-related traffic can coincide with network peaks, the appellant has noted it would reduce passenger traffic to and from the port. It has also said that the Council's model is theoretical and does not reflect the controlled nature of this operation, and that there is no evidence of harm to highway safety, residential amenity, or the local network. It has said that the proposal would reduce passenger traffic to and from the port terminal, would help to alleviate port-side congestion through off-site management, and that a more balanced approach would be to allow meet-and-greet with operational controls such as management plans and monitoring.
8. However, the appellant has not provided any details of how a meet-and-greet service would operate or the effect of this on the highway network, including in terms of the number of trips, the number of trips associated with the current and previous uses on the site to enable a comparison to be made, or any other evidence to demonstrate that the Council's assumptions and conclusions, which are based on its knowledge of the city's highway network, should not be relied upon.
9. Furthermore, it has not provided a copy of the approved Highway Technical Note (Parking) and Operational Management Plan, details of how staff are trained to reduce congestion, or a copy of any revised or new operational controls in relation to its meet-and-greet proposals. Therefore, I am unable to determine whether a management scheme could allay concerns relating to any increase in traffic movements. Similarly, whilst the appellant has stated that the site already operates in accordance with industry and local authority standards, it has not provided any details of these or explained whether they relate to traffic.
10. Therefore, on the basis of the information that has been provided, I am unable to conclude that the proposed variation of Condition 3 would accord with Policy CS18 of the Southampton City Council Core Strategy (amended March 2015) which seeks patterns and forms of development that reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has said that meet-and-greet is essential to the cruise industry and its customers in Southampton, that the appeal scheme would meet rising local

demand, would support economic activity linked to the local cruise industry, that restricting meet-and-greet reduces passenger choice and risks pushing demand to unauthorised operators, that there is no evidence of harm to highway safety or residential amenity, and that Condition 3 has adversely impacted business activities at the site. However, no evidence has been provided to support any of these arguments.

12. The appellant has noted that meet-and-greet is particularly important for elderly passengers, those with mobility issues, and families with luggage. It has also said that the current restriction has prevented full use of the site and that the appeal scheme would be a sustainable and efficient use of previously-developed land. Whilst these are matters to which I attach some weight, they do not outweigh the conflict with development plan policy that I have identified above.

Conclusion

13. The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Burley

INSPECTOR