



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2018

by Mrs J Wilson BA BTP MRTPI DMS

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/17/3185509

3, 5, 7 and 7a Woodside Road, Bournemouth BH5 2AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Bloomfield of Holton Homes against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The undated application Ref 7-2017-5167-Q, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2017.
 - The application sought planning permission for the erection of 6 dwelling houses and formation of parking spaces – Approval of reserved matters of application Ref 7-2016-5167-O without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 7-2017-5167-P, dated 2 June 2017.
 - The condition in dispute is No 14 which states that: All residential car parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be made available for any resident of the development and those persons visiting residents of the development and shall remain unallocated to any specific resident or residence for the lifetime of the development.
 - The reason given for the condition is: In the interests of highway safety and quality design in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main issue

2. The application seeks to remove condition 14 to enable the proposed parking provision to be allocated on the basis of one specific space for each dwelling and 2 unallocated visitor spaces. The main issue therefore is the effect that allocated parking would have in respect of parking provision on and in the vicinity of the site, with regard to local capacity and highway safety.

Reasons

3. Policy CS16 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (Core Strategy) requires parking provision for new development to be in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards. These standards are set out in the Bournemouth Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2014. The SPD adopts a zonal approach in its assessment of local parking standards which takes account of the advice in paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy

- Framework (Framework), including the accessibility of the development and local car ownership levels.
4. There is no dispute that the existing planning permission meets the requirements of the SPD for unallocated spaces. The SPD also specifies standards for allocated spaces. However this would require an additional space than has been provided and without it would lead to a shortfall in parking provision against these standards.
 5. The appellant points out a public car park close to the site which could accommodate visitors. It is also argued that if spaces were allocated occupants would be guaranteed to be able to park adjacent to their home, whereas if spaces were unallocated and full, residents would be displaced onto surrounding streets where, in the appellant's view, the Council's explanation of parking stress has not been evidenced. I have found that the Council has detailed the restrictions in the area and that detail is consistent with my observations at the time of my visit, albeit I accept that this can only represent a snapshot of circumstances. Allocating six of the eight spaces to specific units in the development would lead to drivers having to seek alternatives even at times where spaces in the development would be vacant, the SPD identified that such approaches are less efficient and would result in cars being displaced to surrounding streets.
 6. Notwithstanding the proximity of the public car park, the arguments made by the appellant are not supported by substantive evidence, as required by the SPD, and lower provision from the adopted standard would undermine the SPD, a document to which I attribute significant weight. The displacement of parking from the site onto surrounding streets where there are parking restrictions would place additional pressure on the spaces available to serve existing housing. I observed that some frontages in the vicinity have been laid out as off street parking and this limits the number of on street spaces available reinforcing the importance of adequate provision on any redevelopment site. This displacement would result in additional pressure for parking spaces in the locality which would increase the risk to highway safety. Whilst the Council say the appellant could pursue allocated parking through a reduction in the number of dwellings on the site this is not a matter for this appeal.
 7. For the above reasons the condition requiring non allocated parking is necessary to ensure that adequate provision is made for the number of dwellings proposed and for visitors to the development in the interests of highway safety. Without it the proposal would conflict with Policies CS16 and CS41 of the Core Strategy and the SPD. These policies and guidance together seek to ensure that adequate standards of parking provision for residents and visitors are made within all new development proposals.

Other matter

8. The appellant states that the condition attached to the earlier approval on the site was imposed without consultation with the appellant. However, the parking policy and parking standards are adopted and the proposal was made with provision at a level which met the SPD for non-allocated provision and below the standard which would allow allocated parking. The fact that the Council did not consult the appellant regarding the condition does not alter my findings in respect of the shortfall.

9. The appellant has drawn to my attention an appeal decision¹ where the Inspector concluded on a site elsewhere in the Borough that a small shortfall would not substantially worsen matters. That proposal was for a larger number of flats and the shortfall less than would be the case here so does not represent a comparable situation, in any event that appeal was dismissed for other reasons. Equally the Council have referred to three recent decisions² where the SPD requirements have been supported. In any event I have determined the appeal on its own merits in the light of current policy.
10. I have taken into consideration the appellants' view that unallocated parking would not deter occupants from owning two cars and both would be entitled to park on site. Moreover, it is further argued that if residents knew that they had only one allocated space this would be known at the time and may influence whether to purchase or rent one of the properties. This may be so, however, the standards laid down in the SPD are also known, as is the basis on which planning permission was granted and it would be on that basis that any purchaser would make a choice to buy or rent accommodation in the development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/G1250/W/15/3137618

² APP/G1250/W/16/3154908, APP G1250/W/16/3163087 and APP/G1250/W/17/3173516