



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/23/3316781

Flat 5, 10 Adeline Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH5 1EE

- 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 GDMP Properties Ltd against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2022-6867-F, dated 22 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "two car parking spaces to Flat 5, 10 Adeline Road".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two car parking spaces to Flat 5, 10 Adeline Road at Flat 5, 10 Adeline Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH5 1EE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 7-2022-6867-F, dated 22 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed site and location plan 34, Proposed floor plan 032, Proposed street scene elevation 33, and Proposed bin store plans and elevations 040.
 - 3) The 600mm fence and visibility splay shown on the plans hereby approved shall be installed prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted and thereafter kept free of all obstructions exceeding 600mm above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway.
 - 4) Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, details for the provision of electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted and thereafter retained and maintained for their purpose.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area with specific regard to the Boscombe Spa Conservation Area (CA); and b) car parking and highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is situated on the corner of Adeline Road and Cecil Road. It is a large red brick detached house which has been subdivided into flats. The site has a double garage which is accessed from Adeline Road. There is a low brick wall with a soft hedge above which fronts both Adeline and Cecil Road. The CA derives its significance from the Victorian and Edwardian villas which have important architectural detailing. The site itself is set on a medium sized plot that follows the general proportions of other properties within the CA, both in scale and siting within the plot. Frontages vary in the CA. Some retain a small garden with either soft or hard boundary treatment and others, including those close to the appeal site, have been given over to hardstanding and car parking. No 10 is a prominent corner plot with a mature hedge and boundary wall which contribute positively to the visual qualities of the street scene and thus the CA.
5. To provide sufficient room for the proposal, some boundary hedging and wall would be lost near to the adjacent property on Cecil Road. This would however be balanced through the retention of the boundary treatment along Adeline Road, into the corner of Cecil Road. When approaching the site from the west, the soft boundary treatment would appear to be retained, and the proposed parking would be hidden behind the taller hedge. This would, overall, soften the effect of the new parking provision and provide some screening for it. The provision and arrangement would also, taking into account its own scale and setting within other similar arrangements, not appear unduly out of place in the street scene. Taking this and the fact that the scale of the Victorian and Edwardian Villas, and their relationships to one another, would still be appreciated, the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the CA.
6. The character and appearance of the CA would therefore be preserved. As such, the appeal scheme would accord with the aims of Policy 4.4 of the Bournemouth District wide Local Plan 2002 (LP), Policies CS39 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and Policy BAP1 of the Boscombe and Polesdown Neighbourhood Plan 2019. These collectively seek to ensure that proposals reflect the character of the area and protect heritage assets from proposals that would adversely affect their significance.
7. I am mindful of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which sets out, amongst other things, that any harm to the significance of a heritage asset should be fully justified (paragraph 206). Since I have not found such in this case, this requirement falls away.

Car Parking and Highway Safety

8. The appeal site is in parking zone A where the Council's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (SPD) suggests a provision of zero on the basis that the town centre has ready and easy access to a range of alternative modes of transport. Be this as it may, the thrust of the SPD concerns new development in the sense of buildings, conversions and the

change of use of land. The development in the case of the appeal scheme is a dropped kerb (vehicle cross over) and the parking provided is a by product of that. The residential use it would serve is preexisting. I am also mindful of the immediate area which benefits from a plethora of off street parking for private residences and the standards explained by the SPD read to me as an expectation rather than a minimum or a maximum.

9. The SPD states that a departure from the standards should be justified and Policy CS16 of the CS seeks to ensure parking provision is in accordance with the adopted parking standards. As well as the above, the proposed development would remove two vehicles from parking on the street which has benefits to visibility for others exiting off street areas and the free flow of traffic more generally. I am therefore satisfied that the principle of providing off street parking, as a result of the appeal scheme, would be acceptable.
10. Whilst the parking spaces would not be laid out perpendicular to the carriageway, their angle relative thereto would not be far off. Given this, the position of the plot relative to the road edge, its own angle as it passes and the fact that the proposed arrangement would be in line with others in the street, requiring the spaces to be perpendicular would be unreasonable. The provision of adequate visibility to one side and the maintenance of a fence no higher than 600mm to the other onto a wide and largely unencumbered urban residential street would further my satisfaction that the layout would be adequate. The appellant has provided an annotated version of the proposed site plan to show that the dimensions of the spaces and their location relative to boundaries would be sufficient. Taking into account also how used local residents would be to vehicles crossing local pavements due to the amount of off street parking in the immediate area, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the safe use of the highway for its users.
11. I am aware of the resistance to the provision of a second access point into the appeal site but equally this is symptomatic of a corner plot with a building that has been sub divided into flats. In addition to the absence of any planning harm arising, I do not share the Council's concerns in this regard. The appeal scheme would therefore be in compliance with Policy CS16 of the CS and the accompanying SPD, the aims of which I have set out.

Conditions

12. I have set out the standard time condition and the approved plans for certainty. Given the visibility would be acceptable and the approved plans sufficiently show such, I have set out a compliance condition requiring the measures to be installed prior to first use of the appeal scheme. A condition requiring details of the provision of electric vehicle charging is required in accordance with the SPD.
13. I have not set out a condition for landscaping as this is acceptably shown on the approved plans, as is a bin store. I am also satisfied that that the existing refuse collection arrangements are acceptable given the scheme does not involve the provision of new dwellings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the above conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR