



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2019

by G Jenkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/W/18/3218810

11 Greenside, Bilsworth, NN7 3BY

- 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 Mr and Mrs Scriven against the decision of South Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref S/2018/2136/FUL, dated 5 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2018.
 - The development proposed demolition of existing garage and construction of new dwelling with associated car parking and car parking to no.11 Greenside, Bilsworth.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an area of garden land to the side of No 11 Greenside, which occupies a corner plot at the end of the cul-de-sac. Greenside is characterised by semi detached bungalows and dormer bungalows. The site is adjoined by residential properties and their gardens; in particular it backs on to the large rear garden of another property in Greenside. The land slopes gently upwards away from No 11.
4. The proposal seeks the demolition of an existing garage to 11 Greenside and construction of a two-bedroom bungalow. The bungalow would have a hipped roof and would front onto a new access drive to the route (to the side of 11 Greenside) that would also serve a parking area to the southwest. An area of garden space would be provided to the side of the proposed bungalow, adjacent to 15 Greenside.

Character and Appearance

5. Whilst the area has a balanced and symmetrical street layout, I accept that this has changed over time due to extensions and box dormers being installed, thus, reducing the uniformity and introducing a variation in terms of design to the streetscene.
6. The proposed dwelling would be single storey to reflect the majority of existing dwellings in the streetscene. The site is however, somewhat of an awkward

shape, which results in the design and siting of the proposed dwelling and car parking being contrived and squeezed onto the plot. I accept that the plot size is larger than those surrounding and should be sufficient to accommodate the dwelling, private amenity space and associated car parking, however, the shape of the site makes this problematic.

7. In particular given the close proximity of the dwelling in relation to the frontage of No 15, the bungalow has an awkward position that disregards the building line. There are no windows to the street elevation and as thus the property appears to turn its back on the street. This principal (street facing) elevation therefore appears as a blank brick wall to the street with just a front door, which would detract from the streetscene. The positioning of the dwelling therefore results in a cramped and incongruous form of development within the streetscene. I therefore find that it would be conspicuous in the streetscene given its location and layout, and would not sit well between the existing two properties. It would be squashed into the site due to the design having been seriously constrained by the shape of the site and the adjoining properties.
8. In addition to the above, I consider the isolated car parking area for four dwellings to be completely at odds with the character and appearance of the area as there are no other similar rear parking areas within the vicinity of the site; most properties have driveways at the front for parking or garages to the side.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to 'saved' policies G3 and EV1 of the adopted South Northamptonshire Local Plan 1997, Policies S10, H1 and R1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2014, and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other things seek to ensure a suitable housing mix and density in areas, sustainable development and development that maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the local area.

Highway Safety

10. The application proposes to demolish the existing garage to No 11 Greenside and construct an access drive alongside the property for a parking area containing 4 spaces and manoeuvring area on acquired land to the rear of properties in Greenside and Stoke Road. The Highway Authority are concerned about the intensified use of an existing access and the fact that it doesn't meet the minimum width requirement. Due to the constraints of the development the car parking has been located at an isolated location many metres from the front of the dwellings, adjacent to existing garden areas.
11. The appellant accepts that the access road is below the required standards and considers this to be acceptable, as vehicles would not need to pass each other, and there is adequate turning space within the car parking area. However, I find the proposed access and parking arrangements to be tight, poorly located in relation to the properties and wholly inappropriate for either elderly residents or a young family for whom the scheme is designed. This could therefore result in an increase of on street car parking and would unacceptably increase the risk to highway safety
12. For the reasons set out above I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have access arrangements that would be substandard and the positioning of the proposed parking area at the rear of the site would be

impractical and likely to result in increased on street parking which would be detrimental to local highway safety. As such the proposals are contrary to saved policy G3 of the Adopted South Northamptonshire Local Plan 1997 and guidance contained with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to ensure amongst other things that developments would have a satisfactory means of access, adequate parking, servicing and turning facilities, including for the disabled.

Conclusions

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gemma Jenkinson

INSPECTOR