



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurt MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/W/19/3220930
96 Semilong Road, Northampton NN2 6DG

- 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 Husein Ramadan (3amigos Properties Ltd) against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2018/1414, dated 5 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the scheme proposal is to provide 4no. Apartments including the Lower Ground Floor, First and Second Floors, which shall be Two Person Units and the Second Floor, which shall be a Single Person Apartment. The proposal involves the internal conversion and compartmentation to form 4no. dwellings. The conversion does not require any new build extension works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of single dwelling to 4 No. apartments at 96 Semilong Road, Northampton NN2 6DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref N/2018/1414, dated 5 October 2018, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following submitted plans: 2145 10, 2145 1 Rev A, 2145 3 Rev B, 2145 9 and 2145 7 Rev B.
 - 3) The proposed refuse storage areas as shown on the approved plan shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained thereafter.
 - 4) The proposed bicycle storage for the residents as shown on the approved plan shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of development hereby permitted and retained thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the application form. However, in allowing the appeal I have altered the description to reflect that stated on the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the parking demand likely to be generated by the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a large, five bedroomed mid-terraced dwelling located within a predominantly residential area largely comprising terraced dwellings with good access to services and facilities. The dwelling does not have any off road parking facilities however, on street parking is unrestricted on Semilong Road and a number of terraced properties opposite the site have off road car parking facilities. At the time of my visit (17:30) there was some on street parking along the road but a large number of parking spaces were available.
5. The proposal is to convert the appeal building from a large single dwelling to 4 flats, with no off road parking facilities. Whilst the Council accepts that the site is in an accessible location, it considers that various parking surveys submitted for the area, including one submitted by the appellant, show it to be at capacity and that any additional increase in parking demand would be likely to result in dangerous parking and conflict between residents. The Council considers that the proposed change from one dwelling to 4 flats would increase parking demand further and that such an increase cannot be accommodated and would be harmful to highway safety.
6. Both parties agree that when the Highway Authority's parking standards are applied to the proposal, one additional parking space would be required over and above what would be required for the existing dwelling. However, the Council considers that the demand could be greater if the flats were to be occupied by more than one occupier. Whilst I accept that the sites accessible location does not necessarily mean that future occupiers would not be car owners, the same can be said for occupiers of the existing dwelling and I do not consider that the likely parking demand of the proposal would be significantly greater than for the existing dwelling which is a large 5 bedroomed property.
7. The appellant submitted a parking beat survey which was carried out over 2 days in November 2018 with the number of available spaces assessed at 00:30. The survey shows that in Semilong Road parking was at 87% and 89% capacity across the two nights with the area average being 94%. The Highway Authority questions the methodology used in the survey and considers that the survey shows the area to be at capacity. However, notwithstanding the concerns raised, the survey results together with my observations on site nevertheless show that there is in fact some residual capacity, particularly along Semilong Road and whilst I accept that the amount of on street parking will vary at different times of the day, I do not consider that the submitted evidence demonstrates that the likely additional parking demand generated by the proposal could not be adequately accommodated without detriment to highway safety. There is no evidence that a lack of parking capacity would lead to dangerous parking and conflict between residents. Though the cumulative impact of minor developments might have a greater impact on highway safety, each proposal must be determined on its own merits and for the reasons stated, I do not consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect.

8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the parking demand likely to be generated by the proposal would not have an adverse effect on highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with the relevant aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals have an acceptable impact on highway safety. Although Policy H5 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) adopted December 2014 and Policy H30 of the Northampton Local Plan 1993-2006 adopted June 1997 were also referred to in the Council's decision notice, these policies appear to relate to Houses in Multiple Occupation and not flats so are not therefore directly relevant to the proposal.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed the suggested conditions regarding refuse and bicycle storage in order to ensure that suitable facilities are provided prior to the occupation of the flats and in the interests of the residential amenity of the area and to encourage sustainable transport methods.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR