



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2019

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/W/19/3235232

15 Jubilee Drive, Walgrave NN6 9PR

- 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 J Miller against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2018/1102, dated 7 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'demolition of outbuilding and garage. Erection of new dwelling with off road parking for new and existing dwellings'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide adequate parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Jubilee Drive is comprised of two distinct areas. The first phase of development along this road consists of two storey semi-detached dwellings with generous spacing, similar forms and fenestration that give this part of the road a spacious, unified feel. The newer part of the road consists of more varied dwellings set around the end of the cul-de-sac. The two groups of development are separated by a significant gap between the older and newer parts.
4. The appeal site lies at the meeting of these two areas and is adjacent to one of the last dwellings at the end of the older development. The proposed dwelling would join No 15 Jubilee Drive (No 15) and would be significantly set back from the building line of this host property. While the proposal would be approximately in line with the building line of the neighbouring property at No 17 Jubilee Drive (No 17), since it would join No 15 and the proposed materials would match the host property, it would read visually as being more closely related to the older part of the street but would depart from the pattern of development of this area. Since the proposal would significantly reduce the gap between buildings in this area, it would harmfully disrupt the open and unified character and appearance

of this part of the road. Given the proposed materials and form of the building, it would not be in harmony with the newer part of the street either.

5. I note that the newer part of the street has smaller separation distances than the older part. I also acknowledge that the site is not within a conservation area or near any listed buildings. The lack of access to the rear from the front would not alone be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. However, while the scale of the proposed building maybe in keeping with the other dwellings in the area and I note the removal of boundary treatment at the front, given the siting and form of the proposal, it would significantly diminish the open unified feel of the area.
6. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies GN2A and EN42 of the Daventry District Council Saved Policies from The Daventry District Local Plan September 2007 (LP) which requires among other things, that the scale and design of development be in keeping with the locality and that designs promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance their surroundings. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in this regard.
7. LP Policy GN2E relates to a conservation area or a building listed as being of architectural or historic interest and their setting and is therefore not directly relevant to the proposed development. LP Policy HS22 relates to infill villages such as Walgrave and while the proposal would not conflict with this particular policy, given the harm identified, it would conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Parking

8. The proposed development would provide tandem parking spaces in front of the property. While the Highway Authority has not raised concerns with regard to the size of the parking spaces, from the evidence before me the spaces would not provide adequate space to allow for reasonable manoeuvrability and given the location of the development in a curved part of the road, it is likely that the proposed parking arrangement would give rise to one vehicle parking on the street.
9. However, from the evidence before me, the majority of houses on the street benefit from off-street parking provision and there is some on street parking provision available near the proposed site. While I note evidence regarding existing parking pressure, there is no substantial evidence before me to indicate that there is significant pressure on the on-street parking provision in the area. Moreover, given the width of the road particularly in the vicinity of the appeal site, and that vehicles would be likely to be travelling at slow speeds along the cul-de-sac, there would be unlikely to be an unacceptable impact on highway safety as result of the proposal. Furthermore, an increase of one vehicle parked on the street would be unlikely to give rise to severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would provide adequate parking provision and would not conflict with LP Policy GN2 which requires among other things that developments will not have an adverse impact on the road network. It would also not conflict with the Framework in this particular regard.

11. LP Policies EN42 and HS22 relate to design and restricted infill villages and are not directly relevant to this main issue.

Other Matters

12. I note that there were no local objections to the proposal. However, the appeal has been determined on its planning merits and this has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR