



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/21/3272487

19 Stratford Road, Roade, Northampton NN7 2GD

- 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 Miss Vicki Connell against the decision of South Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref S/2021/0103/FUL, dated 2 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'we are looking at dropping the kerb at the front of our property in order to add block paving to the front garden, therefore making a driveway for vehicles'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council have referred to the development on the Decision Notice as 'dropped kerb', but I have no evidence that the description was altered with the agreement of the appellant. I am basing my decision on the description given by the appellant.

Main Issue

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, with a single garage and parking space accessed from Walkers Way at the rear.
5. The highway to the front of the property is the A508 Stratford Road. From the evidence in front of me, and from observations at my site visit, it is apparent that it is a busy road.
6. The frontage of the properties on that side of the road generally have a grassed front garden with a low railing fence, and landscape planting on the boundary.
7. I find that the removal of a large section of the boundary planting and the removal of the lawned front garden to facilitate two parking spaces would harm the character and appearance of the area, creating a gap in the amenity

frontages of the properties, and introducing a harsh appearance when seen against the remaining properties on that side of the A508, with the addition of block paving onto the frontage.

8. I acknowledge the comments of the appellant that a number of properties on the opposite side of the road have access onto the A508, but the character of the properties is different, with older housing, more established boundary treatments and relationships with the highway.
9. In summary. I find the removal of lawned area and a section of landscape planting would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, specifically that section of Stratford Road, contrary to policies SS2 and SDP1 of the South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan (the LP) which expects development to maintain the character and appearance of the street scene and surroundings as well as the guidance set out in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highway Safety

10. I note that the objection from the Highways Authority states that it is contrary to the adopted highway policy to allow a new access to be taken from a principle county road, however I do not appear to have been supplied with a copy of that policy, nor do the Council actually quote the policy in the reason for refusal, and rely on Policy SS2 of the LP which is a general development policy.
11. As noted above, it was apparent from my site visit that Stratford Road is a busy highway, and I have been supplied with evidence that outlines the number of vehicle movements for the A508 although the information does not inform me which section of the A508 is was taken from.
12. As stated above, it is apparent that a number of properties opposite have direct access onto the A508, but these are generally older housing, with long established access onto the highway, which may well pre-date the current policy position. As regards newer properties, I do not have the full details of those applications in front of me, so I cannot determine the reasoning and circumstances behind those approvals. In any event, I must determine the current appeal on its own merits.
13. As a result, I concur with the Highway Authority that creating an access onto the A508, a busy highway, would be harmful to highway safety with the locality. I have not been supplied details of whether a vehicle could exit in forward gear, but any manoeuvres in such a heavily trafficked area would be injurious to highway safety.
14. In summary, I find that the proposals would be contrary to Policy SS2 of the LP in that it would not include a safe and suitable means of access for vehicles.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge that comments of the appellant in relation to the layout of the new housing, and the need to provide for safer parking for vehicles, but I cannot allow for a situation that causes the harms that I have identified in my reasoning for the personal benefit of the appellant.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR