



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/W/21/3278188

74 Kingsthorpe Grove, Northampton NN2 6NT

- 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 Mrs Kerry-Lee Revitt against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref N/2021/0291, dated 1 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is drop kerb in front of driveway for vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. Kingsthorpe Grove is a busy 'A' road. The site is located in a row of fifteen houses between the junctions with Cecil Road and Clarence Avenue. Only a few of these have dropped kerbs serving parking areas. Moreover, aside from a cluster of dropped kerbs at the northern end of the road, there are very few others elsewhere along this part of Kingsthorpe Grove. The limited number of dropped kerbs near the site means the flow of northbound traffic along this part of the road is largely free flowing.
4. The driveway is not large enough for cars to turn around such that they could both enter and leave in a forward gear. It would therefore be necessary for vehicles using the driveway to either reverse onto the road, potentially into traffic, or for vehicles to stop on the highway and reverse onto the driveway. Either manoeuvre would be likely to interrupt the free flow of traffic on this busy road, which could be dangerous. It could already be the case that reversing may sometimes be needed in order to park on the street between parked cars, but to use the driveway reversing would always be needed and therefore the risk is greater. Moreover, reversing to or from the driveway would possibly take place between parked cars which would mean cars on the highway have less visibility of the manoeuvring vehicles, which increases the risk to safety.
5. Overall, the introduction of an additional access point onto Kingsthorpe Road would increase the number of vehicles making potentially dangerous manoeuvres on the public highway. This would unacceptably harm highway safety.

6. With specific respect to pedestrian safety; there is no form of enclosure along the front boundary of the site, there are railings on the boundary with No. 72 and there is a low wall on the boundary with No. 76. Although the wall at the front of No. 76 is a little taller, a driver emerging from the access would be able to see sufficiently along the pavement in both directions. As such the development would not compromise pedestrian safety.
7. Nonetheless, as set out above, the development would have a harmful effect on road safety. As such it would conflict with government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which, in paragraph 110 requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all users, and in paragraph 111 states that development should be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on road safety.
8. I understand the appellant's personal circumstances mean that parking on her property would be very beneficial to her. I also recognise the desire to be able to charge an electric car at the property. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the development.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and the other considerations do not outweigh this. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR