



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/22/3294474

124 Rockingham Road, Corby NN17 1AG

- 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 N Balica against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NC/21/00450/DPA, dated 12 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a vehicular access to the property (3xdrop kerbs).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 124 Rockingham Road is a semi-detached two storey dwelling in a row of similar semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The properties, which are set back from the highway behind various boundary treatments including walls, hedges and fences, front Rockingham Road. There is a narrow grass verge and a footpath between the front boundaries of the properties and the lay-by to the front. The lay-by provides off street parking for residents of the dwellings, parallel to the edge of the carriageway.
4. The appeal property currently benefits from a pedestrian access, via a gate to the front boundary of the site. The proposal includes the provision of a drop kerb and area of hardstanding to enable a car to park in the front garden of the property. The proposed vehicular access from Rockingham Road would cross the lay-by, footpath and grass verge to the front of the property.
5. Rockingham Road is a relatively busy main road, albeit there are traffic calming measures in place. There are no turning facilities proposed as part of the development, so vehicles would either have to reverse into the proposed parking space or reverse out onto Rockingham Road.
6. Manual for Streets sets out that whilst ideally, defined parking bays should be provided outside the visibility splay, in some circumstances, where speeds are low, some encroachment may be acceptable. However, the required visibility splays in this instance include a significant part of the existing lay-by, as well as the adjoining bus stop. Whilst the use of the bus stop is temporary in nature, it is likely that vehicles will be parked in the lay-by on a more

permanent basis. At the time of my site visit, which I acknowledge is only a snapshot in time, there were a number of vehicles parked in the lay-by. Given that my visit was during the day, it is likely that a greater number of vehicles would be parked there during the evening when residents are more likely to be at home. Such parked vehicles would thereby restrict visibility from the proposed access for vehicles egressing the site, either in a forward gear or more so when reversing onto Rockingham Road. Given the busy nature of Rockingham Road, the lack of visibility at the proposed vehicular access would undermine highway safety.

7. I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect upon highway safety as a result of restricted visibility. It would therefore fail to accord with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core strategy 2011-2031 (adopted July 2016) which, amongst other things seeks to make safe and pleasant streets.

Other Matters

8. There are other properties on this side of the road in close proximity to the appeal site which benefit from vehicular accesses. My attention is specifically drawn to a planning permission at 128 Rockingham Road for a vehicular access and hardstanding. Nevertheless, the precise details of this are not before me that I may be able to draw comparisons with the appeal scheme such that my conclusions thereon may change. Furthermore, given that the permission dates from 2009 and the current development plan was adopted in 2016, it is not clear which policy basis the application was assessed against. In any case, each development proposal is to be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify a grant of planning permission contrary to the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR