



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2023

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/W/23/3315159

64 Elizabeth Road, West Haddon, Northamptonshire NN6 7AF

- 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 B Clarke against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WND/2022/0745, dated 11 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of 2 bed dwelling, new vehicular access and off road parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether the appeal site is a suitable location for residential development having regard to the development plan.
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect on highway safety.

Reasons

Location

3. Policy R1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) (Core Strategy) outlines a need for 2,360 dwellings within the Daventry District and 2,360 dwellings within South Northamptonshire between 2011 and 2029. The Council say this need has been met and this has not been disputed by the appellant.
4. Policy R1 of the Core Strategy also says that where housing numbers have been exceeded further housing development is only permitted where certain criteria are met. There is little before me to indicate that the requirements of the criteria have been met. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy R1 of the Core Strategy which amongst other things seeks to ensure the scale of development in rural areas is consistent with the objective of meeting local needs and supporting local services.

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is a 2 storey semi detached property located on a corner plot with a side garden. The site sits in an area characterised by similarly styled properties set back from the road and a more modern housing development. In front of the side garden is a grass verge, public footpath and 2 on street car parking bays.
6. The proposed 1.5 storey dwelling would be of a scale and appearance that would not be comparable to surrounding development. The development would stand forward of the existing building and would appear as a cramped discordant addition that would fail to assimilate into the street scene. The disjuncture that currently exists between the older housing and newer neighbouring development does not make the proposal acceptable.
7. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with the part of Policy RA2 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) (Local Plan Part 2) which requires that the integrity of a garden or open space be protected where it makes an important contribution to the form, character and setting of the settlement. It would also conflict with the part of Policy ENV10 of the Local Plan Part 2 that requires new development to be of high quality, promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance its surroundings and be of a scale, massing, layout and access that blends well within the site and within its surroundings. Similarly, it would conflict with Policy WH13 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Development Plan (Neighbourhood Plan) which amongst other things requires new development to be of high quality design and take account of the site characteristics.

Highway Safety

8. The development would lead to the loss of a public car parking bay in an area with high levels of on street parking, as observed at the time of my site visit. The proposed parking arrangements for the development would not provide adequate visibility splays with visibility being further compromised if the remaining public car parking bay was occupied. The width of the proposed vehicle parking spaces themselves would be insufficient to enable the opening of parked car doors and to walk around the vehicles with ease.
9. The development would compromise highway safety and as such would conflict with the part of Policy CW1 of the Local Plan Part 2 which requires new development to demonstrate consideration of health and well being in their design and layout and the part of Policy WH13 of the Neighbourhood Plan which requires new development to create safe environments. It would also conflict with the parts of the National Planning Policy Framework that require new development to create places that are safe and would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

10. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant and the reasons for the development. However, this is outweighed by the harm generated by the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons identified and taking into account all other matters, including a lack of harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring development, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR