

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2023

by E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/23/3322510

28 Croyde Avenue, Corby, Northamptonshire NN18 8EG

- 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 Negovan Arsic against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NC/22/00407/DPA, dated 29 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of 3-bedroom end terrace house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would offer satisfactory parking provision; and,
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Parking provision

3. Croyde Avenue is a residential street, with a mix of on-plot and on-street parking. There is a communal on-street parking layby in front of 22-28 Croyde Avenue. However, there is also a well-established area of hardstanding on-plot in front of No 28, which includes land on the appeal site. The evidence indicates that the occupants of No 28 currently use this area of hardstanding to park vehicles.
4. The proposal includes two dedicated parking spaces for the new dwelling, which would be situated on-plot and in front of the building. Whilst two parking spaces would be adequate to serve the proposed new dwelling, the location of the bays would displace the parking provision currently serving No 28. Moreover, the area of hardstanding in front of No 28 would no longer be accessible without compromising the use of the on-street communal parking layby. Consequently, the proposal would result in the loss of on-plot parking spaces and, as a result, would lead to increased competition for on-street parking in the surrounding area.
5. It is clear from my own observations, that there is existing parking pressure in the local area. On my site visit, I observed a general lack of available on-street parking spaces. Consequently, a number of vehicles were parked across

footways and on corner junctions, creating a highway safety hazard. Without evidence to demonstrate how the combined parking demand from No 28 and the proposed new dwelling would be provided for safely, the proposal is likely to exacerbate unsafe parking practices and would cause unacceptable harm to highway safety.

6. In considering this matter, I have taken account of the fact that future occupants of the proposed dwelling would have access to a garage. However, the garage is located to the rear of the site, and from the evidence and my observations, it would be accessed via a gated track. Therefore, in all probability, future occupiers of the new dwelling would be more likely to park on the street frontage due to its relative convenience. Accordingly, the garage does not mitigate the inadequacy of the proposed parking provision for the development.
7. I conclude that the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory parking provision. It would therefore conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (CS) which, amongst other things, seeks to secure safe and pleasant streets, including through the satisfactory provision for parking.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site lies within the curtilage of 28 Croyde Avenue, in a built-up residential area. The majority of buildings in the locality are formed in two-storey terraced rows. Most dwellings share a similar, simple form. However, there is some variety in the width of the dwellings and in their materials.
9. No 28 is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a wrap-around garden. It has a single-storey side extension, which is marginally wider than the host dwelling, and is slightly set-back from its front elevation. The extension has a flat roof and is of limited architectural value. However, it has a similar appearance to the host dwelling with brown bricks and white fenestration.
10. The proposal would replace the existing single-storey extension with a new two-storey dwelling with pitched roof. The dwelling would have the same front building line as No 28 and would be aligned at both ridge and eaves level. It is also proposed that the new dwelling would be constructed with materials to match the host building. The proposed dwelling would therefore be sympathetic in terms of its building line, height and materials.
11. The front elevation of the proposed new dwelling would be wider than No 28. Notwithstanding this, it would have a similar width to the structure it would replace, which sits unobtrusively within space at the side of the original building. Moreover, from my observations, there is some existing variety in the width of dwellings within the appeal property terrace and elsewhere in the immediate locality. Consequently, the width of the proposed dwelling would not have an incongruent appearance in the street scene and its form, appearance, and overall massing would be in-keeping with the visual character of the area.
12. I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, there would be no conflict with Policy 16 of the Part 2 Local Plan for Corby and Policy 8 of the CS, insofar as they seek to ensure development responds to the site's context and is appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and the character of the local area.

Other Matters

13. The evidence indicates that the appeal scheme sought to address concerns about a previous iteration of the development. I have also been referred to the presence of other appeal decisions in the local area. However, I have very limited information before me about the previous scheme or the aforementioned appeal decisions to draw direct comparisons. Therefore, the evidence available does not lead me to a different overall conclusion. I have determined the appeal on its own merits and with regard to the site context at the time of my decision.
14. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling and would therefore contribute to the national planning objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. Given its modest size, it could be more affordable than others in the local area. However, the contribution that would be made by a single dwelling would be very modest and I therefore attach limited weight to this benefit.

Conclusion

15. Although I have found the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, it would fail to provide satisfactory parking provision. The associated conflict with Policy 8 of the CS brings the development into conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations before me that outweigh the harm I have identified. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

E Catcheside

INSPECTOR