



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3368322

115 Gold Street, Wellingborough, North Northamptonshire NN8 4EQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hussain Ali against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NW/25/00002/FUL.
 - The development proposed is installing a dropped kerb to create a driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the description of the proposed development, I have used the initial description of the proposal from the original planning application form. I have omitted the remaining paragraphs included on the form in the description box, as these represent the case for the submitted proposal and are not directly part of the description. I have, however, given the case these additional paragraphs set out due attention in my consideration of this appeal, along with all other documents submitted to me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the local area; and
 - Highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey house with a generous front garden space. The boundary of the appeal site with the public highway is currently defined by a fence that sits to the back of a footway. Between the footway and the carriageway is a wide and continuous grass verge with trees, interspersed with narrow paths between the carriageway to the footway. This continuous green verge strip with trees, is an attractive and defining feature within this part of the street and makes a defining and substantial contribution to the quality of the character and appearance of the local area.
5. Gold Street is a classified road and at the time of my site visit early on a weekday afternoon, the street was busy with vehicles passing in both directions in steady

streams. The side of the carriageway on that side of the road in front of the appeal dwelling was lined continuously by parked cars.

6. The proposal would create a dropped kerb approximately 5.390 metres wide to the carriageway opposite the appeal site, with a hard paved driveway of similar width across the verge area. The boundary fence to the front of the appeal site would be removed, with the front garden area of the appeal dwelling made over predominantly for the parking of cars.
7. The proposal would appear as a single break in an otherwise continuous grass verge between 95 and 121 Gold Street. Whilst there appears to be a number of crossovers to the verge beyond 127 Gold Street and up to the junction with Covington Grove, these demonstrate the harm to the streetscene and character and appearance of the local area that can accrue from crossovers over original grass verges.
8. The proposal would result in a break in the existing uninterrupted stretch of verge, separating it into two distinct parts, altering its appearance as a continuous and high quality part of the streetscape. This would be apparent in immediate and longer views from within the street and surrounding properties. As such, the proposal would have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area, to which the existing continuous verge makes a substantial contribution.

Highway Safety

9. Gold Street is a Classified Road, busy at the time of my site visit, which would undoubtedly be busier during peak periods. The proposal appears to allow for space for the parking of 4 cars. The parking of this many cars would not appear to allow for all those cars to enter and exit the carriageway across the verge area and footway in a forward direction at all times. However, the Council, as Local Highway Authority, has stated that, given the status of Gold Street as a Classified Road, a crossover, as proposed, would require cars to enter and exit the carriageway across the verge area and footway in a forward direction at all times.
10. Without the ability to turn cars around on the appeal site, they would be required to reverse across the footway and verge area, between parked cars and onto a busy Classified Road. Due to the limited visibility for drivers executing such a manoeuvre, this would represent a significant risk to the safety of pedestrians on the footway and vehicles passing through on the carriageway, as well as the driver themselves. Consequently, I find that the creation of a crossover to facilitate off street parking would only be safe for all road users in this location if a vehicle could exit and enter the carriageway in a forward direction.
11. The appellant has stated that they would be prepared to accept a condition requiring this to be the case, with the design of the proposal changed to allow for the parking of only 2 cars to facilitate this. The appellant has also indicated that a revised plan has been prepared that illustrates this revised proposal, however, no such plan appears to have been submitted with the appeal statement. Further, no material or plans have been submitted that show that this proposal for two parking spaces would allow for sufficient turning space of the appeal site to enable a vehicle to enter and leave in a forward direction.
12. I am therefore not in a position to establish from the material submitted whether two cars could park on the appeal site with enough space to allow them to manoeuvre, to exit as well as enter the appeal site onto the highway in a forward direction. As such,

applying a condition limiting the parking on the appeal site to 2 cars would not necessarily make an unacceptable development acceptable in terms of the detrimental effects on highway safety I have identified. Therefore, attaching such a condition would not meet the tests for conditions set out in paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework).

13. For the reasons given above I find that the proposal would result in moderate harm to the character and appearance of the local area and would be substantially harmful to highway safety. This would conflict with Policies 8 d (i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and Paragraphs 115, 116 and 117 of the Framework. Amongst other matters these collectively seek development that ensures that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, does not result in an unactable impact on highway safety, minimising the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles and that responds to local character and design standards.
14. The appellant argues that the proposed crossover would have the benefit of creating a wider pathway access between the carriageway and footway. Whilst the extra width may be of benefit in certain circumstances, access for extra wide child buggies for instance, this would be limited and focused on the appeal dwelling and adjacent properties this would not constitute a significant public benefit, consequently, I have afforded this only limited weight in my considerations.
15. The potential for a future electric vehicle charging point to be installed that would be accessible to vehicles parked on the appeal site, as set out by the appellant would constitute a more significant private rather than public benefit and I have only afforded this potential benefit little weight in my considerations.
16. The appellant has also presented photographs of vehicles parked on the grass verge, vehicles with apparent damage, puddles adjacent to the kerb and the condition of the footway. It is not however clear how the proposal would resolve such issues or result in any significant benefit for the wider public. I have therefore only afforded these potential benefits only very minimal weight in my considerations.
17. The appellant has brought to my attention that a member of the household has a Blue Badge parking permit related to their personal circumstances and has argued that the proposal would significantly improve access for that person to the appeal dwelling. I have no doubt that the proposal would result in such a benefit, and I have given this substantial weight in my considerations.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

18. I have considered the benefits of the proposal as identified by the appellant against the harm that I have identified above. Although the proposal would be of substantial benefit to a member of the appellant's household with mobility and access needs, I do not find that this, along with the other benefits identified, outweigh the harm that I have identified, particularly the substantial harm to highway safety that would result from the proposal. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR