



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2025

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/25/3359119

111 Wellingborough Road, Finedon, Wellingborough NN9 5LG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Pearce against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NW/24/00646/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a pair of semi-detached two-storey 3 bed dwelling houses with attic conversions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site address was not shown in full within the site address section of the application forms. Therefore, I have taken address from the Decision Notice, which provided the accurate site address and postcode.

Main Issues

3. The main issues of the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed car parking area on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook and natural light; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a grassed area located in a gap between two residential properties, and has a residential caravan situated to the rear of the site. The appeal site is located off Wellingborough Road which is a classified road and is generally busy. There are a variety of property types and ages in the area around the site. However, the immediate neighbouring properties are historic in character. Many of the nearby properties on the same side of Wellingborough Road as the appeal site are set back from the highway with front gardens and include some boundary treatments such as low fencing or garden walls.
5. The proposal is for the erection of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings, each with 3 bedrooms. The floor plans include an office in the roof space which

could, in my view, be used as an additional bedroom in each property. The proposal includes the provision of car parking for up to 4 vehicles in total. The proposed parking space would be set out in a row along the frontage of the site. Based on the plans, there would be little space for landscaping or boundary treatments to the front of the property.

6. In my view, the car parking on the site frontage would appear overly dominant and unsympathetic to its surroundings given the absence of adequate soft landscaping or boundary features, the number of parking spaces, resulting in a large expanse of hardstanding. In my view this would appear harsh against the backdrop of the proposed dwellings. Furthermore, given the character of the properties nearby, particularly neighbouring dwellings, I consider that the proposed parking arrangement would appear incongruous in the street scene and would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
7. The Council has concluded that the design of the proposed building is acceptable only having regard to the character and appearance of the area and based on the plans before me I have no reason to disagree.
8. Nevertheless, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed car parking area would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy 8 parts (d) (i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) which requires development to respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character and to respond to the form character and landscape setting of the settlement.
9. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), insofar as it relates to character and appearance.

Living conditions

10. The proposed dwellings would have long rear projections which would extend back into the site by a substantial amount and would have similar depth to those of neighbouring properties.
11. Due to the depth of the proposed rear projections, the proposed dwellings would extend a significant way along the boundary with the neighbouring property Number 109 Wellingborough Road (No.109) alongside the house and garden. The proposed height of the rear projections would be two storey.
12. Although good boundary treatments exist along the shared boundary with No. 109, given the proposed height and depth of the rear projections off the proposed dwellings, together with the orientation of the properties and distance from the shared boundary, I consider that the proposal would appear dominant and cause harm to the outlook from the rear of the neighbouring property No. 109.
13. The side elevation of Number 113 Wellingborough Road (No.113) would face the proposed dwellings and several windows exist on the side elevation, at ground and first floor level. Due to the short separation distance between the side wall of the No. 113 and the proposed dwellings, I consider that the proposed development would have a dominant effect on this property and would negatively affect outlook from it.

14. Having regard to the effect of the proposals on light to neighbouring properties. The appellant considers that the proposals would comply with 45 and 60 degree angles, however, the Council's statement of case states that the proposal would breach the 45 and 60 degree angles to the rear window of no. 109. Based on the plans before me which show a 60 degree line, this appears to be the case. Therefore, due to this, together with the height and depth of the proposed dwellings, I agree that some loss of daylight may occur as a result of the proposed development.
15. Having regard to No.113, due to the height and depth of the proposed development together with the short distance from the shared boundary, I consider that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on daylight to this property, given the presence of windows on its side elevation.
16. Due to the juxtaposition of the proposed dwellings and their southerly orientation in relation to the neighbouring property of No.109, together with the depth and height of the proposed development. I have concerns relating to the loss of sunlight that would occur as a result of the proposed development. In my view, due to the proposal clearly contravening the 45 degree angle, the proposal would cause overshadowing to the rear of the neighbouring property No.109 and would reduce sunlight, particularly to windows on the rear elevation closest to the proposed development, in addition to its garden. This would, in my view, be more exaggerated as the sun moves around during the day, and as a result would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring property, by way of a loss of sunlight to the ground floor windows on the rear elevation.
17. Whilst the proposed development would be lower than No. 113 Wellingborough Road, I consider that it would also see a potential loss of sunlight from the east to windows on the side elevation facing the proposed development due to the short distance between the dwellings.
18. I do not consider that overlooking would occur from the proposed development on neighbouring properties that could not be adequately managed by way of obscure glazing to proposed bathrooms.
19. Nevertheless, I conclude that, due to the depth and height of the proposed dwellings, their location along the shared boundaries with neighbouring properties, the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers regarding outlook and natural light. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 8 (e) (i) of the JCS which seeks to ensure that development protects amenity including by not resulting in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
20. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 135 of the Framework, insofar as it relates to living conditions.

Highway Safety

21. The proposed development would provide off-street car parking for a maximum of 4 vehicles. The proposed vehicular parking area would be to the front of the property facing the proposed dwellings.

22. Wellingborough Road is generally busy, and during my site visit which is a snapshot in time, HGVs passed the site regularly and cars were parked on the street, some of which were parked either partially or completely on the pavements nearby, particularly on the side of the road shared with the appeal site.
23. Many of the driveways of neighbouring properties were modest in size however, many of those nearby had space to turn a vehicle within the driveway area to avoid reversing onto the main road.
24. Due to the restricted nature of the site frontage the proposed development would provide insufficient manoeuvring space for vehicles and would result in cars having to do a manoeuvre to either reverse onto the site to leave the site in a forward gear, or cars having to reverse directly onto the highway over the pavement. Given the busyness of the road, together with the existing on-street parking which could hinder visibility for vehicles, reversing off the proposed driveways would, in my view, put pedestrians and other road users at risk.
25. Whilst many examples of driveways without manoeuvring space likely exist elsewhere and may be common in residential areas, given the busy nature of the road and existing reliance upon on-street car parking, I am not satisfied that the addition of 4 driveway spaces in the proposed arrangement would be safe and that it would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety for road users.
26. As discussed above the proposed dwellings would contain at least 3 bedrooms and could accommodate up to 4 bedrooms even though they may not all be used as such. Nevertheless, in both cases, the proposal would fail to provide adequate on-site car parking including visitor spaces to meet the standards as set out in the Northamptonshire Parking Standards document (September 2016). Due to this, in my view, if the proposed properties were fully utilised in terms of bedrooms this could put additional pressure on, on-street parking provision. Which could lead to unsafe or obstructive car parking and negatively affect the highway network or pedestrians. The appellant has stated that on-street provision does exist elsewhere near to the site, however, in this case, it has not been adequately demonstrated to me that this option would be suitable having regard to highway safety. Therefore, I am not satisfied that on-street car parking would be a safe and suitable alternative to on-site parking in this case.
27. For the reasons set out, I find that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on highway safety due to the proposed parking arrangement. Therefore, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy 8 (b) (i) and (ii) of the JCS which seeks to ensure developments make pleasant streets and spaces by resisting developments that would prejudice highway safety and that developments ensure a satisfactory provision for parking and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards.
28. In addition, for the above reasons the proposal would fail to accord with Paragraph 115 of the Framework insofar as it relates to highway safety and design of parking areas.

Other Matters

29. Regarding the matter of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as required by the provisions of the Environment Act 2021. In order for the site to be exempt from BNG requirements the site must consist of no more than 9 dwellings, be on a site that has an area no larger than 0.5ha and consist exclusively of development that will

be for self-build properties. For the proposal to qualify as a self-build development, it must fall under the definition of self-build as set out in Section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, and there must be a mechanism to secure it as such. This is best achieved by way of a Planning Obligation, which has not been provided as part of this appeal. However, given my overall conclusion on the main issues, it is not necessary for me to seek such a legal mechanism or to consider this matter in any further detail.

30. The appellant has expressed some dissatisfaction with the Council's handling of the application regarding engagement with the appellant about highway matters, in addition has responded to an interested party comment in relation to a parking beat survey which was not requested as part of the planning application process. However, as such information was not provided it cannot have any bearing on my determination of this appeal.
31. The proposal to build two properties on the site would be beneficial having regard to housing delivery for the Council and would contribute towards a five-year housing land supply. However, this matter carries only limited weight due to the scale of the development and would therefore not outweigh the harm identified in the main issues.

Conclusion

32. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised and for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR