

## North Northamptonshire Area – Delegated reports

<b>Application Reference</b>	NW/24/00674/FUL
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Chris Law
<b>Location</b>	112 Overstone Road Sywell Northampton NN6 0AW
<b>Development</b>	Change of use from Dwelling (use class C3) to church (use class F.1 (f) with associated parking and landscaping.
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr LLoyd Chattell
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Andrew Beard
<b>Ward</b>	Earls Barton Ward
<b>Overall Expiry Date</b>	15 January 2025
<b>Agreed Extension of Time</b>	

### 1. The Application Proposal and Background

---

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for the change of use of a detached bungalow at 112 Overstone Road, Sywell to a church. The application also proposes the demolition of an existing rear extension and replacement with a new extension and rear ramped access. 12 parking spaces within the front and rear gardens and soft landscaping within the rear garden are also proposed.

### 2. Site Description and Surroundings

---

- 2.1 The application site consists of an existing two bedroomed detached bungalow on a large plot on the northern side of Overstone Road in the village of Sywell. The property has gardens to the front and rear and a highway access from Overstone Road leading to a parking area and detached garage at the rear of the property.

### 3. Relevant Planning History

---

BW/1977/0273

Approved with conditions.  
Extension to kitchen

22.04.1977

WR/1971/0047	Approved Proposed bungalow and two double garages	15.03.1971
--------------	--	------------

WR/1964/0144	Approved with conditions. Site for a dwellinghouse	26.08.1964
--------------	---	------------

#### **4. Consultation Responses**

---

A full copy of all comments received can be found on the Council's Website <https://www.wellingborough.gov.uk/viewplanningapplications>

##### **4.1 Sywell Parish Council**

Objects to the application for the following reasons:

- traffic and safety concerns
- inadequate off road parking provision which would be difficult to manoeuvre in and out of with vehicles reversing off the site.
- increased vehicle movement near a school, cricket club and existing residential driveways
- incompatible with the residential character of the area
- impacts of noise, lighting, emissions and disturbance from parking in the rear garden
- loss of privacy from use of rear garden as car parking
- use is for a specific group with no wider benefit for villagers.
- lack of justification of need- existing halls are underutilised.
- flood risk concerns from hard surfaced areas.
- BNG assessment- no room for the new hedgerow
- vehicular trip generation is incorrect.
- boundary misrepresentation
- current national housing shortage but application proposes loss of a residential dwelling.
- should use existing halls which would better align with the spatial strategy.

##### **4.2 Neighbours/Responses to publicity**

34 letters have been received from members of the public. 1 letter in support and 33 objecting.

The 1 letter of support has commented that they are members of the church, and the proposal would be within walking distance, reducing their car usage due to their proximity to the site.

The issues raised in the objection letters can be summarised as follows:

- increase congestion in the village, particularly during school drop off times, leading to antisocial behaviour.
- insufficient parking provision resulting in on road parking issues.
- no proven need for an additional church
- church is a closed community, no wider community benefit.
- loss of housing when we are in need of new housing.

- noise nuisance to neighbours at unsociable hours
- wrong location for a church
- change of use not in keeping with the area or a benefit to residents
- drainage issues from large amount of paving

#### 4.3 **Local Highway Authority (LHA)**

No objections subject to parking accommodation being provided in accordance with standards and satisfying policy 8 (b) (ii) of the JCS, tracking to demonstrate that the parking spaces can be used and the existing vehicular crossing being made good and modified as appropriate in accordance with the specification of the local highway authority under licence.

#### 4.4 **NNC Landscape Officer**

No objections however the garden is currently in a state of neglect and new planting should be subject to a planning condition. The proposed close boarded fence on the west boundary and the wall on the highway boundary would be within the root protection area of a significant conifer tree in the neighbouring garden.

#### 4.5 **NNC Planning Ecologist**

There are assumptions and inaccuracies in the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment making some proposals unfeasible. Most of the net gain comes from the proposed new tree planting but the only realistic option for achieving the mandatory 10% would be by buying some additional habitat units from an external provider, which may make this proposed change of use unviable. A landscaping condition could be imposed for approval to detail new tree and native hedgerow planting. A standard Biodiversity Net Gain informative will still be required to be added to the decision notice.

### 5. **Relevant Planning Policies and Considerations**

---

#### 5.1 **Statutory Duty**

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### 5.2 **National Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)  
 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)  
 National Design Guide (NDG) (2019)

#### 5.3 **North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy – Part 1 of the local plan (JCS)**

Policies:

- 1 (presumption in favour of sustainable development)
- 3 (landscape character)
- 4 (biodiversity and geodiversity)
- 7 (community services and facilities)
- 8 (North Northamptonshire place shaping principles)
- 11 (network of urban and rural areas)

5.4 **Plan for the Borough of Wellingborough – Part 2 of the local plan (PBW)**  
Policy  
SS1 (villages)

5.5 **Other Relevant Documents:**

Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document (2009)  
Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (2015)  
Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004)  
Northamptonshire Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2016)  
Air Quality and Emissions Mitigations Supplementary Planning Document (2020)  
Trees and Landscape Supplementary Planning Document (2013)  
Residential Extensions: a guide to good design SPG (2002)

## 6. Evaluation

---

The proposal raises the following main issues:

- principle of development and material considerations.
- design, layout and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- landscape character and visual amenity;
- air quality.
- biodiversity.
- living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.
- effect/impact on highway safety in relation to the proposed access arrangement and parking provision.

6.1 **Principle of Development and material considerations** - Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that *“If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”*

Policy 1 of the JCS is clear that when considering development proposals, the local planning authority will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out within the NPPF.

In addition to the specific NPPF requirements set out above, paragraph 137 states that ‘applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take into account the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot’.

The application form indicates that no pre-application advice or assistance has been sought from the council. The NPPF from paragraph 41 extols the virtues of applicants engaging in pre application discussion with the council to

resolve any issues that may arise to help applicants avoid any unnecessary delays and costs.

The application proposes the change of use of an existing residential dwelling (Use Class C3 (a)) to a church (Use Class F1 (f)). The applicant is the Nene Valley Gospel Hall Trust which are a branch of the Plymouth Brethren Church.

Policy 11 (2) (a) of the JCS is clear that development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous local economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement. The site is located within the village boundary of Sywell as defined by policy SS1 of the PBW and policy map D.16. The planning statement submitted with the application states that 12 existing local families would use the church and would be within walking distance of the site. It has not however been demonstrated that the facility could not be provided more sustainably at a larger settlement nearby such as the growth town of Wellingborough as required by the policy. In addition, there will also be the loss of a residential dwelling.

Policy 7 of the JCS supports the development and enhancement of community services and facilities to (a) meet the needs arising from development and utilising, where possible, opportunities for the co-location of facilities or the use of existing suitable sites.

Paragraph 98 of the NPPF is clear that planning policies and decisions for social, recreational and cultural facilities and services should (a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.

There are existing village halls and churches in close proximity to the site in both Sywell and Overstone which have been identified as being underutilised by Sywell Parish Council. Sywell Parish Council also objects to the principle of the change of use.

The applicant states that the site would only be used 2-3 hours per week and therefore it has not been demonstrated that there is sufficient justification for a new facility when there are existing sites that could potentially be used. Paragraph 98 of the NPPF supports the use of shared spaces and community facilities to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. It has not been demonstrated that a shared space could be used, and the site is not considered to be in a sustainable location in accordance with the spatial strategy.

The development would therefore fail to comply with policy 7 (a) and 11 (2) (a) of the JCS and advice within paragraph 98 of the NPPF.

## **6.2 Design, layout and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

JCS at policy 8 (d) (i) and (ii) describes the principles that proposed development must take into account with regards to its effect on the character and appearance of an area.

The government at paragraph 135 (a) – (d) of the NPPF attach great importance to the design of built development. It goes on to advise that planning decisions should ensure that development will function well and add quality of the overall area; not just for the short term but over the life time of a development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the built environment and landscape setting, while not discouraging appropriate innovation and change (such as increased densities); establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangements of streets, space, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.

The National Design Guide, illustrates how well-designed places that are beautiful, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice. It forms part of the Government's collection of planning practice guidance and should be read alongside the separate planning practice guidance on design process and tools.

The application proposes a change of use of the existing residential dwelling to a church. To facilitate the change of use the existing rear additions are proposed to be demolished and a new single storey rear extension constructed which houses a foyer, toilets and a storeroom and a ramped access. There are no changes to the front elevation of the house.

The plans also show the demolition of an existing detached garage and the provision of two parking spaces within the front garden and 10 parking spaces in the rear garden.

Overstone Road is a linear road with residential dwellings on both sides running through the village of Sywell and Overstone (in West Northamptonshire Council's area). The section of road where the application site is located consists entirely of residential dwellings and therefore has a strong residential character. It is acknowledged that there are other uses along the road such as a primary school and shops however this section of road is residential in character. Policy 8 (d) (ii) is clear that new development should respond to the local topography and the overall form, character and landscape setting of the settlement. The change of use will result in differing car movements for the use which will not be consistent with a residential use.

In addition, the use of the front and rear gardens for a large number of parking spaces would remove the existing verdant garden areas, albeit somewhat overgrown currently, and would result in a site dominated by tarmac hardstanding which would not respect the overall character and appearance of the area.

Sywell Parish Council and a number of residents have objected to the proposals due to change in character of the site.

It is not considered that the change of use of a residential dwelling to a church in this location would be appropriate due to the change in character of the site from both the use and the parking areas proposed. The development would therefore fail to comply with policy 8 (d) (ii) in this regard.

### 6.3 **Landscape character and visual amenity**

Policy 3 (a), (b) and (e) of the JCS states that development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting retaining and where possible enhancing the distinctive qualities of the landscape character area which it would affect.

The development proposes to remove existing garden areas at the site and replace them with areas of tarmac hardstanding for off road parking to serve the church use. It is acknowledged that the existing gardens are overgrown due to the current vacant use of the site however replacing a residential garden with parking would not conserve or enhance the character and qualities of the local landscape through appropriate design and management as required by policy 3 (a) of the JCS.

The NNC Landscape Officer has provided the following comments on the application:

“The garden is currently in a state of neglect, and it is proposed to provide new planting which would be the subject of a planning condition.

The proposed close boarded fence on the west boundary would be within the root protection area of the significant conifer tree (from street view assumed to be a redwood) in the neighbour’s garden, but any damage should be minimal. The wall on the highway boundary would also be partly within the Root Protection Area.”

The plans show new low-level planting within the rear car park and close board fencing, walls and gates within the frontage. No detail is given on what the proposed planting may consist of however this could be agreed following the imposition of a landscaping condition.

However, it is not considered that the loss of a large amount of the rear garden area to tarmac for a parking area would either conserve or enhance the character of the site and would therefore be contrary to policy 3 (a) of the JCS. Some additional planting of trees is proposed to the rear of the site however this is to provide the biodiversity net gain uplift and is not considered to sufficiently soften the rear parking area and would be contrary to policy 3 (e) of the JCS.

The development would be contrary to policy 3 (a) and (e) of the JCS.

### 6.4 **Air quality**

The JCS at policy 8 amongst other things, requires development not to result in an unacceptable impact on neighbours by reason of pollution.

To ensure quality of life and safer and healthier communities the JCS at policy 8 (e) (i) requires development not to have an unacceptable impact on

amenities by reason of pollution, whilst 8 (e) (ii) goes further by stating that both new and existing development should be prevented from contributing to or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.

Chapter 15 of the NPPF offers broad advice on how local planning authorities should prevent both existing and new development from being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.

The PPG at paragraph 001 Reference ID: 32-001-20191101 revision date 01.11.2019 states that 'It is important that the potential impact of new development on air quality is taken into account in planning where the national assessment indicates that relevant limits have been exceeded or are near the limit'. The guidance goes on to explain the implications for local authorities if national objectives are not met which this will include measures in pursuit of the objectives which could have implications for planning.

The East Midlands region is looking to minimise the cumulative impact on local air quality that ongoing development has rather than looking at significance.

As the proposed development includes the provision for vehicle parking. A key theme of the NPPF is that developments should enable future occupiers to make "green" vehicle choices and paragraph 116 (e) "be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations". Policy 15 (c) of the JCS seeks for the design of development to give priority to sustainable means of transport including measures to contribute towards meeting the modal shift targets in the Northamptonshire Transportation Plan.

A condition should be imposed to prepare for the increased demand for electric vehicles in future years appropriate infrastructure for electric vehicle charging points should be included within the development.

Sywell Parish Council and a number of objectors have raised concerns regarding the increased number of cars and the impact of emissions on neighbouring amenity and the wider area.

Subject to the aforementioned condition the development would comply with policy 8 (e) (i) and (ii) and 15 (c) of the JCS.

## 6.5 **Biodiversity/Biodiversity Net Gain**

Paragraph 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, under the heading of 'duty to conserve biodiversity' states "every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity."

The JCS at policy 4 – biodiversity and geodiversity, sets out policy requirements for the protection and where possible, a net gain in biodiversity.

The NPPF at chapter 15 'conserving and enhancing the natural environment' sets out government views on minimising the impacts on biodiversity,

providing net gains where possible and contributing to halt the overall decline in biodiversity.

The application has been accompanied by a biodiversity net gain assessment and metric. The NNC Planning Ecologist has provided the following comments on the submission:

“The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment proposes a 10% net gain in habitat units and 503% increase in hedgerow units. NNC ecologist could not open the Excel spreadsheet to have a proper look at the metric and was only able to analyse the 6 PDF images provided, which miss out most of the information needed to see how this score has been calculated (although a summary is table is provided in the BNG report). As the site has already been partially cleared of trees and a hedgerow (which appears to have been non-native) some assumptions have been made in the assessment, based on the brash that was left on the ground at the time of the visit, and therefore the baseline value of the site is approximate only.

The linear habitat net gain is proposed to be provided by planting a new section of hedgerow between the car parking spaces and the fence, although on the block plan there is no gap suitable for a hedge in this location. Given the narrow nature of the site, leaving at least 2 metres for a new hedgerow would mean there would not be sufficient space to incorporate the proposed car parking, therefore this proposed gain has to be discounted due to being unfeasible.

The area habitat gains will be achieved by the planting of 12 new urban trees and the creation of an area of ‘other neutral grassland’ (ONG) under and between them. From Table 2 in the BNG report, they consider this grassland should be able to achieve a ‘good’ condition, which makes it equivalent to a species-diverse grassland/wildflower meadow. Since this part of the former back garden is currently dominated by non-native species (including cherry laurel and the WCA Schedule 9 invasive species cotoneaster) as well as bramble, and that the condition of any grassland created will be significantly reduced by these species if they remain on site, as well as by shading and leaf-fall from the existing and proposed new trees, this is an unrealistic assumption and therefore the proposed 10% net gain has to be discounted due to being unfeasible.

(Maintaining ONG in any condition would also require a specific management regime to be implemented, which would need to be detailed in another document. The difference in the score between the proposed ONG in good condition and something more realistic, although still ambitious for the site (for example modified grassland in good condition or ONG in poor condition) is significant (0.41 v 0.23/0.18 units)).

In summary, most of net gain comes from the proposed new tree planting but the only realistic option for achieving the mandatory 10% would be by buying some additional habitat units from an external provider, which may make this proposed change of use unviable.

Alternatively, a more proportionate approach is taken given the very limited impacts occurring at this site, in which a landscaping plan is conditioned for approval, to detail new tree and native hedgerow planting (and removal of invasive species if this is considered important in the context of a garden).

A standard BNG Informative will still be required to be added to the decision notice.”

The submitted BNG assessment is unrealistic in its recommendations and would not achieve the overall uplift in BNG stated as the proposals are unfeasible.

Concerns have been raised by a number of neighbouring objectors and Sywell Parish Council that the BNG proposals are not achievable.

The development would therefore fail to comply with policy 4 of the JCS in this regard.

#### **6.6 Living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers**

The JCS at policy 8 (e) (i) details policy relating to the protection of amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

At paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF the government requires new development to provide ‘a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users’.

The proposed change of use will result in a difference in the number of vehicle trips to and from the property. The plans show the rear and front gardens will be used for off road parking provision at the property.

The planning statement states that the church will only be used for 1-hour services at off peak times, three times per week and that the church will have a capacity of between 35 and 45 people at a time. The applicant states that there will be a reduction in the number of vehicle trips compared to the use of the site as a single residential dwelling.

The property is currently a 2 bedroomed bungalow which would be likely to have a maximum occupancy of 4 people and whilst the new church use is only proposed to be used for 3 hours per week, there would be between 35 and 45 people during these times. The planning statement says that the use will be ‘tidal’ with all users arriving and leaving at the same time. The majority of the parking provision will be within the rear garden and would therefore result in a large number of vehicles manoeuvring/parking at the same time. It is acknowledged that this would only be for short periods either side of the worship times 3 times a week however the intensity of the use during these times and the location of the parking is considered to have a negative impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring residential occupiers.

The increase in noise and vehicular movements to the site would therefore be considered to have a negative impact upon the amenity of the immediate neighbours and those in the vicinity of the application site. This would be contrary to policy 8 (e) (i) and (ii) which seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties and the wider area from noise from a development.

Concerns have been raised by Sywell Parish Council and a large number of neighbouring objectors regarding the impact of the proposals in relation to noise and loss of amenity/privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers.

The development would fail to comply with policy 8 (e) (i) and (ii) of the JCS and advice within in paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF.

#### 6.7 **Highway safety**

JCS policy 8 (b) (i) gives a number of requirements that new development should achieve with regards to highway, pedestrian and other sustainable transport matters.

JCS policy 8 (b) (ii) seeks to ensure a satisfactory means of access and provision for parking, servicing and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards.

There is an existing shared vehicular and pedestrian access to the property from Overstone Road and this is proposed to remain and will be 4.5 metres wide with new wall with railings, gate posts and gates. No elevational details of the proposed wall and railings, gateposts and gates have been provided however this has not been requested to be provided as the application is recommended for refusal on other grounds.

The Northamptonshire Parking Standards requires 1 space per 30 square metres of floor space for places of worship. The floor area of the church would be 94 sqm and therefore 3 spaces would be required. The application provides for 12 parking spaces, 2 of which are disabled spaces. This exceeds the parking requirement in the standards. However, the layout of the parking spaces has been raised as an issue by the local highway authority (LHA) as they would be unusable.

The NNC Highways Development Management Engineer has commented that there would be no objections on highway safety or capacity grounds subject to the following:

- Parking accommodation should be provided in accordance with the Northamptonshire Parking Standards and satisfy policy 8 (b) (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

- It is considered that use of the spaces, especially those allocated for disabled use, may prove difficult to manoeuvre into and out of to ensure vehicles enter and leave in a forward gear and tracking diagrams should be provided.

- The existing vehicular crossing must be made good and modified as appropriate and all highway surfaces affected by the proposals reinstated in accordance with the specification of the Local Highway Authority and subject to a suitable licence/agreement under the Highways Act 1980.

- The application site is not affected by a Public Right of Way

The NNC Highways Development Management Engineer has raised concerns regarding the use of the spaces and requested that vehicle tracking should be provided to demonstrate the usability of the spaces. This has not been requested as the application is recommended for refusal on other grounds.

It has not been demonstrated that the proposed off road parking arrangements provide sufficient manoeuvring space to allow all spaces to be used at the same time. This could result in vehicles reversing onto the Overstone Road which involves crossing the pavement running across the front of the property, causing potential conflicts with pedestrians and other vehicles using the highway.

Policy 8 (b) (i) of the JCS is clear that development should prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users and resisting development that would prejudice highway safety and 8 (b) (ii) ensure satisfactory means of access and provision for parking, servicing and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Paragraph 117 states at (c) that development should create places that are safe, secure and attractive which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles and respond to local character and design standards.

Sywell Parish Council and a large number of neighbouring objectors have raised concerns regarding the parking provision for the development and the impacts this would have on congestion in the village, particularly during school drop off/pick up times.

The application has not sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed parking arrangements are usable and would not result in conflicts with other users of the public highway so as not to prejudice highway safety.

The development therefore fails to comply with policy 8 (b) (i) and (ii) of the JCS and advice contained in paragraphs 116 and 117 (c) of the NPPF.

## **7. CONCLUSION/PLANNING BALANCE**

---

The proposed development does not comply with the relevant development plan policies and is inconsistent with the provisions in the NPPF. In the absence of any material considerations of sufficient weight, it is recommended that the proposal be refused.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION**

---

**REFUSE** for the following reason/s:

## **9. Reasons for Refusal**

---

1. The proposed change of use of the site to a church (Use Class F1 (f)) would

result in the loss of a residential dwelling in the rural area and it has not been demonstrated that the facility could not be provided more sustainably at a larger settlement nearby. The proposal has not demonstrated that the use of existing suitable sites and co-location/sharing of facilities has been explored. The proposed development would be contrary to policy 7 (a) and 11 (2) (a) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The change of use of a residential dwelling to a church and use of the rear garden as a car park would result in an unacceptable change to the residential character of the site and this section of Overstone Road. This would have a negative impact on the overall character and appearance of the immediate and wider locality. The proposed development would be contrary to policy 8 (d) (i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.
3. The loss of residential garden and its replacement with a large area of hardstanding for car parking would not conserve or enhance the character of the site and the proposed landscaping would not sufficiently mitigate the harm caused from this loss. The proposed development would be contrary to policy 3 (a) and (e) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.
4. The proposed biodiversity net gain measures set out in the submitted biodiversity net gain assessment are not achievable and the development would not therefore achieve a net gain in biodiversity of at least 10%. The proposed development would be contrary to policy 4 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 187 (d) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. The increase in noise from vehicular movements and use of the site as a church will have a negative impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residential occupiers and occupiers in the vicinity due to the intensity of use of the site. The proposed development would be contrary to policy 8 (e) (i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. The application has not sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed off road parking provision would be usable through the submission of vehicular tracking drawings. This could result in vehicles reversing out of the site increasing the potential for conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and other highway users. The proposed development would be contrary to policy 8 (b) (i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and paragraphs 116 and 117 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Informative/s**

1. This refusal is based on the following submitted plans/reports:  
Drawing number NVGHT-573-SUR-010 - Site Location Plan (registered 20 November 2024)  
Drawing number NVGHT-573-SUR-020 - Existing Floor Plan and Elevations (registered 20 November 2024)

Drawing number NVGHT-573-PA-010 - Proposed Floor Plan, Elevations and Block Plan (registered 20 November 2024)

Planning Statement by Andrew Beard Planning (report reference ABP/0566 dated 14 November 2024) (registered 20 November 2024)

Baseline Habitat Condition Assessment by Arbtech dated 10 September 2024 (registered 20 November 2024)

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Issue 2 by Arbtech dated 30 September 2024 (registered 20 November 2024)

Biodiversity Metric Spreadsheet (registered 20 November 2024)

2. In accordance with the provisions in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and pursuant to paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework, where possible and feasible, either through discussions, negotiations or in the consideration and assessment of this application and the accompanying proposals, the council as the local planning authority endeavoured to work with the applicant/developer in a positive and proactive way to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the relevant provisions in the framework.
  
3. Link to Policies for Refusals -  
[https://www.nnjpdu.org.uk/site/assets/files/1086/joint\\_core\\_strategy\\_2011-2031\\_high\\_res\\_version\\_for\\_website.pdf](https://www.nnjpdu.org.uk/site/assets/files/1086/joint_core_strategy_2011-2031_high_res_version_for_website.pdf)

### Delegated Item Authorisation

<b>Case Officer Signature:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>14/01/2025</b>
<b>Authorising Officer signature:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>15.01.2025</b>