

Action Point 117: EN39 Former Select and Save site, Irthlingborough – reasons for refusal for the planning applications associated with the site

Refusal

20/01181/FUL

Erection of block of 6 flats with associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping

Appeal dismissed - 26.05.2022

This appeal against non-determination was dismissed. The Appeal statement listed the following objections:

- the effect of the proposal on the respective settings of a Grade I Listed Building (LB), namely St Peter's Church, and a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), namely Louisa Lilly Almshouses,
- the effect of the proposal on the setting and significance of the Irthlingborough Conservation Area (ICA),
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area,
the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of existing neighbouring properties, especially numbers 1, 2 and 3 Oak Terrace and the Louisa Lilly Almshouses, with particular regard to outlook and privacy,
- whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to noise disturbance, outlook and car parking, and
- whether the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, with particular regard to car parking and access

Inspector's Reasons:

"Planning Balance and Conclusion

50. As noted above, great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, irrespective of the level of harm. The provision of 6 residential units would make a modest contribution to the area's housing needs, which would be of public benefit, to which I attach moderate weight. The proposal would also provide economic benefits, both during the construction phase and post completion, which would also be of public benefit.

As the scale of the economic benefits would be relatively minor, I attach limited weight to this factor. I therefore conclude that the public benefits do not outweigh the harm I have found in respect of the significance of the designated heritage assets.

51. I also conclude that the social and economic benefits outlined do not outweigh the harm I have found in respect of the NDHA.

Notwithstanding the conclusions I have reached with regard to living conditions of future occupiers and highways safety matters, I consider the

harm to significance of the designated and non-designated heritage assets, the character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions of occupiers of existing neighbouring properties result in the proposal being contrary to the development plan considered as a whole. The benefits of the scheme do not outweigh this harm.

52. Consequently, there are no other considerations that lead me to conclude other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons outlined, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.”

Additional information:

:

20/00997/FUL

Erection of block of 8 flats with associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping

Appeal allowed - 26.05.2022. This appeal submitted against non-determination was allowed.

NE/21/00421/FUL

Demolition of existing first floor ancillary retail area and erection of two floors containing 8 residential units with associated car and cycle parking and refuse store

Permitted - 21.07.2021