

East Northamptonshire Council

DC Appeal Results

For Period from: 06 Jul 2015 to : 07 Aug 2015

Officer

Case Ref. No.	Appellant	Location	Appeal Type	Date Decided	Decision
---------------	-----------	----------	-------------	--------------	----------

Anna Lee

Written Representations

14/00793/FUL	Mr J Bingley	OP5946 TF9902 Main Road Collyweston	Against Refusal	20/07/2015	Dismissed
--------------	--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	------------	------------------

The application was refused as the proposal would poorly relate to the built form, appear unduly prominent and obtrusive in the landscape and would detract from the open and rural character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector noted that the proposed stable would be prominent and the walls, gates and piers features would have a suburban and domestic appearance. In addition, the already constructed 2.4 metre high close boarded fence and post and rail fence appear intrusive in the landscape. The appeal was dismissed as the Inspector concluded that the development would harm the character and appearance of the countryside.

Carolyn Tait

Written Representations

14/02288/FUL	Mr Sohan Singh	King Edward VII 158 Queen Street Rushden	Against Refusal	29/07/2015	Dismissed
--------------	----------------	--	-----------------	------------	------------------

Planning permission was refused for two reasons. Firstly the applicant failed to submit sufficient information to demonstrate that the public house was no longer needed by the local community, that it was no longer viable as a public house, or that it could be used for any other community purpose. Secondly, it was considered that the proposal would have resulted in an increase in on-street parking in the immediate vicinity which would have had a detrimental impact on highway safety.

The Inspector considered that there was sufficient evidence to conclude that the premises has poor prospects of viable operation as a public house and that there are sufficient public houses in the local area to serve the local community if the existing use were to cease. However, the Inspector noted that the applicant had not given anyone else the opportunity to run the proposal as a public house or any other community facility. He stated that the loss of a community facility without consideration of other uses should not be done lightly and that previous marketing of the site had ruled out interest by potential future occupiers. Therefore, on this matter, he concluded that the change of use would have resulted in the unjustified loss of a community facility contrary to the NPPF and policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

With regards to parking, the Inspector considered the site to be in a sustainable location, within a short walking distance of the town centre, and that the proposed apartments would be small, limiting the ownership of cars. The Inspector concluded that a smaller number of cars would increase pressure on parking in the immediate area, but not to an excessive degree.

Decided Appeals Dismissed :	2	100.00%	
Decided Appeals Allowed :	0	0.00%	M Denotes Member
Decided Appeals Withdrawn :	0	0.00%	Decision against
Decided Appeals Total :	2	100.00%	Officer advice

