

DELEGATED

AGENDA NO  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE 12<sup>th</sup> July 2006

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF  
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD  
SERVICES

**Revised application for two storey extension and ramp for disabled access 1 The Mews,  
Station Road, Eaglescliffe 06/1581/REV**

### **SUMMARY**

1. The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey extension and ramp for disabled access at the property 1 The Mews, Station Road, Eaglescliffe.
2. The main considerations of the application are the affect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the existing property and wider conservation area and the potential impact on the amenities of neighbours.
3. The application is considered to be in line with policies GP1, HO12 and EN24 and recommended for approval.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Planning application 06/1581/REV be **Approved with Conditions** subject to:

#### ***Accordance with Plans***

- 01.** *The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.  
Drawing Number(s) :- SBC 001,002,003*

*Reason: To define the consent.*

#### ***Building materials***

- 02.** *Notwithstanding any description of the materials in the application no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roofs of the building(s) have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control details of the proposed development.*

***The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Structure Plan and Stockton on Tees Local Plan. set out below GP1 and HO12,EN24***

## **THE PROPOSAL**

4. The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey extension and ramp for disabled access at the property 1 The Mews, Station Road, Eaglescliffe. The extension will create a disabled bathroom shower room at ground floor level and extend the existing bedroom at first floor level. The extension proposed is 2.3m in length and 3.5m wide.
5. A disabled ramp is proposed towards the entrance of the currently stepped property within the rear yard area.
6. The property is an existing two storey one bedroom cottage and the property will remain a one bedroom property which more appropriate facilities for a disabled user.
7. The proposals will see the removal of an existing ground floor rear window which faces into the rear alleyway.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

The following Consultations were notified and any comments they made are below:-

### **Councillors**

#### **Councillor Mrs Rigg**

The comments which I make are based on the information before me at present and my opinion may change in the light of any further evidence in the future.

In general I support efforts to make housing accessible for those with mobility difficulties, and that seems to be the principle behind this application. However, I am at a loss to understand the need for a bathroom on each floor when there is only one bedroom in the property, and that bedroom is on the first floor. I am also surprised that a ramp is proposed without a guard rail of any sort, running parallel to the building frontage and approximately 1m wide judging by the drawing. I regularly push a relative's wheelchair which is approx 70cm wide so I question the safety of trying to turn a wheelchair from the door onto the ramp and vice versa in this application. Can one of the occupational therapists from CESC be consulted on the access issues please?

### **Parish Council**

No comments received

### **Occupational Therapist**

Confirmed by telephone not their department who responds to consults as not technical officers consult Urban Renewal.

### **Engineers and Transportation**

No adverse comments to make regarding the application

### **Urban Renewal - Mr Dave Dawson**

No comments received

## **NEIGHBOURS**

### **Gordon Steel by email**

The plans do not show the proposed extension in context with the adjacent properties, it is not possible to assess the impact of increased building density in an already restricted space. Objects to the application due to building density, adverse impact on amenity of the conservation area, The

Mews consists of three properties and PPG3 states that developments should provide amenity space. The new extension and wheel chair access will use up the amenity space available affecting all residents.

With the exception of 15 Station Rd all the other buildings on the building line are single storey in height (consisting of garage) and the new building will overwhelm the site. The plans are incomplete and incorrect. The suggestion that the property will be suitable for a disabled person is worrying as there is only one access point via a single width alleyway, difficult to access.

Inadequate parking provision, PPG 3 states 1.5 spaces per plot. No provision for wheelie bin storage. How will building work take place and concerns that site access will be through the alleyway, this is a constricted space that will not be able to accommodate large construction vehicles.

**Vicki Thompson**

**Chair EPAG, C/o 4 Ashville Avenue**

The application contravenes SPG 4 as this part of Eaglescliffe is unsuitable for a disabled person. Concerns over access to the train station for the resident, parking difficulties and emergency vehicle access.

Inadequate parking provision and will compound the existing parking problems.

No facilities for wheelie bin storage in the area, further obstructions and hazards would not be acceptable.

Building works in the narrow alley would impact on the safety and privacy of neighbours which is unacceptable.

**Alan Taylor, 576 Yarm Road**

Object on the grounds that it will reduce his privacy. Would also like assurances from SBC that the proximity is within permitted guidelines and that the resulting building density does not exceed the value set out in PPG3.

Objects on the grounds that there is already inadequate parking (1 space for 3 flats) and the application will result in no parking provision. PPG3 states 1.5 spaces per flat. He has concerns that both residents and visitors will park in the alley directly obstructing access to his property. Objects because there is no provision for the storage of wheelie bins and it is likely these will be put on the alley restricting access to his property.

Has concerns about how the developer plans to access the property to carry out the work and therefore objects on the grounds that the work cannot be carried out safely without impacting severely on his access:

- SBC has already advised that access will not be granted via Hughenden
- Access via the alley is difficult since it is narrow and restricted. In addition Mr Nelson's grandchildren play around the rear of the house and would be at risk from commercial vehicles.

**Frances Campbell**

**South Lodge, The Avenue**

Objects to the application. Unsuitable entrance for a disabled person or wheelchair user. It is a narrow alleyway, restricted and would be particularly difficult for a disabled user. Eaglescliffe is not user friendly for any disabled person, and this is not a suitable site for a disabled persons dwelling. Direct access to the home and travelling on public transport would be difficult. The ramp to the railway station is steep and not suitable for anyone other than the able bodied.

There is no amenity space and the disabled access would use all of the amenity space available. This contravenes PPG3 and would also have an adverse impact on all residents of the Mews.

There is inadequate parking provision. cars cannot park in the alleyway and the cobbled alleyway would make access for the disabled difficult it is likely that a disabled person would require a vehicle and this is not a suitable location.

**Lisa Taylor by email**

The plans do not show the proposed extension in context with the adjacent properties, it is not possible to assess the impact of increased building density in an already restricted space. Objects to the application due to building density, adverse impact on amenity of the conservation area, The Mews consists of three properties and PPG3 states that developments should provide amenity space. The new extension and wheel chair access will use up the amenity space available affecting all residents.

With the exception of 15 Station Rd all the other buildings on the building line are single storey in height (consisting of garage) and the new building will overwhelm the site. The plans are incomplete and incorrect. The suggestion that the property will be suitable for a disabled person is worrying as there is only one access point via a single width alleyway, difficult to access.

Inadequate parking provision, PPG 3 states 1.5 spaces per plot. No provision for wheelie bin storage. How will building work take place and concerns that site access will be through the alleyway, this is a constricted space that will not be able to accommodate large construction vehicles.

**Mrs E Taylor  
25 Pennypot Lane, Eaglescliffe**

This area is already overdeveloped in line with PPG3 on top of which it is supposed to be a conservation area.

The disabled ramp will take up half of the existing amenity space. Where will the wastes bins be stored there is already a problem. At present there is already one space for parking which will be lost if this goes ahead leaving three flats with no parking, contrary to the recommended 1.5 spaces of PPG 3. Parking in the alley could affect the occupants of 576 Yarm roads access to their property, there is already congestion in the area.

Concerns over construction and access and potential disruption to residents.

**PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATION**

Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, section 54A of the Town and Country planning Act requires that an application for planning permission shall be determined in accordance with the Plan, unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.

The relevant development plan in this case is the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

**Policy GP1**

Proposals for development will be assessed in relation to the policies of the Cleveland Structure Plan and the following criteria as appropriate:

- (i) The external appearance of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area;
- (ii) The effect on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties;
- (iii) The provision of satisfactory access and parking arrangements;
- (iv) The contribution of existing trees and landscape features;
- (v) The need for a high standard of landscaping;

- (vi) The desire to reduce opportunities for crime;
- (vii) The intention to make development as accessible as possible to everyone;
- (viii) The quality, character and sensitivity of existing landscapes and buildings;
- (ix) The effect upon wildlife habitats;
- (x) The effect upon the public rights of way network.

#### **Policy EN24**

New development within conservation areas will be permitted where:

- (i) The siting and design of the proposal does not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area; and
- (ii) The scale, mass, detailing and materials are appropriate to the character and appearance of the area

#### **Policy HO12**

Where planning permission is required, all extensions to dwellings should be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and should avoid significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties.

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2, Householder Extension Guide**

#### **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8. The application site 1 The Mews is situated to the rear of Station Road and accessed through an existing rear alleyway. The site lies within the Eaglescliffe with Preston Conservation area.
9. The existing dwelling is a small one-bedroom cottage. Situated towards the rear of station Road the property is accessed down an existing cobbled alleyway. The property currently benefits from no parking provision and has limited amenity space, which is used for servicing such as bin storage rather than as usable amenity space.
10. The main considerations of the application are the affect of the proposals on the appearance of the existing dwelling, street scene and surrounding conservation and the potential impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
11. There have been several concerns raised by objectors mainly to parking provision for the property, with one objector stating that an existing car parking space will be lost through the development. The property currently has no incurtilage car parking provision. As the proposal is only for an extension to an existing one bedroom dwelling which will not increase the bedroom capacity of the property, it is not considered that the current car parking arrangements will differ or worsen with the proposed development. The property tenure is not proposed to change therefore It would be unreasonable in this instance to insist on extra car parking provision when currently none is available. In addition the Head of Engineering and Transportation has no objections to the proposals.
12. Issues such as access for emergency vehicles are also extraneous, this is an existing dwelling and the access facilities available for emergency vehicles will not be altered or compromised by the proposal. The rear alleyway is an adopted highway and problems such

as hazards and unauthorised use can be dealt with by the Head of Engineering and Transportation underway highway legislation.

13. The proposed ramp will take up some of the existing outdoor space (this is a metre wide strip 8.1m in length across the front of the property), as stated previously this space is not used at present for amenity purposes due to its constrained nature and sheltered location. Provision will remain for bin storage and for neighbours to gain satisfactory access their properties. The applicant has amended the design of the ramp to ensure minimal visual disruption to the property so that the ramp is not an obtrusive feature in the conservation area. The ramp is considered to be a minimal addition which is required for disabled access due to the property being stepped.
14. This is a revised application the previous application for a ramp was designed with a guard and hand rail and was more visually intrusive. This did not comply with building regulations due to the spacing of the proposed railings and gradient. The current ramp gradient means there is no requirement under building regulations for a hand or guard rail and the ramp is considered suitable in building regulation terms for a disabled user. The rail removal has alleviated the concerns regarding the visual aesthetics of the ramp in the street scene and the current design is now considered acceptable.
15. Neighbours also have concerns that this property and the neighbouring vicinity are not suitable for a disabled resident. Should a disabled person choose to reside here it is considered that the current proposals will ensure access to the property and the facilities in general would be improved for someone with physical disabilities. To clarify the property and proposals do comply with the requirements of building regulations for a disabled residence. Any person choosing to live in the property would do so on its suitability for their own requirements and it is not a planning matter to determine which users groups are suitable to reside in certain properties or locations.
16. The extension is a sympathetically designed proposal, which will not greatly alter the existing building from its current appearance. The roof will be hipped to minimise massing and follow the existing roof line. It is not considered that the extension will have any adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, which due to their siting are not considered to be affected by the proposals.
17. There is an existing window on the rear side elevation which looks into the rear alleyway. The proposed extension removes this window leaving no windows looking into the alleyway. A new ground floor window is proposed looking into the yard of the Mews towards Hugendon. It is not considered that these window changes will have any adverse impact on the amenities of neighbours. Indeed it is considered that removal of the alley-facing window will reduce any opportunities for overlooking. The extension will not overshadow or dominant neighbouring properties and the design is in keeping with the existing property.
18. There has also been two objections on the basis that all the other properties in the rear alley are single storey to the rear, with the exception of 15 Station Road. As can be seen on site this is inaccurate, the Mews itself is current two storeys in height and although it is noted there are a miss match of rear extensions within the alleyway (the majority of which are single storey) it is not considered that the current proposals will be out of character with the street scene or neighbouring properties in the vicinity, many of which have two storey extensions to the rear.
19. Neighbours object on the grounds that the development does not comply with guidelines set out in PPG3 in terms of amenity space. The property currently features a small amount of amenity space which largely takes on a service role. Although this area will be reduced in

size the loss is marginal and is not considered to have any adverse impact on occupiers of the dwelling.

**CONCLUSION**

20. the application is considered to be in keeping with the property in terms of design and is not considered to have any adverse impact on the amenities of the Eaglescliffe with Preston Conservation Area or neighbouring properties and the application is recommended for approval with conditions in line with policies GP1,HO12 and EN24 and in accordance with SPG 2.

**Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services  
Contact Officer Miss Fiona Short  
Telephone No 01642 526271  
Email address development.control@stockton.gov.uk**

**Ward Eaglescliffe  
Ward Councillor Councillor M. F. Cherrett**

**Ward Eaglescliffe  
Ward Councillor Councillor J. A. Fletcher**

**Ward Eaglescliffe  
Ward Councillor Councillor Mrs M. Rigg**