
Appeal Decision APP/H0738/A/06/2005216

consider that the site is large enough to meet these technical requirements and that they could be appropriately secured by the imposition of a reasonable planning condition.

4. Whilst I accept that there would be some extra traffic generated by the proposed dwelling, I do not consider that the movement of the additional vehicles to and from the access and along Brisbane Road would pose a sufficiently material risk to highway safety to infringe the relevant sub-sections of Policies GP1, HO3 or HO11 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (1997).

Trees and landscape

5. The site occupies a discrete location, separated from the retained rear garden of No 10 by a substantial conifer hedge, and it contains a number of other trees, shrubs and hedges. I acknowledge that this mature landscape displays an attractive appearance that merges seamlessly with both the naturalised planting growing alongside the former railway line at the rear of the site and with the more formal garden trees growing on the properties in Briar Walk. However, I am satisfied that the site is sufficiently large to allow a modest dwelling to be built, together with its parking and turning areas (that could also be used for any short term materials storage) without prejudice to the future retention of the protected trees growing on the eastern site boundary. I also consider that careful siting of the building and hardstandings could also be satisfactorily arranged to ensure the retention of the best of the other, unprotected, mature trees and shrubs growing in the garden. Moreover, there would be an appropriate area of garden/amenity space within which to provide some new specimen planting to ensure continuity of tree and shrub cover in the longer term.
6. I am satisfied, therefore, that the development could proceed without causing any unacceptable harm to the existing landscape elements of the site or to the character and appearance of its surroundings. The proposal would therefore comply with relevant sub-sections of Local Plan Policies GP1, HO3 and HO11 in this respect.

Living conditions

7. A single-storey building is suggested in the statement supporting the application and this could be required by planning condition. I accept that parts of a bungalow would be visible from the large gardens of the dwellings to either side, but I do not consider that its presence would have any serious overbearing effect, or any other undue adverse impact, on the enjoyment of these garden spaces by the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. I also consider that any dwelling on the site would be sufficiently far away from the houses themselves to avoid any material effect on their outlooks. Nor would there be any significant risk of overlooking or loss of privacy, as this could be successfully addressed by reserving finished floor levels for later approval, by restricting rooms with windows in the roofspace and by the retention of the high timber fences and hedges along the common garden boundaries. All of these requirements could also be dealt with by the imposition of conditions.
8. However, amongst other things, the occupiers of No 8 object to the proposed access being alongside their garden and to the extra noise and light pollution that would arise from traffic using it. In this regard, the shared access would run in between the two frontage dwellings before continuing as a private driveway, passing alongside a significant section of the common garden boundary with No 8 to reach the main body of the site. As a consequence, I have no doubt that the occupiers of this neighbouring house would be acutely aware of the