



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2007

by **Christopher John Checkley**
BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
11 October 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/A/07/2046043

4 Alpha Grove, Stockton-on-Tees, TS20 2HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs A Maddison against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application Ref 06/1876/REV, dated 1 June 2006, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2006.
- The development proposed is amendments to original plans.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The determining issue is the effect of the amended scheme upon the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and pedestrians on the highway, having regard to levels of on-street car parking.

Reasons

3. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No 2: Householder Extension Guide (SPG2), adopted in 2004, indicates that garages should normally be a minimum of 6m long by 3m wide (measured externally) to enable a car and a bike to be parked inside. Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments (DPD3), adopted in 2006, suggests that in-curtilage spaces should normally be 6m long, but that in constrained circumstances the length may be reduced to 5m. DPD3 indicates that a 4-bedroom house in this location should have up to 3 spaces provided within its curtilage.
4. Planning permission was granted in 1999 (ref 99/1214/P) for a 2-storey extension to the side and rear of the house that included 2 parking spaces in the form of a garage and a carport (the approved scheme). I have not been supplied with copies of the approved plans and there is disagreement on their content. The Council say that the approved plans indicated that the garage would have internal dimensions of 2.4m width by 4.7m length, whilst the appellant understands the approved length to have been 4.5m. I do not have sufficient evidence before me to form a conclusion on the matter, although it appears that the approved length was below that recommended in the

Council's standards. The approved provision of 2 spaces in number was below the Council's maximum standard of 3 spaces. In this location, I consider it reasonable to require the provision of 2 on-site spaces of adequate size to meet the parking needs of a 4-bedroomed house.

5. The appeal seeks permission for variations from the approved plans which include the substitution of one large garage in place of the approved carport and garage. The large garage, which has already been built, has a garage door only about 3.5m in width and approximate internal dimensions of 5.2m/5.3m width by 4.5m length (about 4.4m length to the back of the garage door). The drive is well below 4m long. Thus, the scheme as built is unable to provide any parking spaces within the curtilage of the size recommended in the Council's standards. Therefore, all parking associated with this extended 4-bedroomed house currently needs to take place on the street. The submitted plans propose slightly increasing the internal length of the garage but only across the existing doorway, so this would provide only one useable space. The result would be that some of the everyday parking needs of the house would permanently need to take place on the roadside of this cul-de-sac of limited width, potentially restricting intervisibility between pedestrians and vehicle drivers, and impeding vehicle movements and access into and out of driveways.
6. The Council raise no objection to the design or appearance of the extended dwelling or its effect on the living conditions of neighbours through overlooking and I find no unacceptable effects in either regard. I note the appellant's allegation that she was not made aware that written approval was necessary for the proposed amendments to the approved scheme before commencing construction. However, I have no jurisdiction over these matters and I am obliged to focus in this appeal on consideration of the planning merits of the scheme now before me. I have taken account of the appellant's other comments, including the financial implications of amending the garage to hold 2 cars, but none of the points raised are sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.
7. I conclude that the harmful effect upon the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and pedestrians on the highway resulting from increased on-street parking would be contrary to Policy GP1 of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan which seeks the provision of satisfactory parking arrangements.

C J Checkley

INSPECTOR