



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 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.
ov.uk

Decision date:
13 December 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/A/07/2052003

18 Branksome Grove, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 5DD

- 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 Mr Mark Thomas against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application (Ref 07/1500/FUL) dated 18 May 2005, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2007.
- The development proposed is a two storey extension plus single storey extension to rear.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. There are 2 main issues regarding the effects of the proposed extension. The first is the effect upon the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at No 20 Branksome Grove, with particular regard to visual impact and outlook. The second is the effect upon highway safety, having particular regard to the parking arrangements proposed.

Reasons

The living conditions of the neighbouring residents at No 20 Branksome Grove

3. The neighbouring semi-detached house at No 20 Branksome Grove is on a corner plot on a bend near the head of the cul-de-sac. At present the first floor windows in the side of No 20 are separated from the 2-storey gable of No 18 by the attached single-storey garages of both houses and the narrow undeveloped gaps adjoining their shared boundary. The plans before me indicate that this separation at first floor level would be significantly reduced to a distance of only about 6m, well below the 11m guideline that applies to such situations in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Guide (SPG2).
4. I conclude that there would be a significant and unacceptably overbearing effect and loss of outlook for the affected first floor windows in the side of No 20, particularly since the proposed extension would lie to the south where it would cast an enlarged shadow over the neighbouring property. This harmful effect would be contrary to the provisions of Policies GP1 and HO12 of the

adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (LP) and the associated SPG2, which seek to prevent significant loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. My conclusion is not affected by the knowledge that the current occupants of that property have not objected to the scheme.

The effect upon highway safety, having regard to parking arrangements

5. Under the guidelines within Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments (SPD2), the Council requires the provision of up to 2 spaces within the curtilage for a 3-bedroomed house and a maximum of 3 spaces within the site for a 4-bedroomed house. In this case, the on-site parking provision of 2 spaces for the existing 3-bedroomed house would remain the same for the proposed 4-bedroomed house after the extension.
6. Most houses in the vicinity have drives and garages meeting the parking needs of individual dwellings. There is no evidence before me of a serious problem with levels of on-street parking and I would expect levels of traffic on this cul-de-sac to be low. I am mindful also that the parking standards are maximum figures rather than minimum levels.
7. I conclude on this second issue that there is no evidence that the parking arrangements proposed would result in so significant an increase in on-street parking that a significant reduction in the safety of highway users would result. Therefore, I find no conflict would arise with the road safety objectives underlying LP Policy GP1 and SPD2.

Other matters and conclusions

8. I saw that the relationship between the existing side extensions at Numbers 2 and 4 was not directly comparable with the relationship between the appeal proposal and No 20. I have determined this case on its merits. Although I have found in favour of the appellant under the second issue, this does not alter the clear-cut objection under the first issue. Therefore, the appeal must fail.

C J Checkley

INSPECTOR