



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2009

by **B.S.Rogers BA(Hons), DipTP, 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:
29 April 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/A/09/2093400 1 Elton Road, Billingham, Cleveland, TS22 5HW

- 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 Ms G.Crosby against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 08/3094/FUL, dated 3 October 2008, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2008.
- The development proposed is conversion of garage into playroom.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the impact of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house which has been extended such that it now has 4 bedrooms. The Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan Policy GP1 seeks to ensure adequate access and parking arrangements. This is amplified in the Council's 2006 adopted SPD3: *Parking Provision for New Developments*, which indicates that a house with this number of bedrooms should have 3 spaces; this would include a garage space.
4. At present, the driveway is wide enough to accommodate 2 cars in addition to the garage space. The proposal would remove the garage space but the appellants point out that a further space is available at an angle in front of the house. I appreciate that this space can not be used independently but that situation is little different from the present use of the garage, which would also require the moving of a vehicle parked in the driveway to permit access or egress.
5. Whilst I accept that the appellants are able in principle to comply with the Council's standard, the proposed insertion of a bow window into the former garage opening would diminish the effective length of the driveway, which is already below the Council's normal requirement of 4.8m. This is likely to lead to vehicles overhanging the footway, which would be harmful to pedestrian safety and contrary to Policy GP1. For this reason, the appeal should fail.

B.S.Rogers

Inspector
