



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2009

by **A J Wilson BA MA DipLA 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 May 2009

Appeal Ref: **APP/H0738/A/08/2092950** **244 Norton Road, Stockton, Cleveland, TS20 2BS**

- 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 Kent against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 08/2851/FUL, dated 13 September 2008, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2008.
 - The development proposed is a rear single-storey extension and conversion of a 2 bedroom house into 2 flats.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a rear single-storey extension and conversion of a 2 bedroom house into 2 flats at 244 Norton Road, Stockton, Cleveland in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 08/2851/FUL, dated 13 September 2008, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the condition that the development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the free flow of traffic and highway safety in Norton Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling situated on the corner of the junction where Larkhill Square meets Norton Road. The principal road is one of the main arterial routes linking Stockton-on-Tees with the A19 and the Council's evidence on traffic flows demonstrates that it is a very busy route. There are no traffic regulation orders in operation which would prevent parking in front of the appeal property. Nevertheless, I consider that the volume of traffic, together with the narrowness of the carriageway arising from the central road markings, would almost certainly deter any casual parking on Norton Road, either short or long term. The Council accepts that this is likely to be the case and, indeed, two vehicles belonging to persons working at the site during my site visit were parked in the side streets, off Norton Road, to the north and south of the appeal site. I consider, therefore, that even if the proposed development does generate the demand for additional on-street parking, this would be very unlikely to take place on Norton Road outside the property.
-

4. The Council has produced a supplementary planning document (SPD) entitled *Parking Provision for New Developments* which records that 1.25 spaces should be provided for each new unit of accommodation in flatted development. However, the site is within walking distance of local services and facilities and very frequent bus services operate along Norton Road to and from the larger shopping, service and employment destinations. In such a location, therefore, prospective occupiers of the modest accommodation to be offered by the two flats would have excellent opportunities to use more sustainable forms of transport and to choose not to own a private vehicle.
5. The SPD also indicates that, in certain circumstances, departures from the standard will be considered. In this respect, the existing dwelling has no off-street parking area available to it and any vehicles owned by its occupants would currently park on-street in Larkhill Square, alongside the gable wall of the property. Moreover, I see no reason to doubt the appellant's suggestion that such an on-street parking arrangement would also be available for any parking demand arising from the additional unit to be created.
6. I have had regard to the Council's evidence that the number of on-street parking spaces in this narrow cul-de-sac is relatively limited; and that the absence of off-street parking for the other, existing dwellings in Larkhill Square means that there is pressure on the available spaces. I also acknowledge that vehicle turning manoeuvres must take place in the entrances to the two, narrow, rear service roads which, I understand, are soon to be gated as part of a programme of local environmental improvement. Nevertheless, although it would become more difficult to turn a vehicle in the street after the implementation of the gating scheme, I consider that it would still be possible to do so. I also consider that the drivers of existing parked vehicles would be more likely to carry out such a manoeuvre, however difficult this might be, rather than reverse blind into the busy main road. I do not consider that the extra parking demand that might arise from the proposed, single, additional unit would make this existing situation materially worse; or that it would necessarily result in any significantly increased risk of potentially dangerous reversing manoeuvres into Norton Road.
7. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would not be sufficiently detrimental to the free flow of traffic or highway safety in Norton Road to infringe the terms of saved Policy GP1 of the *Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan*.
8. The Council's delegated report indicates that there are no objections to the use of the property as two flats; to their internal arrangements; or to the erection of the rear extension. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. I have not been alerted to any conditions which the Council would wish to apply in the event of permission being granted and I shall therefore attach only the standard time condition required by the legislation.

Anthony J Wilson

INSPECTOR