

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

2 FEBRUARY 2011

**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES**

10/2713/FPD

10 Chedworth Court, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees

Proposal to build parking area in rear garden and installation of new access gates in existing fence.

Expiry Date 15 February 2011

SUMMARY

This application seeks planning permission for the provision of a new vehicle access and parking area for the existing house at 10 Chedworth Court, Ingleby Barwick. The main planning considerations with regard to this application are the impact on the street scene, the impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties and highway safety.

Letters of objection have been received from nine sources and support has come from two different correspondents. The objectors are concerned about the impact on the overall parking provision in the cul-de-sac and that it would be a reduction in the number of the street parking spaces available to residents. In accordance with the approved scheme of delegation the application is reported to the Planning Committee for determination.

The dwellings at Chedworth Court have each had parking in garages and private spaces laid out and constructed, all of which are sufficient for their own needs. Some of these private parking areas are accesses by individual driveways and others by surfaces shared by several dwellings. The number of accesses onto Chedworth Court limits the lengths between them for on road kerb side parking. Most of the kerbside parking is around the frontage of the applicant's property. The existing off road car parking provision for the applicant's and all other dwellings is sufficient to meet the standards in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Development. The provision of additional private parking space is not contrary to the advice in this document or the Core Strategy, Local Plan or Government planning advice.

The Head of Technical Services considers that the proposed access and car parking space would be acceptable in terms of highway safety, subject to the gates not opening over the public highway and loose surfacing materials being kept back from the highway. The Head of Technical Services has also requested that as many of the bushes are retained as possible on the highway verge where the access would be formed. These matters can be controlled by condition.

It is considered that the development would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the street scene or lead to an adverse loss of amenity for neighbouring properties. Any loss to highway safety is not supported by the Head of Technical Services and sufficient to warrant a refusal of permission. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy CS3, Saved Policies of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan and to the advice given within Supplementary Planning

Guidance 2: Householder Extension Guide, February 2004 and Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006.

The application is recommended for approval subject to a condition to ensure that the materials match those of the existing house.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning application 10/2713/FPD be Approved subject to the following conditions:-

- 01 *The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.***

<i>Plan Reference Number</i>	<i>Date on Plan</i>
<i>SBC0003</i>	<i>20 October 2010</i>
<i>SBC0006</i>	<i>21 December 2010</i>
<i>SBC0007</i>	<i>21 December 2010</i>
<i>SBC0001A</i>	<i>18 January 2011</i>
<i>SBC0008A</i>	<i>18 January 2011</i>

Reason: To define the consent.

- 02 *The hard surfacing materials for the access and parking area shall be Beamish Cobble Block paving or as otherwise may be approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surfacing material shall be laid so as to be permeable or to allow run off to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling. No unbound material such as gravel shall be used unless a 1.5m wide hard surfaced buffer strip is provided adjacent to the public highway for the full width of the access.***

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development for surface water disposal and to ensure that loose materials are prevented from being carried onto the highway in the interests of highway safety.

- 03 *The gates for the hereby approved access shall match the height and materials of the existing boundary fence or as otherwise as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority and shall not constructed so as to be able to open over the public highway.***

Reason: in the interests of visual amenity and highway safety.

BACKGROUND

1. The housing estate was constructed following the granting of Full planning permission under reference No.02/2393/P. The approved scheme was for residential development of 86 dwellings.
2. A conservatory has been added to the rear of No.10 Chedworth Court following conditional planning permission under reference No.04/1417/FUL.
3. Retrospective permission was granted for the erection of a summerhouse in the rear garden, under application reference No.09/0838/FUL.

PROPOSAL

4. The proposal is to form a driveway into the curtilage of the house from the public highway of Chedworth Court and form a car parking space within a side garden next to the gable end of the house.
5. The side garden is roughly triangular in shape and amounting to 52sqm in area. On one side is the gable of the applicant's house, on the second the rear of a summer house which separates it from the rest of the garden. On the third side the garden is separated from the road by a 1.85m high close boarded timber fence. This side garden is currently surfaced in wood chippings and does not contain any plants or trees. On the roadside outside the fence are two rows of small bushes or shrubs.
6. A 2m wide entrance would be formed in the existing fence line with gates to match the existing fencing. Outside the garden a drive and highway verge crossing would be formed to the public highway. The side garden would be laid with cobble block paving with drainage channels to form parking for a car.

CONSULTATIONS

7. The following Consultees were notified and any comments received are set out below:-

Ingleby Barwick Town Council

No comments

Head of Technical Services

I refer to your memo dated: 18 January 2011

General Summary

Urban Design has no objections.

Highways Comments

There are no objections to the proposed access subject to the gates not opening out over adopted highway.

The applicant should contact Direct Services regarding the construction of the new dropped vehicle crossing.

It should be noted that unbound material, such as gravel may only be used if a 1.5m hard surface buffer strip is provided adjacent to the highway for the full width of the access in order to prevent materials being carried onto the highway.

Landscape & Visual Comments

In the interest of amenity it is preferable that as much of the planting as possible is retained.

PUBLICITY

8. Neighbours were notified and any comments received are below (if applicable):-
9. **Representations of Objection**

Mr and Mrs M Sahani 9 Chedworth Court Ingleby Barwick

I am writing to you to put forward our objection to the proposed planning application re 10 Chedworth Court Ingleby Barwick. Although we were not notified, we feel that this application will have a severe impact on our living within the cul-de-sac. At present, due to the lack of initiative shown by the developers, parking is an absolute nightmare. At first when we moved in we used to park our cars on the huge drive shared by no's 10, 8 and ourselves without any problems and everyone was happy. Since problems have arisen which of no fault of ours or of no 8, the occupants of no 10 have made life horrendous for all and they having taken it to such

an extent that they have taken out an injunction via the courts against no 8 and us no longer allowing us to park on the shared driveway.

This leaves us with having to ask visitors or tradesmen who call at our house to park in the two available spaces outside no 10 which no 10 is now trying to claim for themselves also. Over the Christmas period no 10 used one of those spaces leaving her driveway free in order to cause us more inconvenience during the inclement weather meaning family who visited us had to park on Lullingstone Crescent and walk a fair distance.

I believe that this application is to further cause more distress in the cul de sac as they have two empty garages and two driveways with only three cars in the house. I see no point in them needing another parking space. I strongly feel that the council need to see the impact this will cause as parking is at a premium in Chedworth Court as it is and this addition will take away another space for selfish reasons only. It was the occupants of no 10 who in court recited that each house has two garages and two driveways so why should we need to park elsewhere and cause the neighbourhood distress yet they are doing just the same.

If this was allowed then the space taken would mean visitors and tradesmen parking on shared drives and upsetting the other occupants of Chedworth Court. On many occasions the occupants of no 10 have parked their vehicles out side of their house taking up both parking spaces when their driveways have been clear. The severity of parking disputes and problems can be verified by Cleveland Police who have been called out numerous times by the occupants of no 10. I am sure the council can not allow this as it would cause immense distress to all others residing in the cul-de-sac.

Mrs M Jones 12 The Vale Stockton-on-Tees

If this is allowed, where exactly are we to park when we visit they already have space for 4 cars?

Manish Sahani 9 Chedworth Court Ingleby Barwick

I refer to the comments made by Mr G Ross with regards to the parking issue here. I would not call this "initiative" rather more a disregard to neighbours as his sister has stopped other neighbours parking around their properties without any regard to the layout of the street. The only initiative here is for her own selfish reasons without any care and respect for others.

With reference to making it easy to park when visiting I do not see a problem as no 10 has two garages and two driveways and on occasions has taken to parking her car in her back garden. So if no 10 needs five spaces with only 3 vehicles in the house then stealing another off the road is not initiative but pure greed and she is trying to stamp her authority on the street. Had any initiative had been shown then we would not be in the situation we are currently in. Just for the record no 9 was not fined by the court for abusing no 10's rights whatsoever. Obviously the residents have not understood the legal procedure as we contributed towards costs and were not imposed with a financial penalty. I felt this was an important point to highlight as it adds a slur on our character.

I sent an email to Mr A Bishop yesterday and sent an objection via the site yesterday also my sister sent an objection why are these not on the comments list as yet?

I am asking as to whether this application has been brought to the attention to site engineers and as to whether or not a site survey is to take place. I feel that the only way the impact this has on us is via a site survey and strongly request one as there are further underlying issues to this.

Further to my comments I would also like to point out that this driveway could also be a hazard. Driving out of our shared driveway gives us no vision to the road on the left hand side. If there was a car reversing out of the proposed new driveway and we were turning it could cause an

accident as it is a blind corner. I strongly believe that somebody from the council really needs to make a visit to the site and assess the impact this will have.

Mrs A Gardner 7 Hawnby Close, Fairfield

This takes away our right to public highway access and gives individual rights over rest of public

Anita Seth 2 Deborah Crescent, Ruislip

My brother lives at no 9 and when we visited there over Christmas we found parking a real hassle. We had to park on the main rd and walk a fair distance with bags in our hands as there is no parking there. The only two parking spaces available were occupied by the residents of no 10. I feel this is unfair to the street.

Mr and Mrs Brian Gardner

7 Hawnby Close Fairfield

If allowed, they will be claiming PUBLIC highway use as their own. This leaves no room for visitors.

Diane and David Jones 8 Chedworth Court Ingleby Barwick

Initiative? No need to take cars off road they already have parking for 4 cars, just causing trouble.

We have objected to the above planning via the website but we feel we are unable to get across the serious implications this application would have on this small close in so few words. As it stands the 10 houses are very restricted with parking for guests or access to emergency vehicles because of court imposed parking restrictions, there is an area to the other side of number 10 an area some 30metres in length and 11 in width which is suitable for the parking of 6 cars unfortunately the residents of number 10 have restricted parking to anyone on this area, not only that, they have done the same on the public road outside the house. Should this driveway be allowed it will need access, this in turn will further restrict parking to guests and residents in this small area. At present there are 2 spaces that can be used without causing inconvenience to other property's this will be reduced to 1 and this is serving 10 houses, should they have guests it becomes impossible to park anywhere in the close, not only that guests will have to park in other areas which will in turn block the access to other property's, this can not be allowed.

The parking in Chedworth Court has been given very little thought by the planners, numerous residents are at each others throats and police have been called on more than a dozen occasions should this go ahead parking will become impossible causing further problems and tension can the council ignore this, i think not, further more the residents of number 10 have 3 cars and parking spaces for 4 they do not need more space for parking, we feel as do other residents do that this is just an exercise to cause further inconvenience and tension in an otherwise pleasant area.

Could this letter be displayed on the comments page please as 100 characters does not allow us to vent our feelings strongly enough.

We have noticed you have not notified number 9 who use this area for visitor parking , it will also directly affect numbers 2 and 6 as guests will be unable to park where the proposed drive is intended and there for will have no choice but to park outside of 2 and 6, which will block or make difficult access to the respective houses. number 9 have no choice they have to use the (road /intended driveway) because of court restrictions on the large area in front of there own house where parking is now not allowed. we there for feel all these houses will be upset should they not be notified.

Guests to the respective houses will end up having to walk over 150 yards to visit us and other neighbours should this ridiculous application be approved

The road is not big enough to restrict parking to guests and this plan will do so we strongly object. We currently have 2 spaces for guests in the whole road this will be reduced to 1. The court imposed parking restrictions are already in place this is our guest's only parking area. Yet more lies no fines were imposed on number 8 please do not slander us on a public site.

Heather Allison 14 Lullingstone Crescent Ingleby Barwick

I would like to add my objection to the proposed application. This is a completely unnecessary development when you consider that this house already has a double garage and a double driveway. The issue here seems to be the ongoing dispute between various neighbours over parking and I feel the applicant is once again trying to antagonise the situation and actually spreading the ill feeling by upsetting even more neighbours, ourselves included. The road opposite the proposed exit is very narrow and if a car is parked in this space there is no room to exit. In the original plans for this house if the builders thought the best space to build a drive had been where the applicant is proposing they would have done so. This application is completely unnecessary and if we all cemented over our gardens we may as well build houses in car parks.

Debra Baker-Heriot 14 Lullingstone Crescent Ingleby Barwick

I strongly oppose this planning application. The proposed gates and drive will be immediately opposite our own drive. This will cause us concerns coming on and off our own drive. The road is very narrow anyway and if we park across the back of the drive there will be no room for them to exit.

I am also concerned that the positioning of the gates and angle of exit from (the) drive means they have to use (the) neighbour's drive opposite ours to get on and off their drive.

This house like all our houses has an existing double garage and drive which allows for the parking of four cars - more than adequate for the house.

I also oppose because it would be nice if the road we live in didn't resemble a municipal car park (!). No other drive here has gates and (it) does not fit with the outline planning ethos of the Rings Estate and Ingleby Barwick in general.

Mrs M Jones 12 The Vale Stockton-on-Tees

If this is allowed, where exactly are we to park when we visit they already have space for 4 cars?

Diane and David Jones 8 Chedworth Court Ingleby Barwick

Initiative? No need to take cars off road they already have parking for 4 cars, just causing trouble.

We have objected to the above planning via the website but we feel we are unable to get across the serious implications this application would have on this small close in so few words. As it stands the 10 houses are very restricted with parking for guests or access to emergency vehicles because of court imposed parking restrictions, there is an area to the other side of number 10 an area some 30metres in length and 11 in width which is suitable for the parking of 6 cars unfortunately the residents of number 10 have restricted parking to anyone on this area, not only that, they have done the same on the public road outside the house. Should this driveway be allowed it will need access, this in turn will further restrict parking to guests and residents in this small area. At present there are 2 spaces that can be used without causing inconvenience to other property's this will be reduced to 1 and this is serving 10 houses, should they have guests it becomes impossible to park anywhere in the close, not only that guests will have to park in other areas which will in turn block the access to other property's, this can not be allowed.

The parking in Chedworth court has been given very little thought by the planners, numerous residents are at each others throats and police have been called on more than a dozen

occasions should this go ahead parking will become impossible causing further problems and tension can the council ignore this, I think not, further more the residents of number 10 have 3 cars and parking spaces for 4 they do not need more space for parking, we feel as do other residents do that this is just an exercise to cause further inconvenience and tension in an otherwise pleasant area.

Could this letter be displayed on the comments page please as 100 characters does not allow us to vent our feelings strongly enough.

We have noticed you have not notified number 9 who use this area for visitor parking, it will also directly affect numbers 2 and 6 as guests will be unable to park where the proposed drive is intended and there for will have no choice but to park outside of 2 and 6, which will block or make difficult access to the respective houses. Number 9 have no choice they have to use the (road /intended driveway) because of court restrictions on the large area in front of there own house where parking is now not allowed. We there for feel all these houses will be upset should they not be notified.

Guests to the respective houses will end up having to walk over 150 yards to visit us and other neighbours should this ridiculous application be approved

The road is not big enough to restrict parking to guests and this plan will do so we strongly object. We currently have 2 spaces for guests in the whole road this will be reduced to 1. The court imposed parking restrictions are already in place this is our guest's only parking area. Yet more lies no fines were imposed on number 8 please do not slander us on a public site.

Heather Allison 14 Lullingstone Crescent Ingleby Barwick

I would like to add my objection to the proposed application. This is a completely unnecessary development when you consider that this house already has a double garage and a double driveway. The issue here seems to be the ongoing dispute between various neighbours over parking and I feel the applicant is once again trying to antagonise the situation and actually spreading the ill feeling by upsetting even more neighbours, ourselves included. The road opposite the proposed exit is very narrow and if a car is parked in this space there is no room to exit. In the original plans for this house if the builders thought the best space to build a drive had been where the applicant is proposing they would have done so.

This application is completely unnecessary and if we all cemented over our gardens we may as well build houses in car parks.

10. **Representations of Support**

George Ross 29 Polton Road

This will help me visit my daughter frequently

George Ross 33 Vinter Road OX13 3PF

Good initiative by my sister to take cars off a public road and help with parking.

PLANNING POLICY

11. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permissions shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plan is the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP)

The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application:-

Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) - Sustainable Living and Climate Change

1. All new residential developments will achieve a minimum of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes up to 2013, and thereafter a minimum of Code Level 4.
2. All new non-residential developments will be completed to a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) of 'very good' up to 2013 and thereafter a minimum rating of 'excellent'.
3. The minimum carbon reduction targets will remain in line with Part L of the Building Regulations, achieving carbon neutral domestic properties by 2016, and non domestic properties by 2019, although it is expected that developers will aspire to meet targets prior to these dates.
4. To meet carbon reduction targets, energy efficiency measures should be embedded in all new buildings. If this is not possible, or the targets are not met, then on-site district renewable and low carbon energy schemes will be used. Where it can be demonstrated that neither of these options is suitable, micro renewable, micro carbon energy technologies or a contribution towards an off-site renewable energy scheme will be considered.
5. For all major developments, including residential developments comprising 10 or more units, and non-residential developments exceeding 1000 square metres gross floor space, at least 10% of total predicted energy requirements will be provided, on site, from renewable energy sources.
6. All major development proposals will be encouraged to make use of renewable and low carbon decentralised energy systems to support the sustainable development of major growth locations within the Borough.
7. Where suitable proposals come forward for medium to small scale renewable energy generation, which meet the criteria set out in Policy 40 of the Regional Spatial Strategy, these will be supported. Broad locations for renewable energy generation may be identified in the Regeneration Development Plan Document.
8. Additionally, in designing new development, proposals will:
 - _ Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space;
 - _ Be designed with safety in mind, incorporating Secure by Design and Park Mark standards, as appropriate;
 - _ Incorporate 'long life and loose fit' buildings, allowing buildings to be adaptable to changing needs. By 2013, all new homes will be built to Lifetime Homes Standards;
 - _ Seek to safeguard the diverse cultural heritage of the Borough, including buildings, features, sites and areas of national importance and local significance. Opportunities will be taken to constructively and imaginatively incorporate heritage assets in redevelopment schemes, employing where appropriate contemporary design solutions.
9. The reduction, reuse, sorting, recovery and recycling of waste will be encouraged, and details will be set out in the Joint Tees Valley Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents.

12. National Planning Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development: 31st Jan 2005
 Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport: 01 January 2011

13. Other Supplementary Planning Documents

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

14. The application site is a residential property on a housing estate within the settlement of Ingleby Barwick. The house is located in a cul-de-sac which serves 11 properties for vehicular access purposes. Each property has a double garage and two private parking spaces in front of the garage doors.
15. The applicant's house has an open plan front garden and main elevation facing east onto the turning head of Chedworth Court. The main rear garden is to the west of the house. An enclosed side garden to the north of the house is separated by a 1.8m high close boarded timber fence from the cul-de-sac. To the south side of the house is a shared access leading to the applicant's double garage and two external parking spaces which are level with the end of the rear garden. The shared parking access also provides access to the double garages and 2 external parking spaces for the neighbours, Nos. 8 and 9 Chedworth Court.
16. The applicant's rear garden backs onto those of properties in Lullingstone Crescent. These houses also have double garages and parking spaces at the rear of their gardens. The driveway and garages of No.12 opens onto Chedworth Court. This neighbour's driveway and garages are immediately adjacent to the applicant's side garden where the proposed access and parking area would be formed.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

17. The main planning considerations are the principle of the development, the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on residential amenity and privacy and highway safety and other material considerations.

The principle of the development

18. The application site is an existing residential property that lies within the settlement boundary of Ingleby Barwick as defined for the purposes of the Saved Local Plan policies. The access and parking area would be formed within the garden curtilage of the applicant's detached house and are intended for domestic purposes.
19. There are no policies or other advice within the Council's adopted Core Strategy Document and Saved policies in the Local Plan that specifically restrict or prevent the creation of additional access and parking areas for domestic dwellings. The determination of this application is therefore to be considered in the context of Government advice in national planning policies and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006.
20. Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport: has been updated in January 2011. This sets out advice on drawing up planning policies and standards for parking provision in new developments. Maximum figures for parking provision in relation to developments do not apply to housing or minor developments. Local authorities are advised to set out their own standards whilst promoting sustainable transport choices. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006 is therefore the relevant document.
21. Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006 does not set a maximum figure for car parking provision for existing houses. As it stands the applicant's property has 4 private spaces available to it composed of a double garage and two external spaces located to the front of those garage doors. The provision of

a parking space in addition to that required if this were a new house is not prevented by SPD3 or by other supplementary planning guidance and policy documents.

22. The Head of Technical Services has raised no objection to the proposal on highway safety or policy grounds.
23. Objections have been received by residents and others, but these do not raise issues of policy and those representations are considered further below. In principle the proposals are acceptable and would be in accordance with the Core Strategy, Stockton on Tees Local Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006 and Government planning advice in PPG13: Transport.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

24. The application relates to the formation of a vehicle access to a private property on a housing estate. The works would involve forming a gateway in the existing 1.8m high close boarded timber garden fence with the new gates being formed of the same material. The existing fence is only viewable from the roadway and properties in the immediate vicinity of Chedworth Close. When closed the appearance of the means of enclosure would be virtually the same as it is now.
25. The side garden to the house where the car parking space would be located is roughly triangular in shape and enclosed by the side of the house, the rear of a timber summer house and the boundary fence. The side garden lies to the north of the house, is over shadowed by the house and not overlooked by lounge or other principle rooms. There are no plants or trees inside the applicant's garden fence on this side garden and it is surfaced in wood chippings. The proposal is to hard surface this with Beamish Cobble block paving. This would compliment the block paving used on private driveways elsewhere on the housing estate. As this surface would not be readily visible from outside the site there would be little or no impact outside the garden.
26. Cars parked on the land would generally be below the fence height and when the gates are closed vehicles would only be readily visible at a distance from the upper floors of a house on the other side of Chedworth Court and in Lullingstone Crescent. This parking area would be immediately adjacent to the driveway and garage of No.12 Lullingstone Crescent and would not have a significant visual impact on the surrounding area.
27. In the interests of preventing run off contributing to flooding in the vicinity or elsewhere a condition is recommended requiring the surface material to be permeable or porous. The proposed cobble block paving could satisfy this requirement. It is also not a gravel material that could have an adverse impact on highway safety which is a concern of the Head of Technical Services. It is recommended that these are requirements are added to the condition for the avoidance of doubt.
28. Outside the fence line there is a row of shrubs on the open plan area in front of the side garden. Most of these shrubs would be removed to form the highway access. A line of smaller plants on the edge of the highway verge that extends around to the front of the applicant's house would be shortened in length to form the access. The grass for the width of the access would be replaced by a block paved vehicle crossing outside the gates and up to the public highway of Chedworth Court. This hard surfacing outside the fence would have the greatest visual impact on the area which is confined to the road entrance into Chedworth Court.
29. The proposed driveway would be seen in the context of the many other drives and shared surfaces that lead away from the public highway of Chedworth Court to the various private parking areas and garages. An objector has stated that "it would be nice if the road we live

in didn't resemble a municipal car park (!). No other drive here has gates and (it) does not fit with the outline planning ethos of the Rings Estate and Ingleby Barwick in general.”

30. The applicant would be creating an access through an existing fence line and the gates would help screen the car parking area. The proposed access would be immediately adjacent to the existing double width, splayed and un-gated entrance to the parking and garaging for No.12 Lullingstone Crescent. The proposed driveway would widen the highway verge crossing for a relatively short width but the retention of the fence and formation of gates in matching material would limit the visual impact on the street scene. If the fence were removed altogether then the proposed parking area within the garden would be exposed to full view. This then would add to any feeling that the estate looked like a public car park due to the amount of existing hard surfaces to cater for off street parking.
31. The Head of Technical Services has raised no objections on landscape or design grounds and has only asked that as many shrubs as possible be retained along the frontage of the applicant's property. The number to be retained would be determined by the technical requirements imposed by the Council's Direct Services regarding the construction width of the new dropped vehicle crossing.
32. It is considered that the proposed parking area, access and gates would be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and that it would have little impact on the character and appearance of the area so that it is in accordance with the Core Strategy, Stockton on Tees Local Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006 and Government planning advice in PPG13: Transport.

Impact on residential privacy and amenity and highway safety

33. The proposed access and parking area would not alter or reduce the applicant's existing private parking, which is on the other side of their house. The existing 4 parking spaces comprised of the double garage and double driveway would remain unaltered. As long as the proposed gates do not open out over the adopted highway and unbound material, such as gravel is not used without a 1.5m hard surface buffer strip the Head of Technical Services has no objections on highway grounds. Conditions controlling those matters are recommended.
34. The proposed parking would increase the number of spaces available to the applicant. The proposed access would come directly from the public highway of Chedworth Court between its turning head and its junction with Lullingstone Crescent. The applicant would then not rely on the existing shared surfaced access area on the other side of the house that leads to their existing private parking and garaging. Those parking spaces and garages are accessed from the end of the Chedworth Court cul-de-sac and the route passes the front of two neighbouring houses, Nos. 8 and 9 Chedworth Court. Those neighbours also use the shared surface to access their own parking and garaging for 4 cars. The representations received make it clear that this sharing of an unadopted shared surface can be the cause of tensions between neighbours.
35. All properties in Chedworth Court have been notified of this planning application and the receipt and consideration of representations is not confined to its residents. Reference is made to a Court injunction having been taken out on some residents. This seems to relate to property rights of residents and is therefore not a planning consideration but a private legal matter.
36. The representations received are almost exclusively concerned with the impact of the proposals on the future availability of parking for residents and visitors to Chedworth Court. Objections have been received from nine sources and letters of support from two others.

Objector's claim that there is a lack of parking spaces available in the cul-de-sac despite Chedworth Court being designed to Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments standards. Objectors attribute this lack of parking to the design of the cul-de-sac which has little room for kerbside parking due to the number of drives and shared surfaces leading on to it. There are two large areas of shared surfacing leading to private parking and garages which it is understood are meant to be kept free of parked vehicles and are seen as an inefficient use of potential parking space.

37. It is claimed that visitors and tradesmen tend to use the kerbside parking around the frontage of No.10 where driveways and garage doors would not be obstructed. When these spaces are taken up residents, visitors or tradesmen people have to park on Lullingstone Crescent and walk a fair distance. Objector's claim that garages are not being used for parking as they should. It could also be that there may be reluctance from visitors to use the spaces in front of private garage doors.
38. Objectors are concerned that the proposed access will take away an on road parking space causing them distress in having to park elsewhere. They do not see the point in the applicants having another parking space, but also say that at times the applicant's themselves take up the parking on the road outside their own house. As this is public highway with no parking controls all residents and visitors are entitled to park on the highway. The applicant's suggest that the additional new parking area would be used by their visitors instead of them using the highway.
39. The Head of Technical Services has provided highway advice on the application and does not consider that there is any need for a site survey to take place which some objectors have requested. An objector considers that the proposed driveway could be a hazard as they say that there is no vision to the side of the road where the proposed driveway would be. As anyone leaving a shared driveway would have to already be on Chedworth Court before reaching the proposed site of the new access there is no evidence that visibility for the proposed driveway would be below standard.
40. The proposed gates and drive would be opposite the driveway to No.1 Chedworth Court. An objector says that they park across the back of their own drive and the applicant's would not be able to exit without using the neighbour's drive. The Head of Technical Services has not raised this as a concern and it would appear that Chedworth Court is wide enough at this location for the applicants to access the proposed car parking space.
41. There are no objections on the grounds that there would be an invasion of privacy or otherwise directly affect the amenity of occupant's in their own houses. The parking space would be no closer to a neighbour's house than that respective properties own parking area. There are no reasons to consider that it would lead to any greater noise or disturbance than any of the other domestic car parking and access arrangements at Chedworth Court.
42. Representations of support have been received and the writers consider that the driveway and parking area would take cars off the public road and help the existing parking situation.
43. The Head of Technical services has not raised any highway objections and the matters relating to the opening of the gates and loose gravel material are recommended to be controlled by condition. The proposals are considered to be acceptable with regard to its impact on residential privacy, amenity and highway safety and to be in accordance with the Core Strategy, Stockton on Tees Local Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006 and Government planning advice in PPG13: Transport.

CONCLUSION

44. The creation of an access and parking area for a dwelling on a housing estate within the settlement of Ingleby Barwick is acceptable in principle. The proposed position, access design and materials for gates and surfacing are all considered to be acceptable in design terms and would not have an adverse impact on the appearance and character of the area.
45. It is considered that there would not be an adverse impact on residential amenity and privacy or a significant reduction in highway safety sufficient to warrant a refusal. The proposals are therefore in accordance with Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan March 2010 CS3 and Stockton on Tees Local Plan Saved Policies and Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Miss Debra Moody Telephone No 01642 528714

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward Ingleby Barwick West
Ward Councillor Councillor K Dixon

Ward Ingleby Barwick West
Ward Councillor Councillor R Patterson

Ward Ingleby Barwick West
Ward Councillor Councillor Jean Kirby

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:
None

Environmental Implications:
As Report

Human Rights Implications:
The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

Community Safety Implications:
The provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report

Background Papers

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Stockton on Tees Core Strategy March 2010

Stockton on Tees Local Plan June 1997.

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2: Householder Extension Guide, February 2004

Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, November 2006

Planning Applications 02/2393/P, 04/1417/FUL and 09/0838/FUL.