

DELEGATED

AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 MARCH 2011

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES

11/0050/FUL

31 White House Croft, Long Newton, Stockton-on-Tees

Alterations and extensions to form study, attached garage and garden room. Installation of two solar panels to south facing garage roof, removal of two poor quality trees t1, t2 (dwg 3) from rear garden and alteration of vehicular access from front highway together with re siting of lamp standard

Expiry Date 7 March 2011

SUMMARY

Approval is sought for the conversion of an existing integral garage into a study with an extension to the side to replace the converted garage. The proposal also includes a covered area to the rear of the garage and a garden room to project from the rear of the main dwelling house.

Six letter of objection have been received from neighbouring residents largely on the grounds that the proposal will impact upon the adjacent culvert, resulting in flooding. Objections also relate to impact upon the street scene, the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of view, overlooking and appearing overbearing and implications for highway safety as a result of moving the lamppost and traffic generated by the extension.

Northumbrian Water were consulted regarding the concerns and no objections were raised to the development. The Council's Urban Design section have raised no objections to the proposal on highways grounds however a Tree Preservation Order has been placed on T1 and a condition is recommended to ensure the tree is retained.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning application 11/0050/FUL be Approved with Conditions subject to

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>SBC0001</i>	<i>31 January 2011</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>10 January 2011</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>10 January 2011</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>10 January 2011</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>10 January 2011</i>

Reason: To define the consent.

02. The external finishing materials shall match with those of the existing building

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory form of development

03. Notwithstanding the proposals detailed in the Design and Access Statement/ submitted plans the Ash tree labelled T1 shall be retained and maintained for a minimum period of 25 years from practical completion of the development. This tree, shrub or hedge shall not be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans, without the written authorisation of the Local Planning Authority. Any tree, shrub or hedge or any tree/shrub or hedge planted as a replacement that dies or is removed, uprooted or destroyed or becomes seriously damaged or defective must be replaced by another of the same size and species unless directed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

04. Prior to the development, hereby approved, being brought into use, the lamppost shall be re-sited in accordance with Drawing No. 3

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and ensure access to the proposed parking spaces.

05. The surface of the additional parking space shall be constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. Such details shall provide for the use of permeable materials or make provision to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The approved car parking space shall be retained for the life of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To provide sufficient car parking to serve this four bedroom dwelling and to prevent increase risk of flooding from surface water run off.

INFORMATIVES

The Proposal has been considered against the policies below and it is considered that the scheme accords with these policies and the proposal is in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and does not involve any significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of the neighbouring properties or have any significant implications for highway safety. The proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area and there are no other material considerations which indicate a decision should be otherwise.

Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan (June 1997)
HO12 Householder Extensions

Adopted Core Strategy (March 2010)
CS3: Sustainable Living and Climate Change

The street light column will have to be moved, at the applicant's expense, to accommodate the widened driveway. The applicant should contact the Street Lighting Engineer, Highway Network department regarding the relocation of the light column.

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.

PROPOSAL

1. Approval is sought for the conversion of an existing integral garage, into a study with an extension to the side to replace the converted garage. The proposal also includes a covered area to the rear of the garage and a garden room to project from the rear of the main dwelling house.
2. The proposed garage will project 4.1 metres from the side elevation with a length of approximately 5.8 metres with a covered area to the rear of the garage with a length of approximately 3.3 metres. The proposed extension to the side incorporates a pitched roof with a maximum height of approximately 5.5 metres.
3. The proposed development also includes a garden room to project from the rear by approximately 4 metres with a width of 4 metres.
4. The proposed development includes two solar panels to the rear which does not in itself require permission.
5. In addition the removal of T1 and T2 (shown on drawing 3) does not require permission.
6. Providing that the Council undertake the works the siting of the lamp standard also does not require permission
7. The additional hard standing will not require permission providing that it is constructed from permeable materials.

CONSULTATIONS

The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below:-

8. Longnewton Parish Council

The Long Newton Parish Council have no objections or comments regarding the above application for no 31 White House Croft, Long Newton.

9. Northumbrian Water Limited

Following our telephone conversation today I can confirm that the above application has been examined and Northumbrian Water has no objections to the proposed development.

10. Head of Technical Services General Summary

Urban Design has no objections to the development but however object to the removal of tree ref. T1.

Highways Comments

Urban Design does not object to the principle of this application providing the Ash tree ref. T1 on the applicants drawing is retained.

Highways Comments

The applicant does not propose to increase the number of bedrooms at this property; the proposed garage replaces an existing garage on a like for like basis. Therefore no objections to this application are raised.

In order to facilitate this development, a street lighting column will require to be moved at the applicant's expense, to accommodate the widened driveway. It is necessary for the applicant to contact the Street Lighting Engineer, Highway Network Management regarding the relocation of the lighting column.

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.

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

It is noted that several objectors have raised highway concerns in White House Croft as follows:

Visibility

On street parking issues

Parking/traffic during construction works

Resiting of street light column

Culvert

The application is acceptable in highway terms as the proposed widening of the driveway will not be detrimental to highway safety. The road layout is similar to many shared surface cul-de-sacs around the Borough with the property being at the end of a cul-de-sac it is considered that vehicles will be travelling at reduced speeds along this road and visibility is adequate in line with current standards. All the properties in the vicinity benefit from adequate incurtilage parking. There are no recorded injury accidents on White House Croft since Jan 2006 to Dec 2010.

The widening of the driveway will provide an extra car parking space at no. 31, which will assist reducing on street parking.

Concerns have been raised that the construction of the extension will result in site traffic restricting parking and visibility, as this is a temporary arrangement this will not be detrimental on a long term basis and occurs for every development. It is not considered significant.

Concerns have been raised with regards to the resiting of the street light column; the Highway Network Manager has advised that the repositioning of the light column will have little effect on the current lighting levels around the area. It should be noted that street lighting columns are to light the highway not individual dwellings.

The applicant proposes a single storey garage extension to the side of an existing property. The proposed development is not located within a flood zone and it is unlikely to increase flood risk within the area. There is a culvert adjacent to the property which is maintained by Greenbelt at the

residents' expense. Therefore, we suggest that the applicant contacts Greenbelt regarding the proposed works.

Landscape & Visual Comments

Whilst the principle of development is acceptable, tree ref. T1 Ash (referenced as such on the applicants plan) has a sufficient amenity value to warrant its retention. The tree formed an integral part of the original consent for residential development on this site and does not have to be removed to accommodate the extension. The tree can be viewed from the main road through the village and as such is an important feature in the local landscape.

The tree ref T2 (referenced as such on the applicants plan) can be removed however as it is a smaller specimen near to some of the trees on the site boundary and the Ash Tree ref T1 and therefore it would not be able to develop to its full potential.

11. PUBLICITY

12. Neighbours were notified and any comments received are below (if applicable):-

13. Mr S Ballantyne
50 White House Croft Long Newton
Object on the following;

RESITING OF THE EXISTING LAMP POST

14. . The building work needed to be undertaken to re-site the lamp post could disturb/damage the culvert and hinder access to the culvert. Should any damage occur either during or after the building work and, as a direct result of it, who would be held responsible for the cost and repair to the culvert? It could have serious legal implications and impact on all of the residents. The proposed siting of the lamp post would move it onto the corner of the road. Over the past 6 years that we have lived here, there have been many near accidents between vehicles on this corner. The corner has been extremely dangerous with several people going out of control on this bend. We therefore object to the lamp post being moved on safety grounds. Re-siting the lamppost would increase light coming into our property to an unacceptable level, especially in our bedroom. Should any attempt be made to deflect the light away from our property, this would then have an impact not only on its effectiveness to light the area but also on shining into neighbour's properties to yet again an unacceptable degree. We would then have to look out onto not one but two lamp posts. We therefore object to the resiting of the lamp post on the grounds of spoiling our view.

EXTENSION OF DRIVE AREA AND LOWERING OF CURB

15. Should permission be granted for this, this would effectively mean that the residents of, and visitors to, 31 Whitehouse Croft would be reversing out onto the dangerous corner mentioned above. We understand the needs of the occupants of 31 Whitehouse Croft for additional parking to allow Mrs De Chaumont Rambert to run her business from the property and to allow clients somewhere to park. However, this is a residential area and the needs and safety of the other residents have to be put first. We have further concerns that this will bring additional visitors to the property Therefore we have to object to this area of planning on safety grounds. On visiting a property, people do not always park on the drive. Also, where several visitors come on one occasion and all drive space had been taken, a situation may occur where visitors park across the bottom of the drive. Currently visitors to surrounding houses park outside the house they are visiting. By extending the drive at Number 31, this would restrict where people park who are visiting numbers 29 and 36.

Parking is restricted enough on our cul-de-sac. Also this would restrict access to emergency vehicles. By granting permission to extend the drive further, this would only make matters worse.

16. The access to the additional tarmac drive would be positioned over the top of a communal service strip that extends 3 ft into the current grassed area. It is our understanding that it was a planning restriction when the houses were originally built that no one can build or place a solid structure over this area. Where they are proposing to lower the curb to enable them to extend the drive, there is a drain on the main road. We have concerns regarding the fact that building work undertaken near this drain may either damage or disrupt this.

ERECTION OF THIRD ATTACHED GARAGE

17. We are concerned that this proposed building works is too close to the existing culvert and that building work to this degree, and to such a close proximity, will have a negative impact on the culvert structure. We have noticed, especially over the past 18 months, that an area of the grass that runs up to number 29 and 31 Whitehouse Croft has sunk. This corresponds to the flow of the culvert and we must stress our concern as to the safety and the state of the culvert and as to whether it is starting to collapse. We also object to the erection of the garage on the basis that it would spoil our only view of the village. This would not only have an impact on the value of our house and its saleability but also reduce our personal enjoyment of living here.
18. Our understanding when buying our property was that the residents of this part of Whitehouse Croft are not allowed to change the frontage/appearance of the house in any way so a question immediately arises over the feasibility of this planning application to erect a third garage.

TREES

19. Please can we request further clarification as to the exact trees and age of the trees that they are proposing to remove? If it is ones that were there prior to the erection of the houses, then we feel that they should remain as this then would have been clearly a condition of the original planning permission. We live in a village to feel part of the countryside and we strongly believe that we have to respect our natural environment.

BUILDING WORK/DISRUPTION

20. To carry out this level of building/extension/alteration, it would inevitably create substantial site traffic and disruption to the surrounding area and its residents concerns are raised regarding how this will be managed.

21. Further Comments

50 White House Croft Long Newton

22. I am rather concerned at the comments that were posted by your Technical Services Department who we were assured would consider the areas of concern that have been raised. The report refers to the resiting of the lamp post and the need to install the required curbing. No where does it refer to the
23. Safety concerns that we all raised in relation to the traffic flow and the safety of the cul de sac/corner where the proposed works to the front of the property at No. 31 are planned to take place. Nor have they commented on the concerns raised on how the resiting of the lamp post will impact on light distribution on this corner and the cul de sac. Nor how light will impact on the lives of those who live in numbers 36 and 50 when shining into our bedrooms. Nor have they commented on the fact that the lamp post will be resited within 6 feet of the culvert which is against the Deed of Covenant that exists on this estate. Nor

does it make any reference to the fact that number 31 is built on a raft and the implications for further building/land disturbance that this can cause to the area. Nor does it take into account the necessity for the culvert to flow without damage to avoid the whole of Whitehouse Croft flooding.

24. To this end, the report does not comprehensively cover the issues/concerns raised and we do not feel that this has been given the consideration that we have been promised that it would. Again, we require more reassurance that the Planning Application is being treated in an equal and fair way.
25. A recent highway safety issue, including a refuse truck, has been outlined to illustrate concerns regarding highway safety concerns. The issues has been reported the whole incident to Peter in Refuge Collection who was intending to refer the situation to the Enforcement Officer to take action.
26. Further Comments to be considered alongside the comments made in our first letter and subsequent email.

Culvert

27. We believe that the culvert at Whitehouse Croft, Longnewton has to be considered as a major Planning, not just Building Control, issue. The culvert has a function that is essential to the surrounding area. The water that flows through the culvert comes from natural drainage from the fields. This area of Longnewton has historically been prone to flooding throughout the generations. The stream that flows into the culvert is vital in the drainage of the surrounding areas, otherwise these areas will flood.
28. The stream flows from the fields at the side of the A66 and enters this part of Whitehouse Croft in number 44 Whitehouse Croft's garden. The culvert then runs through the centre of this part of the estate/under the road i.e. the estate was built over and around the culvert/stream and then through the area between numbers 29 and 31. It then travels down into Baliol Croft and onto the main village road.

Deeds of Covenants

29. Wording of the deeds is included to support previous objections regarding restrictions placed on the development

Stockton Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 2

30. The objector does not consider that the proposal accords with principles in SPG2 in terms of impact upon the street scene.

Resiting of Lamp Post

31. The site/position of each lamp post when the estate was built will have been fully researched and planned by a qualified engineer to ensure that each light gave the ultimate benefit to its surrounding area to maximise efficiency and effectiveness. By resiting this lamp post, it would move the light to a position which is already lit by other posts therefore increasingly the light in that area to an unacceptable level, especially in our bedroom and leaving the former area insufficiently lit. We object to the moving of the lamp post on this basis.

Extension of drive

32. By extending the drive to the left of the existing property and lowering the curb to allow access on and off their new drive, this will have serious safety implications surrounding our entering and exiting our drive. The width of the road on this part of estate is restricted enough and as such the corner has to be taken with caution with people often turning the corner in the middle of the road. This corner is a hazard in both good and bad weather. By allowing the extension to the drive of number 31 Whitehouse Croft, this will increase the directions in which traffic is entering this corner and thus further endanger the safety of residents and visitors alike.
33. The additional site traffic will only exacerbate the problem and further raise the issue of safety on both the corner and the surrounding area.
34. Additional vehicles visiting and parking in this restricted area will also create further safety concerns both from the width of the road, our entering/exiting our drive and reduced visibility.
35. I reviewed the planning website in relation to the above planning application and I am rather concerned at the comments that were posted by your Technical Services Department who we were assured would consider the areas of concern that have been raised.
36. The report refers to the resiting of the lamp post and the need to install the required curbing. No where does it refer to the
 - 1) Safety concerns that we all raised in relation to the traffic flow and the safety of the cul de sac/corner where the proposed works to the front of the property at No. 31 are planned to take place.
 - 2) Nor have they commented on the concerns raised on how the resiting of the lamp post will impact on light distribution on this corner and the cul de sac.
 - 3) Nor how light will impact on the lives of those who live in numbers 36 and 50 when shining into our bedrooms.
 - 4) Nor have they commented on the fact that the lamp post will be resited within 6 feet of the culvert which is against the Deed of Covenant that exists on this estate.
 - 5) Nor does it make any reference to the fact that number 31 is built on a raft and the implications for further building/land disturbance that this can cause to the area.
 - 6) Nor does it take into account the necessity for the culvert to flow without damage to avoid the whole of Whitehouse Croft flooding.
37. To this end, the report does not comprehensively cover the issues/concerns raised and we do not feel that this has been given the consideration that we have been promised that it would. Again, we require more reassurance that the Planning Application is being treated in an equal and fair way.
38. To demonstrate our concerns, yesterday afternoon we had an real life scenario upon the corner where the council refuse truck was trying to collect rubbish as they normally do on a Tuesday. However, parked directly opposite our property was a van waiting to clean some of the residents wheelie bins. In addition, a client was waiting to to gain access to No. 31 in their car and the whole area was gridlocked. I was also trying to get off my own drive in my car.
39. The van outside our house then parked on the side lawn of No. 36, damaging their lawn. My wife and I both received a mouthful of abuse from the man driving the van when asking him not to park the van on our neighbour's lawn. He also had removed four of the residents' wheelie bins that had not been emptied onto our neighbour's lawn to commence cleaning them. We have photographic evidence of this. The refuse truck was then unable to collect rubbish from the bottom of the cul de sac because of where his van had parked. To be able to exit the estate and free the corner, the refuse truck then had to reverse back round the corner on to our drive (No. 50) nearly hitting both myself and my car that was parked on our

drive. The driver of the car waiting to attend No. 31, then had to reverse back down the cul de sac eventually parking on the bottom of the drive at No. 29. It was absolute chaos and highly dangerous.

40. We have reported the whole incident to Peter in Refuge Collection who was intending to refer the situation to the Enforcement Officer to take action.
41. This is a prime example of how little space there is to manoeuvre vehicles within our normally quiet cul de sac. Imagine the same scenario when ours and others children in our cul de sac are innocently playing outside. The consequences are not worth thinking about. Add site traffic on top of this and this is an accident waiting to happen.
42. Can you please provide me with some reassurance that the residents concerns in this part of Whitehouse Croft are given your full attention. To date we really feel that this does not appear to be the case when reading the report submitted by Technical Services.

Chris and Judith Butterworth
48 White House Croft Long Newton
43. object on the following grounds

Drains

44. A number of residents of White House Croft, and we are one, make payments to maintain the culvert in a satisfactory condition. The proposed modifications suggest that the new building will be over / adjacent to the culvert. This is highly likely to potentially cause damage to the culvert and thereby create problems of both a water flow type and a potential financial impact if repairs are required due directly to the building works. I have no intention of being liable for additional costs associated with work on the culvert,

Car Parking

45. The extent of the modifications would suggest that this is a major building project and as such will require a number of contractors to be at site for a number of weeks / months. It is recognised that the contractors will have industrial vehicles and it cannot be disputed that this will cause major parking issues on what is a busy part of the croft where all vehicles need to pass to exit the road. Such over crowding will inevitably cause issues and may in extreme cases create road safety issues. In addition to the general parking arrangements the croft has up to 8 children living in the road. The children are of varying ages and during the spring and summer months they will be outside during the lighter nights. One has to assume that this creates a safety issue which cannot be tolerated. Other potential issues regarding parking include the potential development of a business at the premises. This can only create more traffic issues as clients come and go.

General mess / sludge

46. As previously specified, this is a substantial modification to the property and over the course of the demolition and reconstruct phases it is quite clear that there will be a substantial amount of dirt, sludge, mud and general littering. This will inevitably affect other residents and their vehicles.
47. I should point out that we are keen to see quality improvements to any properties in the road and if done correctly can be positive to the surroundings, but the area is very quite and we as residents are keen to keep it that way.

48. Mr and Mrs Newey

44 White House Croft Long Newton

49. I am writing to you because I am extremely concerned about the title subject. At present I am at my place of employment offshore West Africa, so e-mail is the only way I can communicate with you.

50. I live in No 44 White House Croft, in my back garden above ground there is a running stream (culvert) which flows underground under the land the occupiers of No 31 want to build there extension on. If there is any restriction in the flow of water my garden would very quickly be flooded. No building company can guarantee this will not happen unless they concrete tunnel the culvert prior to the building works being undertaken.

51. I have written to you previously about this, but am told by my wife this morning that a neighbour of ours received a letter from you explaining that was not an objection to development .If that isn't an reasonable objection I would like to know what is.

52. In the worst case scenario if flooding occurs who would be legally responsible for any damage? I can see I will have to take legal advice on my return to the U.K. at the end of February. In addition to the possible problems this development could incur with the culvert it will also cause a traffic problem on a tight corner near my property. People invariable park outside whilst visiting friends and any narrowing of the road would in my opinion cause a safety concern, particularly for the young children that play in the street there.

53. Finally if the present occupiers can get planning permission to build over the culvert, why couldn't Yuill Homes get the same when the houses were first built? Because they considered building over the culvert to be a risk they couldn't take, because of the detrimental effect it could have on the community as a whole.

54. Mr and Mrs Mason

40 Whitehouse Croft Long Newton

As a follow up from my previous comments, i still have not received any correspondence from Stockton council, i have noted comments made on the application and have even more concerns now. I note comments from one resident stating that many comments are unfair and unjust, from our point of view that is easy for some residents to say when they have adequate street lighting, we don't, and to reduce it further is completely unjust. As for the comments about children , the comments themselves are quite childish, and again easy from someone who does not have young children playing out in an area which has hardly any pavements to start with or green spaces, even more ironic that the same document states the road is narrow, blind corner and dangerous and yet fails to see why people have objections to moving a lamp and all the safety issues mentioned , has everyone forgot the horrendous winter we have just had and the fact it was my husband who salted the roads not the council for our safety and the residents, my main concern now is why the need for an additional garage and drive ?if it is in anyway connected to running a business from this address then i would like further investigation and clarification before and planning is approved. Finally the culvert is the biggest issue and i have looked at three different maps all of which place the culvert in different location, it quite clearly needs much more investigation as this effects all of us including residents at the front of the estate, we have nothing at all against these neighbours , and can understand them wanting to improve their property, for the right reasons and to at least take on board our objections and to the reasons why. At this point i would also like to request a copy of the minutes of the meeting from Long Newton parish council as they have put in a document they have no objection. Could you also provide information is this a flood risk area, wish to object to planning application at 31 white house croft, i am most annoyed that we did not receive a letter especially when the application is partly to re site a lamppost, our house is in the corner and very dark to start with it is out of the question to move this lamp post and reduce

our light , mainly for safety and security issues, but there is not enough light to start with and this was planned original by engineers, so as i have stated it is out of the question to reduce the light even more.

55. I share the same concerns with other neighbours re the culvert and much more investigating needs to be carried out before any land at all is disturbed. I cannot see the need to add another garage when the two existing garages are not used to start with, if parking is an issue for visitors then it would be quite easy to change the existing front lawn to hard standing, to accommodate this. This is a tight corner and a hazard in the winter, yet another reason to leave the lamp post alone. I believe only two people live in this house, and it is a large property to start with, an extension to the rear is acceptable but to redevelop the front with the work entailed is really not necessary . please keep in touch with us with any developments as we live here and have a right to be kept informed , thank you

56. Karen Woodward

38 Whitehouse Croft Long Newton

I am writing to you in regard to the application regarding planning permission to number 31 White House Croft. As a house owner on the street i feel that this extension and building work would be hazardous and does not take into consideration the safety of the residents especially the children who reside in this end of White House Croft.

57. Mrs De Chaumont Rambert using her home as a work place would only cause extra traffic on White House Croft and as there are no pavements on this end of the street and my children have to walk on the road. This could be a potential danger especially when people who do not know the road lay out are entering and leaving this area of White House Croft added to this danger is the fact that Mr De Chaumont Rambert has applied to move the street light outside number 31. Personally i think that this is only adding more of a danger to my children and that of other children in the street, as the children come home on dark school evenings to what could become a badly lit road which will see a rise in traffic is ridiculous. There is no parking facilities for extra cars, even though the application includes an extra drive way. There is usually three cars parked outside their home so where does that leave any clients visiting Mrs De Chaumont Rambert to park? they will end up parking on the road, the very road that my children have to walk, thus causing a very hazardous situation. The corner of the road outside no 36 is practically a blind corner so anyone leaving White House Croft by car has to take the corner wide so they can see any oncoming traffic again another hazard to anyone who does not no the road.

58. White House Croft is quite a narrow street and this added traffic, building vans, building deliveries etc will only cause extra dangers to the residents and their children. I feel that Stockton Borough Council are not taking into consideration the effects especially the long term effects that this application would have.

59. This is just one of the issues, it does not include the effect such a build would have on the local culvert that runs threw the street, the issue of the mess caused by the building work. I myself can personally vouch for the hazards of this as i was involved in a very serious car accident that was partly caused by the debris and dirt left on the road outside no 31 when it was originally built by Yuill.

60. I would like to think that the planning department will take into consideration the residents and the effect that this application would have on the local environment before they agree to any proposals for building work.

61. Henry Cowan

33 White House Croft Long Newton

62. Fully support the application. Children should not play on the road - Hazard removed!! We have no objections to the proposed extensions. I feel that many of the comments already submitted are very unfair and unjust. I fully accept peoples concerns re the culvert etc; however I am sure that appropriate and accurate investigations will show there is no cause for concern re this matter.
63. Regarding an increased road safety issue. The only issue in the past, at present and I have no doubt in the future if the fact that children from the age of two upwards have been allowed to play out in the road unsupervised causing a danger to themselves and to others. The road is narrow and has a blind corner. This proposed work will not make the situation any worse.
64. It is the responsibility of the parents to ensure their children don't play on such a dangerous road, surely not the applicants responsibility.
65. Many of the comments relate to the disruption associated with the work. Many in the croft have had extensions built, and as a result have caused such disruption themselves, including myself. I indeed like many of the original resident moved into the house when others were yet to be built. We lived with it, we worked round it and put up with it because it was short term.
66. Re taking out poor trees taking away from " The country view" I would be very surprised indeed if the resident in question could see any of these trees from her property at all, given their location.
67. Re changing the front elevation of the house. I feel that it will in-fact enhance the area and actually make the house look more in proportion.
68. I have not forgotten that I will have to look out of every front window of my house and stare at a brick wall extension to the rear. I have no objection to this as I rarely stand and look out of those windows.
69. Stephen And Sharon Reay
36 White House Croft Long Newton
70. Object as I would not want to the street light moving as it would result in intrusive lighting. The proposal may damage the adjacent culvert and the residents would not be held responsible or pay for any damage.

PLANNING POLICY

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.

Policy HO12

71. Where planning permission is required, all extensions to dwellings should be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and should avoid significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties.

72. Permission for two-storey rear extensions close to a common boundary will not normally be granted if the extension would shadow or dominate neighbouring property to a substantial degree.
73. Permission for two-storey side extensions close to a common boundary will not normally be granted unless they are set back from the boundary or set back from the front wall of the dwelling

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

74. The application site is a detached dwelling house located within a residential cul de sac. The application site faces the turning head of the cul de sac providing a large separation distance to the neighbouring property opposite. The rear garden is enclosed by a 1.8 metre high closed boarded fence. There is a culvert adjacent to the east of the application site providing a large separation distance to the neighbouring property to the east.
75. There is an existing lamppost to the front of the site which will be moved to gain access to the extended driveway.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

76. The main issues for consideration when assessing this application are the potential impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties, character of the surrounding area and potential implications for highway safety.
77. Six letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents largely on the basis that the proposal will impact upon the adjacent culvert and result in flooding and drainage problems, the objectors' state that there are also restrictive covenants placed on the property. Concerns are raised regarding the impact upon the street scene and impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of view, overlooking and appearing overbearing. The objectors also raise concerns regarding, traffic generated during construction and moving the lamppost on the grounds that this will impact upon parking, manoeuvrability and reduced visibility resulting in a detrimental impact upon highway safety.
78. Objectors also raise concerns regarding the impact upon the trees on the site and the impact upon the value and saleability of surrounding properties.
79. One letter of support has been received from a neighbouring resident.

Amenity of neighbouring properties

80. The proposed conversion of the garage includes the replacement of the garage door with a window in the front elevation. The property faces on to the turning head of the cul de sac. As such there is a large separation distance of approximately 17 metres to the side elevation of number 50 White House Croft. As such it is not considered that the proposed development will result in a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy.

81. The proposed garage extension will project from the north east elevation and as such will largely be screened from properties to the south and west by the existing dwelling house. There is a separation distance of approximately 16 metres to the side elevation of number 29 White House Croft. As such it is not considered that the proposal will result in a detrimental impact upon the amenity of this neighbouring property in terms of appearing overbearing.
82. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact upon views from surrounding properties. However it is not considered that the proposed extension would restrict views, furthermore the right to a view is not a material planning consideration.

Character of the Area

83. The design of the proposed extension is considered to be acceptable as it respects the character of the existing dwelling in terms of style, scale and materials. The surrounding properties consist of various designs therefore it is not considered that the proposed extension will result in an incongruous feature or a detrimental impact upon the character of the surrounding area.
84. The Council's Landscape Architects have raised no objections to the development but would object to the removal of the Ash tree (ref. T1 on drawing No. 3) as it is considered that has sufficient visual amenity value to warrant its retention. Therefore a Tree Preservation Order has put on T1 to retain the tree on the site. However it is not considered that tree ref T2, which is a smaller specimen near to some of trees on the site boundary, is worthy of protection. A condition is recommended accordingly.

Highway safety

85. The applicant does not propose to increase the number of bedrooms at this property; the proposed garage replaces an existing garage on a like for like basis. Therefore the proposed development accords with guidance within SPD3: parking for New Developments and the Head of Technical Services raises no objections to this application. As such it is not considered that the proposal will result in an adverse impact upon highway safety
86. In order to facilitate this development, a street lighting column will require to be moved at the applicant's expense, to accommodate the widened driveway. An informative is recommended to advise the applicant to contact the Street Lighting Engineer, Highway Network Management regarding the relocation of the lighting column and the applicant should contact Direct Services regarding the widening of the dropped vehicle crossing.
87. It is noted that several objectors have raised highway concerns in White House Croft as follows:
- Visibility
 - On street parking issues
 - Parking/traffic during construction works
 - Resiting of street light column
 - Culvert

88. The application is acceptable in highway terms as the proposed widening of the driveway will not be detrimental to highway safety. The road layout is similar to many shared surface cul-de-sacs around the Borough with the property being at the end of a cul-de-sac it is considered that vehicles will be travelling at reduced speeds along this road and visibility is adequate in line with current standards. All the properties in the vicinity benefit from adequate incurtilage parking. There are no recorded injury accidents on White House Croft since Jan 2006 to Dec 2010.
89. The widening of the driveway will provide an extra car parking space at no. 31, which will assist reducing on street parking.
90. Concerns have been raised that the construction of the extension will result in site traffic restricting parking and visibility, as this is a temporary arrangement this will not be detrimental on a long term basis and occurs for every development. It is not considered significant.
91. Concerns have been raised with regards to the resiting of the street light column; the Highway Network Manager has advised that the repositioning of the light column will have little effect on the current lighting levels around the area. It should be noted that street lighting columns are to light the highway not individual dwellings.

Residual Matters

92. The value and saleability of property is not a material planning consideration and as such cannot be considered when assessing this application.
93. The impact upon the culvert and drainage is a matter to be considered under building control regulations and as such is not a material planning consideration. However Northumbrian Water was consulted regarding the application and has raised no objections to the proposal.
94. Concerns are raised regarding the impact of the vehicles during construction however given the scale of the development it is considered that the impact will be short term therefore it is not considered that this would warrant refusal of the application.
95. Objectors have commented that the applicant is running a business from home. The applicant has confirmed in writing how the business operates. From the information provided it appears that the business is ancillary to the main dwelling and as such does not require permission however this matter is currently being further investigated by the Planning enforcement section.

CONCLUSION

96. Overall it is not considered that the proposed extension will result in a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties, character of the surrounding area or highway safety. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy HO12 of the Local Plan and as such is considered to be acceptable.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Miss Helen Turnbull Telephone No 01642 526063

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward Western Parishes
Ward Councillor Councillor F. G. Salt,

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications: As Report

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:

Planning application 11/0050/FUL