

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2012

by **Kevin Ward BA (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 September 2012

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/12/2179518**  
**56 Glaisdale Road, Yarm, Cleveland TS15 9RP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr J Craven against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 12/0221/FUL, dated 25 January 2012, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2012.
  - The development proposed is a two storey extension to side of property and single storey extension to rear.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
  - a) The living conditions of the occupiers of 58 Glaisdale Road in terms of outlook, sunlight and daylight.
  - b) Highway safety.

### Reasons

#### *Living conditions*

3. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Guide (the SPG) was adopted following consultation and I have therefore given it significant weight in determining the appeal.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would project right up to the common boundary with No.58. The ground floor window to the side of No.58 serves a kitchen. The proposed extension would bring the two storey element of the appeal property noticeably closer. Whilst it would have little effect on direct sunlight given the orientation of the houses, due its height and very close proximity the extension would have an imposing and overbearing effect on the outlook from the window and noticeably reduce the amount of daylight received to the side of No.58, creating an undue sense of enclosure.
5. I consider therefore that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.58 in terms of outlook and daylight.

*Highway safety*

6. The proposal would make adequate provision for off-street parking to meet the needs of the extended appeal property. The current open arrangement between Nos.56 and 58 allows for cars to be readily manoeuvred and parked along the driveways. I saw that this is a common feature of the houses along Glaisdale Road and appears to have been incorporated in the original layout of the estate. The proposed extension would create a restricted width for cars to be manoeuvred and parked on the driveway to No.58. I share the Council's view that this would make the use of the garage and driveway for parking less likely and would increase the tendency to park on the road/footway. I consider that the likely increase in on-street parking would have an adverse effect on highway safety.
7. I note the appellant's point that a fence could be erected along the boundary and that this would have a similar effect on parking. However, there is no evidence that this is a realistic prospect, particularly given the likely impact that this would have on the ability to park on the driveway to the appeal property itself. In any event I must consider the appeal on the basis of the actual circumstances that exist.
8. I appreciate that there are examples of two storey side extensions in Ruddy Close. However, I am not aware of the particular circumstances relating to these existing extensions and in any case I have determined the appeal before me on its own merits.

**Conclusion**

9. For the above reasons and taking account of other matters raised I consider that the proposed development would conflict with Policy HO12 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan, and guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document on parking provision for developments and the SPG. I conclude therefore that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Kevin Ward*

INSPECTOR