



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/D/24/3349613

69 Briardene Way, Backworth, North Tyneside NE27 0XQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Adeelah Phul against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00663/FULH.
 - The development proposed is proposed front extension to existing dwelling with flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Proposed front extension to existing dwelling with flat roof at 69 Briardene Way, Backworth, North Tyneside NE27 0XQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00663/FULH and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 300-01 Proposed Plans Rev 2, 300-02 Proposed Elevations Rev 2 and 300-04 Block Plans Rev 1,
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety with specific regard to parking provision.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site has a grassed garden area to the front as well as an area of hard standing that appears suitable to provide parking for 2 vehicles. Properties on Briardene Way have a similar arrangement. All the properties on the street are served by a shared private driveway.
5. On Briardene Way there are multiple visitor parking bays. At the time of my visit the area appeared quiet. Although cars were parked on many of the driveways, none of the nearby visitor parking bays were occupied and I noted

no cars parked elsewhere on the street in the immediate vicinity of the site. Although my observations were a snapshot in time, I have little evidence to suggest they represent an atypical scenario. Overall, Briardene Way did not appear to me to be experiencing any significant degree of parking stress.

6. The Council's 2022 Transport and Highways Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) has been introduced since the property was granted consent. It sets out, amongst other things, that three parking spaces should be provided for four bedroom dwellings. The appeal site's current situation reflects this guidance with 2 driveway spaces and a garage for a single vehicle. However, the SPD also outlines that in areas with good accessibility, appropriate parking management and robust travel plan measures in place, a reduction in these requirements may be considered.
7. No specific travel plan has been provided for the site nor the wider area. That said, the site is a reasonably accessible location with bus stops close by and a Tyne & Wear Metro station within walking distance. Despite there being no parking controls in the immediate area, my observations above suggest there is not currently a high level of demand that would necessitate this.
8. It is highly probable that many garages in the area will be used for purposes other than parking. In such circumstances, including the appellant's current situation, overflow parking would, in all likelihood, be accommodated in the visitor parking bays or on the street, and garage parking would not even be considered. Based on my observations above, I have no substantive evidence to suggest the current arrangement is causing harm to highway safety through either cars parked causing an obstruction or inhibiting the free flow of traffic.
9. Whilst I noticed a degree of on street parking at Greenhills and Greenacres, this was not to an adverse level with the visitor bays provided generally utilised over parking directly on the highway. I do not therefore see this matter as such that parking issues have arisen out of lower standards being applied. I have, in any event, considered the scheme before me on its own merits. Moreover, my observations on site suggest that, even if some overflow parking was to occur, this could be accommodated by the ample number of visitor bays without causing harm to highway safety in the manner I have set out above.
10. The SPD notes that cycle storage should ideally be provided separately from the garage in the form of a suitable shed if space allows within the property boundary. Although I am not certain whether alternative cycle storage currently exists, there is a spacious rear garden accessible via the side, where there is ample space. Accordingly, I am not persuaded the proposal would remove the availability for suitable cycle storage.
11. The recently allowed appeals cited are limited in number in comparison to the size of the housing estate, and while the possibility exists that other similar proposals may come forward, I have seen no compelling evidence to suggest that there is a reasonable prospect of significant levels of similar development being repeated nearby. Even if other similar proposals came forward, noting the Council's ability to control any such proposals, each case would be considered on its own merits having regard to the evidence and circumstances relevant at the time.
12. However, for the reasons set out, the proposal would not result in harm to highway safety in relation to on-street parking in the area, and it would accord

with Policies DM6.1 and DM7.4 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017. In respect of this issue, these policies require development proposals to ensure sufficient car parking is well integrated into the layout.

Conditions

13. In addition to conditions related to the timeliness of the development and the identification of plans, a condition requiring the use of matching materials is also necessary to ensure the character and appearance of the area is not harmed by the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. There is nothing sufficiently compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the above conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR