



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2025

**by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 5 June 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/W/25/3360508**

**56 The Meadows, Wallsend, Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear NE28 7QA**

- 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 Mr Sam Watson against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01410/FULH.
  - The development proposed is ground floor garage conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by North Tyneside Council against Mr Sam Watson. This is subject to a separate decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development above is taken from the application form, omitting wording that is not an act of development. While the garage has already been converted, the parking arrangements shown on the plans and described on the application form have not been implemented. As such, for clarity, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.
4. I note the points raised about land ownership from the Council and an interested party and the clarification provided in the appellant's submissions. Notwithstanding this, dispute about land ownership is a civil matter to be resolved between the relevant parties and does not alter the planning merits of the proposal.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the provision of car parking, with regard to character and appearance and highway safety.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site accommodates a four-bedroom detached dwelling. In line with the standards set out in the Transport and Highways Supplementary Planning Document (2022) (SPD) there is a requirement for three off-street car parking spaces. Despite the submitted Block Plan indicating two car parking spaces on the driveway, it is not in dispute that only one of these spaces is within the red edge plan and in the appellant's ownership. As such this second space on the driveway cannot be relied upon to contribute to meeting the parking requirements.

7. Two other off-street car parking spaces are indicated on the Block Plan, one adjacent to the fence on a landscaped strip that is currently used for bin storage, and one within the appeal property's garden. However, there is limited detail to indicate whether these two spaces are of sufficient size, if there would be adequate space around them for manoeuvring or in the case of the parking space indicated adjacent to the fence, if there would be room to open all vehicle doors to help get a child in or out or to assist those who are less mobile. It has also not been shown where the bin storage would be relocated to or that adequate garden space would remain if parking arrangements were laid out in this way. The practicalities of the proposed car parking layout are indicative that it would not be well integrated into the appeal site layout and would not deliver good design as a consequence, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant is said to currently own two cars, however this may well change over time or if there were different owners. The parking standards have been developed to reflect the likely demand for parking and it seems reasonable that a four-bedroom dwelling could result in a three-car household, as well as additional parking for visitors. Even if the garage has not historically been used for parking, there is no substantive evidence that it could not be used for this purpose by future occupiers should they wish to.
9. The appellant has indicated that there is an informal arrangement with a neighbour for the use of an adjacent car parking space which they have used for several years with no issues. However, there are no clear details about where this space is located, and it has not been shown that this arrangement is feasible. Without such details any condition to secure a parking arrangement would be imprecise and not enforceable, failing to meet the policy tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
10. Given my findings above, the conversion of the garage would result in one off-street car parking space at the appeal site, a shortfall of two spaces and therefore a reasonable prospect of displacement parking. While I did not observe any indiscriminate parking along The Meadows, the parking bays were well used at the time of my site visit which was mid-morning mid-week and parking demand could reasonably be higher in the evenings when residents are back from work and at the weekend. This is supported in evidence which indicates that parking is in high demand, and I have no reason to doubt the Council's or interested parties' comments on these matters.
11. The Meadows is a relatively narrow road, and the appeal property is located a short walk from the nearest parking bays. It is proximate to the junction with Kings Vale and at a bend in the road. Therefore, any displacement parking would be likely to result in indiscriminate parking on the pavement directly opposite the appeal property for convenience. Parking in this way could reasonably affect the free flow of traffic and reduce visibility to the extent that it would pose a danger to highway safety. Furthermore, taking account of the needs of all users, including the elderly and those with mobility issues or disabilities, displacement parking would obstruct the pavement, and so pedestrians would have to cross the road to the other pavement or otherwise walk in the road. As such, the proposal would not create a safe, secure and attractive place which minimises the scope for conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles as sought by Framework Paragraph 117.

12. The appellant has provided a series of photographs seeking to demonstrate that there are not any on-street parking pressures. However, there is limited information to indicate that the photos are representative of when parking demand would be at its highest, bearing in mind that demand will vary during the day and throughout the week. While the site is said to be served by several bus stops, there is no information about their location or the frequency of services, and the metro station is more than a 10-minute walk away, beyond what is generally considered to be conducive to walking. As such, there is no substantive evidence that the site's relative accessibility would reduce parking demand. There is support for the proposal from some neighbouring residents, however this is not, in itself, a reason to allow inappropriate development. These matters do not therefore lead me away from my above findings and overall, there is no clear evidence to justify a departure from the parking standards.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to apparently similar developments involving garage conversions. However, there is no clear evidence to indicate that they are directly comparable to this appeal scheme. In any event the fact that apparently similar development has been granted permission is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
14. To conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the provision of car parking, with regard to character and appearance and highway safety and would conflict with Policy DM6.1 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017). Amongst other things, this policy requires development to demonstrate high design standards with sufficient car parking that is well integrated into the layout.

### **Other Matters**

15. While the appellant has expressed frustrations with the Council's handling of the application, this does not alter or outweigh my findings which are based on the planning merits of the case. I note the matters raised by a neighbouring resident and the appellant's response, however as I am dismissing for other reasons these other matters are not determinative.

### **Conclusion**

16. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*F Harrison*

INSPECTOR