South Tyneside Council

LPA Statement of Case

Planning Inspectorate Ref.	6006432
South Tyneside Council Ref.	250805
Appeal by:	Maine Blueprints
Site address:	10 Belle Vue Crescent, South Shields

1.0 Background

1.1 On 16 December 2025, South Tyneside Council ("the Council"), as Local Planning Authority [LPA], received a planning application relating to "Change of use C3 4 bedroom single dwelling to C4 6 Bedroom HMO" at the appeal site.

1.2 The planning application was subject to written requests from a Councillor and Member of Parliament, with reasons, that it be determined by Planning Committee. These requests, in line with requirements set out in the Council's Constitution, were such that the planning application could not be determined under delegated powers.

1.3 The Council's Planning Committee considered and determined the application on 9 March 2026. The planning application was refused contrary to the recommendation of officers, and the decision notice was issued on the 9 March 2026. The refusal reason was as follows:

> 1. The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation would, as a result of the cumulative effects of such uses in the area, adversely impact on the character of the area and upon the amenity of existing occupiers, and have an unacceptable impact on parking and highway safety in the area, contrary to Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, Policy 16 of the South Tyneside Publication draft Local Plan and Paragraphs 116 and 135(f) of the NPPF.

1.4 A copy of the decision notice has already been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, by the appellant.

1.5 A copy of the officer report to planning committee has already been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by the LPA (when the appeal questionnaire was submitted). The minutes of the 9 March 2026 planning committee meeting are not currently available at this time. Due to local elections, the next planning committee meeting will likely take place towards the end of May, at the earliest. It would be for the next planning committee to agree the minutes from the 9 March 2026 planning committee..

2.0 The Council's Case

2.1 The Council considered that the appeal proposals would lead to significant harm in terms of the impact on the character of the area and residential amenity issues associated with HMO uses. The occupants would live as separate households with individual living, working and social patterns and would generate a more intensive use with activity from comings and goings compared to its use as a

single dwelling. The terraced form of development at this part of Belle Vue Crescent means that the increased activity and intensive use would be particularly noticeable and would harm the character of the street and adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to disturbance.

2.2 Additionally, concerns were raised regarding cumulative impacts related to an overconcentration of HMOs in the local area if this proposal was granted. In this regard there is already one HMO located approximately 60 metres away, and two further HMOs approximately 200 metres away, all at Stanhope Road.

2.3 The Council also noted existing car parking pressures in the locality and the narrow cul-de-sac within which the application site lies, including highway safety concerns arising as a consequence of the nature and intensity of the proposed use leading to increased demand for car parking from prospective residents and visitors, as well as limited turning space for delivery vehicles, leading to inconvenience and disturbance to local residents.

2.4 Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework sets out that "in determining all application under the planning Acts we will ensure that, where relevant:" under criterion (b) that "the development is acceptable in relation to any impact on residential amenity;" and under criterion (g) that "the impact of the development is acceptable in relation to highway capacity and safety or include proposals to mitigate any adverse impacts;". The development is considered to conflict with these policy criterion due to the impacts of the proposal on neighbouring properties by way of residential amenity, and increased parking pressures in the area.

2.5 Policy 16 of the South Tyneside Publication draft Local Plan set outs that "Where planning permission is required, proposal for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) will be permitted where:" under criterion (ii) that "the proposal would not result in an over-concentration of HMOs within any one area of the borough, or lead to HMOs becoming the dominant dwelling type, or adversely impact on the functionality and characteristics of a local area." and under criterion (iv) that "the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of surrounding properties by causing excessive noise and disturbance" and under criterion (v) that "the proposal would provide adequate provision for parking, servicing, refuse and recycling". The development is considered to conflict with these policy criterion due to the overconcentration impacts of the proposal with nearby

existing HMOs, impacts of the proposal on neighbouring properties by way of residential amenity, and increased parking pressures in the area.

2.6 Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out “development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.” The development is considered to result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety due to increased parking pressures in the area.

2.7 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF sets out that “planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.” The development is considered to not be conducive to the above criterion by way of not providing a high standard of amenity for existing users nearby.

3.0 Comments on the appellant’s grounds of appeal

3.1 The appellant’s grounds of appeal notes the Planning Committee refusal does not introduce any new technical evidence and does not explain why the officer’s conclusions were unsound or should be departed from, relative to the alleged cumulative impact and character of the area, residential amenity and parking and highway safety matters.

3.2 The members of Planning Committee, in reaching their decision, are entitled to give differing weight to the relevant material planning considerations as compared to the officer report and, in consequence, reach a different decision to that recommended by officers. That was the case here.

3.3 The members of Planning Committee took their decision having regard to their view of the picture as a whole and their own local knowledge of the area, notably on the issues mentioned above and with regard to the policy criterion set out in section 2.0 of this statement, and where it is considered the development is in conflict with these policies.

3.4 The appellants Statement of Case refers to the appeal site occupying a corner/end terrace location, further reducing any potential cumulative impact. However, despite occupying such a location the property on the appeal site is still

sandwiched in between two neighbouring dwellings on either side with No.12 Belle View Crescent to the north and No.1 Vine Street to the east. Both of these neighbouring properties physically adjoin the appeal property. As such, the Council would contend that the corner/end terrace location of the appeal property does not materially reduce the impact of the proposal in terms of its adverse cumulative impact on the character of the area and upon the amenity of existing occupiers.

4.0 Closing remarks

4.1 The Planning Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.

5.0 Other matters

5.1 The Council has separately submitted (to the Planning Inspectorate) a list of suggested planning conditions for the Inspector to consider, if they were to allow the appeal and grant planning permission.

5.2 It is noted the description of development on the committee report is ‘Change of use from a residential dwelling (C3) to 6 bed, 6 person House in Multiple Occupation [HMO] (C4), and provision of rooflights.’, whilst on the decision notice the description is ‘Change of use from a residential dwelling to a 6 Bedroom, 6 Person HMO (C3)’. If the Inspector were to allow the appeal, it is suggested the description of development matches that in the committee report for completeness.