

Appeal 6014446

Appeal details

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written Part 1
Appeal site	161 Wansbeck Road, Jarrow, NE32 5SR
Agent contact details	simon carrington simon.c@beaupartners.co.uk 07730445058
Application number	260209

Before you start

Which local planning authority (LPA) do you want to appeal against?	South Tyneside
---	----------------

What is your appeal about?	Full planning
----------------------------	---------------

What date did you submit your application?	9 Apr 2026
--	------------

Was your application granted or refused?	Refused
--	---------

What is the date on the decision letter from the local planning authority?	21 Jul 2026
--	-------------

Appellant's appeal

Was the application made in the appellant's name	No
--	----

Applicant's name	Rupert Waspe Soyca Ltd
------------------	---------------------------

Application reference	260209
-----------------------	--------

Contact details	simon carrington Beaumont and Partners
-----------------	---

Phone number	07730445058
--------------	-------------

Site address	161 Wansbeck Road Jarrow NE32 5SR
What is the area of the appeal site?	127 m ²
Is the site in a green belt	No
Site fully owned	Yes
Agricultural holding	No
Will an inspector need to access the land or property?	No
Site health and safety issues	No
Was your application about any of the following?	Change of use
Enter the description of development	Change of use from dwelling (Use Class C3) to 6 bed, 6 person House in Multiple Occupation [HMO] (Use Class C4) and insertion of rooflights
Did the local planning authority change the description of development?	No
Why are you appealing?	he planning officers report for committee sums up the proposal very well and shows the policy issues here and contradict the reason for refusal. Cumulative impact and character – The planning officer makes the clear argument that this is not the case in this situation. The Committee’s reason does not identify or quantify any harmful concentration or explain the mechanism of harm. With the planning officer referencing the same guidance as we were given at the original meeting to discuss the potential way forward. The proposal would not “sandwich” the site between HMOs. The proposal should not produce more than 10% of HMO’s within a 100m radius. We clearly pass both those tests as evidenced by the planning officers report to committee. Emerging Local Plan Policy 16 (limited weight) does not show conflict; thresholds cited are not breached. A six-person C4 remains a residential use comparable, in land-use terms, to a large family dwelling. No objective evidence has been put forward to show material harm to local character.

Significant changes since application	Other: We started the development under Permitted Development but the council removed these rights with an immediate Article 4 direction without the normal 1 year period to resolve issues like these.
Preferred procedure	written
Are there other appeals linked to your development?	No
Did the appellant apply for an award of appeal costs?	No

Appellant's documents

Application form	260209 Application Form 090426.pdf (/published-document/98949e6e-84df-4939-aa31-32680fdd8f5a)
Decision letter	260209 Decision Notice.pdf (/published-document/16e3de8c-3e85-498b-a6aa-89cc83319333)
Separate ownership certificate in application	No
Environmental statement	No