Classification: NULBC UNCLASSIFIED

APPEAL BY MR GRANT EDWARDS, AXAIR FANS UK LTD AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL TO REFUSE TO GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE EXTENSION TO EXISTING WAREHOUSE ON AN AREA DESIGNATED AS EXPANSION SPACE AT UNIT 3, LOWFIELD DRIVE, NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME

Application Number	18/00220/FUL
LPA's Decision	Refused under delegated authority 18th May 2018
Appeal Decision	Appeal Allowed
Date of Appeal Decision	1 st November 2018

The Appeal Decision

The Inspector identified the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on parking and highway safety.

In allowing the appeal the Inspector made the following comments:-

- The application site is within the context of an established industrial estate with, it is agreed by the appellant and the Highway Authority, a record of no highway accidents on Lowfield Drive in the last five years.
- Whilst acknowledging the differing policy interpretations with regards to parking requirements, the Inspector highlighted that the objective nonetheless is safe development, in line with Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (Core Strategy) Design Quality Policy CSP1. As such, parking provisions should be sufficient to be safe, taking account of the function of the proposed extension and the realities on site.
- The Council's concerns with regards to the ability to restrict staffing numbers were acknowledged, however the restriction of the extension's use to storage space by planning condition would go some way to address this matter
- Considering the extension's proposed storage use, the appellant's statement on staffing numbers and the existing parking capacity, it is not considered that the proposed development is likely to generate much if any increase in parking on Lowfield Drive.
- The location of the nearest bus stop 0.9miles walk from the appeal site is somewhat separated from the industrial estate. Walking time on top of waiting for a bus makes the public transport propositions potentially challenging and requiring of a powerful approach with a Travel Plan.
- In light of the conclusion on parking demand and highway safety, a Travel Plan, including proposed motorcycle parking and secure undercover cycle parking as part of the development, has potential to reduce car parking demand.
- To conclude, the proposed development would not significantly affect highway safety. A Travel Plan would be an opportunity to manage and reduce car use at the site. It would enable the business to accommodate a changing supply chain and thereby retain jobs at this location. It would consequently comply with the relevant requirements of Local Plan Policy T16 and the Core Strategy which seek to ensure

that new development is safe and fosters the employment base. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Recommendation

That the appeal decision be noted