



North Tyneside Council

Planning Committee

5 May 2023

Dear Councillor,

With reference to the agenda previously circulated for the meeting of the Planning Committee to be held on **Tuesday, 9 May 2023** I attach for your consideration supplementary papers in relation to the following items:

Agenda Item	Page
6. 21/01779/REM, Land West of Mackley Court, Wallsend	3 - 6
To determine a reserved matters application from VB Benton Ltd for the approval of the access, scale, layout, appearance and landscaping of planning approval 12/02025/FUL, construction of 1no. retail / commercial unit falling within Use Class E.	
8. 21/02496/FUL, Land Adjacent to Hatfield House, Borough Road, North Shields	7 - 8
To determine a full application from Low Town Developments for the erection of 5no. three storey townhouse style terraced dwellings, with communal parking and rear amenity space.	

Circulation overleaf ...

Members of the Planning Committee

Councillor Julie Cruddas
Councillor John Hunter
Councillor Pam McIntyre
Councillor John O'Shea
Councillor Jane Shaw

Councillor Margaret Hall
Councillor Chris Johnston
Councillor Tommy Mulvenna
Councillor Willie Samuel (Chair)

ADDENDUM 2 - 05.05.2023

Application No:	21/01779/REM	Author	Maxine Ingram
Date valid:	2 August 2021	:	
Target decision date:	27 September 2021	☎:	0191 643 6322
		Ward:	Northumberland

Application type: approval of reserved matters

Location: Land West of Mackley Court Wallsend Tyne And Wear

Proposal: Reserved matters for the approval for the access, scale, layout, appearance and landscaping of planning approval 12/02025/FUL - Construction of 1no. retail / commercial unit falling within Use Class E (Amended plans received 17.01.2023)

Applicant: VB Benton Limited, Mr Hogan C/o BH Planning & Design 1 Hood Street Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 6JQ

Agent: BH Planning & Design, Fraser Tinsley 1 Hood Street Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 6JQ

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

1.0 Representations

1.1 A further objection has been received. This is set out below:

- Inadequate parking provision
- Inappropriate design
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of residential amenity
- Loss of visual amenity
- Nuisance - disturbance
- Nuisance - dust/dirt
- Nuisance - noise
- Poor traffic/pedestrian safety
- Poor/unsuitable vehicular access
- Traffic congestion
- Will result in visual intrusion
- Within greenbelt/no special circumstance
- This proposal is completely nonsensical when considering the welfare of those living on the estate. There are already several retail units within close proximity of the estate and proposal for a Lidl which will be closer for almost half of the properties on the estate and for the majority of Fallow Park.
- There are already significant issues with traffic during busy periods on the

roundabout on Station Road and this will be amplified by traffic trying to access the retail unit as well as deliveries. Due to a lack of visitor parking on Moor Drive/Mackley Court there are also many cars parked on the street/pavement meaning all the analysis done regarding turning circles etc should be redone to take this into account otherwise they won't be able to comply.

- When the traffic is busy at the main road/junction it will force cars to use other streets such as Ridge Way and Furrow Drive to try and leave the estate, these roads have no footpaths and so this increases the risk of incidents occurring on the estate.

- The noise of early/late deliveries will be extremely disruptive to residents who live in the immediate proximity of the unit. An example of North Tyneside Council's failure in managing this issue would be Aldi in Forest Hall where deliveries were initially not allowed to take place before 7am but can now be seen as early as 5am. Similarly opening hours were initially agreed to try and minimise disruption at Aldi but were extended at the request of Aldi within months of the site opening, something that is sure to happen in this instance also.

- Another concern is antisocial behaviour from those who are likely to try and hang around the premises.

- Overall it seems like an obvious and sensible decision to reject this application. When looking at the pros and cons of the application it's clear the risks far outweigh the benefits.

1.2 Two further representations supporting the application have been received. These are set out below:

- As a mother with young children whose partner often works away it's often difficult to get to other shops. This would make life so much easier and I'm sure there are multiple others in the same boat. This is part of the reason we even moved to the estate in the first place as it was on the original plans that this area was always going to be a shop. I think it's quite ridiculous there's people objecting it when they bought their houses knowing full well that this was proposed from the beginning. Many estates have little shops and manage just fine. If anything, it helps our economy to grow as well. It will be a great help to those who have mobility issues, the elderly, people like me with young children and busy lives who don't have much time to spare and this who just quickly need to run out for some bread and milk. It will also be handy for older children wanting to help out. When my children are older, I still wouldn't feel comfortable sending them to the other shops across busy roads but a shop on the estate is ideal.

- A shop will greatly benefit east Benton rise / fallow park. It will save people making unnecessary journeys further afield in a car therefore save emissions. People who are saying it will greatly increase traffic are wrong realistically this is only going to be used by people on the estate so would be going past anyway.

- It was also stated on the plans to the estate that there would be a shop so were fully aware when buying a house on the estate.

1.3 A further representation raising concerns and support for the application has been received. This is set out below:

- Inappropriate design
- Nuisance - noise
- Traffic congestion

- In general, I support the building of a retail unit on the estate, we have no amenities of this type. However, I am concerned about traffic on Moor Drive and in Mackley Court. I can't see why the entrance to the car park can't be from the roundabout on Station Road. Especially if any further development of the site is considered - we were initially told there may be a medical centre on site, and there is certainly space for that.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM

Application No:	21/02496/FUL	Author	Rebecca Andison
Date valid:	16 December 2021	:	
Target decision date:	10 February 2022	☎:	0191 643 6321
		Ward:	Riverside

Application type: full planning application

Location: Land Adjacent To Hatfield House Borough Road North Shields Tyne And Wear

Proposal: Erection of 5no. three storey townhouse style terraced dwellings, with communal parking and rear amenity space (REVISED PLANS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION)

Applicant: Low Town Developments, 1 Silksworth Hall Drive Sunderland SR3 2PG

Agent: Building Design (Northern) Ltd, Mr Joss Ryan The Old School Simpson Street Sunderland SR4 6DR

1.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:

1.1 The recommendation given to Members within the Officer Report is to grant planning permission subject to a Unilateral Undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning act 1990 to secure the following:

- Coastal mitigation: £1,685
- Habitat creation: £2,566

1.2 The Unilateral undertaking is now complete. Therefore, the recommendation to Members is that planning permission should be granted.

This page is intentionally left blank