

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 27 September 2022

Present: Councillor W Samuel (Chair)
Councillors K Barrie, John Hunter, C Johnston,
L Marshall, T Mulvenna, J O'Shea, P Richardson and
J Shaw

Apologies: Councillors J Cruddas, M Green and M Hall

PQ31/22 Appointment of substitutes

Pursuant to the Council's Constitution the appointment of the following substitute members was reported:

Councillor L Marshall for Councillor M Hall

PQ32/22 Declarations of Interest

Councillor C Johnston declared a non-registerable interest in planning application 22/01502/FULH, 23 Monks Way, Tynemouth because he lived in close proximity to the application site and took no part in the discussion or voting on the matter.

Councillor J O'Shea stated that as he had previously expressed his support for planning application 21/00174/FUL, 1-2 East Parade, Whitley Bay and took no part in the discussion or voting on the matter.

Councillor P Richardson stated that whilst he lived near the site of planning application 20/00321/FUL, Friends Meeting House, 23 Front Street, Whitley Bay he had not predetermined the application and had an open mind to the arguments to be presented at the meeting.

PQ33/22 Minutes

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 30 August 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PQ34/22 Planning Officer Reports

The Committee received guidance in relation to the principles of decision making when determining planning applications and then gave consideration to the planning applications listed in the following minutes.

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full planning application from North Tyneside Council for demolition of existing buildings. Redevelop the site to provide a community facility with Library services, ICT, Tourist Information, flexible spaces for community use, financial Services and a Changing Places Bathroom. Residential accommodation to provide 6no flats to be accessed from Middle Street via stairs and a lift, including parking. Substation to be rebuilt to suit modern requirements.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

In accordance with the Committee's Speaking Rights Scheme Mrs P Stevens of Northumberland Terrace, Tynemouth had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. As Mrs Stevens was unable to attend the meeting she submitted a written statement which was considered by the Committee. Within the statement Mrs Stevens set out four grounds of objection relating to:

- a) a lack of proper publicity regarding the development,
- b) the Council's failure to adequately maintain the existing building,
- c) the unexplored option of listing the building as a community asset; and
- d) the impact of the proposed demolition on the character and heritage of the area.

Sharon Mackay of North Tyneside Council addressed the Committee to respond to Mrs Stevens comments. Sharon explained how the Council had initiated an options appraisal of the building in 2018. As this had concluded that the refurbishment of the existing building was unviable, proposals for its demolition and redevelopment had been prepared in conjunction with Northern Powergrid, to replace the electricity sub-station, and Newcastle Building Society to co-locate a service within the library. Proposals had been subject to a public consultation exercise in 2021 and the plans had been revised taking into account the views of residents and Historic England who were satisfied that little of the original building remained. The proposed development would deliver a high quality building that would reflect the original design and provide significant community benefits in terms of library and community facilities, a changing places bathroom, commercial space and 6 new homes.

Members of the Committee asked questions of Sharon Mackay, her colleague Richard Brook, and officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) whether there was any evidence of deliberate neglect of the existing building;
- b) the extent to which the Council had sought heritage funding grants to refurbish the existing library building;
- c) the location of the proposed railings to the front curtilage of the building;
- d) the area of floorspace on the ground floor allocated to community, library and commercial use and the area to be used as a one bedroom apartment;
- e) the location and outlook from the two ground floor apartment windows;
- f) comparisons with a similar development in Wooler, Northumberland;
- g) details of the proposed storage of commercial and residential refuse bins;
- h) the nature and extent of the public consultation exercise relating to the planning application;
- i) details of the proposed condition restricting the operation of the library and community hub to between 7am and 9pm Mondays to Saturdays and 9am to 6pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays;
- j) the possibility of incorporating the installation of solar panels to the design of the new

- building and salvaging the bricks of the demolished building for further use;
- k) whether the applicant could be required as a condition of planning permission to install electric vehicle charging points. The Committee agreed that should the application be granted permission should be subject to such a condition;
- l) details of the proposed condition requiring the applicant to submit for approval a construction method statement setting out details of matters such as vehicular access to the site and dust suppression; and
- m) the level of harm to the character of the Tynemouth Conservation Area balanced against the public benefits of the development.

The Chair proposed acceptance of the planning officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote, 8 members of the Committee voted for the recommendation, none against and one abstention.

Resolved that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the planning officers report and a condition requiring the applicant to install electric vehicle charging points.

(Reasons for decision: The Committee concluded that, having regard to the relevant policies contained in the Council's Local Plan 2017 and National Planning Policy Framework, the proposed development was acceptable in terms of the principle of development, its impact on the amenity of neighbouring and future residents, biodiversity and the highway network and the less than substantial harm which would be caused to the conservation area was outweighed by the public benefits of the development.)

PQ36/22 20/00321/FUL, Friends Meeting House, 23 Front Street, Whitley Bay

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from the Clerk of the Monkseaton Meeting House for conservation and renovation of the pre-1911 elements of the building. Demolition of the existing front porch and rear extensions of the building dating from 1911 to 1980. Construction of a new front porch (modelled on the existing) and rear extension connected to the main building. The front and rear gardens will be remodelled to provide access for all.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

In accordance with the Committee's Speaking Rights Scheme Colin Barrett of Bygate Road, Monkseaton, Gavin Kirby of Front Street, Monkseaton and Maurice Searle of Searle Town and Country Planning, had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. The Chair had requested that the speakers appoint a single spokesperson and so Maurice Searle addressed the Committee to speak on behalf of a residents group and the freeholder of Alder Court. He was critical of the applicant's general lack of consultation with neighbouring residents. The proposed replacement of the boundary wall with Alder Court could not proceed until agreement was reached with the owners and negotiations had not yet commenced. The development would have an adverse effect on the character and ecology of the secluded gardens to the rear of the property. It was suggested that access to the Friends House should be restricted from Bygate Road via the rear garden to prevent disturbance to neighbours.

Matthew Moore, the Northumbria Area Quaker Meeting Resources Manager, addressed the Committee to respond to Mr Searle's comments. He explained that the meeting house wished to create a welcoming, accessible and friendly place of worship and to make these facilities available for use by others. Mr Moore outlined examples of acceptable uses of the meeting house, including councillors surgeries, yoga and craft groups, mindfulness sessions and professional development. The two existing meeting rooms in the building were not fit for purpose and so the proposed development sought to improve the facilities, improve its appearance and maintain its heritage. Access to the meeting house would be from the front door on Front Street.

Members of the Committee asked questions of the speakers and officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the extent to which the Committee could consider the issues raised in relation to access to the meeting house from Bygate Road and ownership of the boundary wall; and
- b) the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of those occupying 21 Front Street.

The Chair proposed acceptance of the planning officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote, members of the Committee voted unanimously for the recommendation.

Resolved that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the planning officers report.

(Reasons for decision: The Committee concluded that, having regard to the relevant policies contained in the Council's Local Plan 2017 and National Planning Policy Framework, the proposed development was acceptable in terms of the principle of development, its impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, the residential amenity of neighbouring residents and on the highway network.)

PQ37/22 21/00174/FUL, 1-2 East Parade, Whitley Bay

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from North Eastern Holdings Ltd for demolition of existing building and erection of residential development comprising 19no. 2-bed apartments, with associated vehicular access, landscaping and other associated works.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

The Chair proposed acceptance of the planning officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote, 7 members of the Committee voted for the recommendation, none voted against and two abstained.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant this application subject to an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the addition, omission or

amendment of any other conditions considered necessary; and
(2) authorise the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development to determine the application following the completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- i. Affordable Housing: financial equivalent to 1.46 units;
- ii. Ecology: £4,095 towards habitat creation/management and footpath improvements;
- iii. Parks and Green Space: £11,181 towards environmental improvements to Local Parks and to the local area;
- iv. Equipped Play: £13,300 towards Investment in Council's children's equipped play site offer;
- v. Employment and Training: £5,000 or 1 apprenticeship; and
- vi. Coastal Mitigation: £6,403 towards specific coastal mitigation projects and coastal service.

PQ38/22 22/01502/FULH, 23 Monks Way, Tynemouth

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full householder planning application from Mr Nathan Sandy for over garage extension and porch to front elevation. Replacement of timber cladding with smooth white fibre cement cladding.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

The Chair proposed acceptance of the planning officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote, 8 members of the Committee voted for the recommendation, none against and one abstention.

Resolved that planning permission be refused on the following grounds:

- a) The proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its size, height and position in relation to the neighbouring properties, Nos. 12 and 14 Marshmont Avenue, would have a significant overbearing impact on the residents of those properties, resulting in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity in terms of loss of outlook and light from the rear gardens and windows; contrary to Policies DM6.1 and DM6.2 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017 and the Design Quality SPD.
- b) The proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its flat roof, is not in keeping with the design of the existing dwelling and would be out of character with the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DM6.1 and DM6.2 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017.

PQ39/22 22/01328/FUL, Land Adjacent to Third Avenue, Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from Northumberland Estates for construction of battery energy storage containers and substation buildings, together with associated electrical infrastructure, small operational buildings, security fencing, CCTV, improved access tracks and structural landscaping.

The Chair proposed acceptance of the planning officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote, members of the Committee voted unanimously for the recommendation.

Resolved that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the planning officers report.

(Reasons for decision: The Committee concluded that, having regard to the relevant policies contained in the Council's Local Plan 2017 and National Planning Policy Framework, the proposed development was acceptable in terms of the principle of development and its impact on surrounding occupiers, the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the highway network and trees and the ecology in the area.)