

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 25 October 2022

Present: Councillor W Samuel (Chair)
Councillors J Cruddas, P Earley, M Hall, John Hunter,
C Johnston, L Marshall, P Richardson and J Shaw

Apologies: Councillors K Barrie, M Green, T Mulvenna and J O'Shea

PQ40/22 Appointment of substitutes

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

Councillor L Marshall for Councillor J O'Shea
Councillor P Earley for Councillor M A Green

PQ41/22 Declarations of Interest

Councillor J Cruddas declared a non-registerable interest in relation to planning application 22/01495/FUL, Hadrian Yard A, B & C, Hadrian Way, Wallsend because a friend of her daughter was present at the meeting as a representative of Lambert Smith Hampton, the applicant's agent.

Councillor L Marshall stated that whilst she had been contacted by residents in relation to planning application 22/01495/FUL, Hadrian Yard A, B & C, Hadrian Way, Wallsend because she was their ward councillor, she had not expressed any opinions on the merits of the application, she had not pre-determined the application and she had an open mind to the arguments to be presented at the meeting.

PQ42/22 Minutes

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2022 be confirmed subject to the inclusion of Councillor J Cruddas in the list of apologies and the amended minutes be signed by the Chair.

PQ43/22 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.

PQ44/22 22/01495/FUL, Hadrian Yard A, B & C, Hadrian Way, Wallsend

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with two addendums, one circulated prior to the meeting and another circulated at the meeting, in

relation to a full planning application from Smulders Projects UK for erection of a new workshop building (55mx270mx41m) at Yard C to accommodate welding and fabrication activities.

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 Stephanie Roscamp-Forshaw, Jean Cormie, Stephanie Collins and Marcia Ash of Railway Terrace, Wallsend had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. As Stephanie Collins and Marcia Ash were unable to attend the meeting Stephanie Roscamp-Forshaw and Jean Cormie spoke to the Committee and they were accompanied by Phil Forshaw.

Stephanie Roscamp-Forshaw spoke on behalf of 22 residents living in 10 houses at Railway Terrace, Wallsend. She stated that residents were united in their opposition to the proposed development because of the loss of light and shadowing on their properties. This would create cold and damp living conditions which would lead to their homes becoming uninhabitable. Such conditions would be detrimental to the health and mental wellbeing of residents. She stated that the impact of the proposed development on Railway Terrace had been misrepresented in the supporting evidence provided by the applicant which was inadequate to allow the Committee to make a fully informed judgement. The residents had always sought to work with the operators of the site to support economic activity but Smulders had not engaged with local residents. She asked the Committee to consider three options:

- a) refuse permission when the residents would commit to work closely with Smulders to bring forward a better proposal;
- b) grant permission on the condition that the workshop building be moved to a new location away from Railway Terrace; or
- c) delay making a decision until new information is produced to provide reassurance that the data presented is accurate.

Jean Cormie addressed the Committee to describe the likely impact of the development on the health of her and her husband who had underlying health conditions which would be made worse by a lack of daylight.

James Cullingford of Lambert Smith Hampton, accompanied by Jan De Rycker of Smulders Projects UK and Keith Ketchley of Desco, addressed the Committee to respond to the speakers' comments. James Cullingford explained that Smulders had won contracts to construct transition pieces for the offshore wind industry. The proposed workshop had been designed to deliver these contracts. It could not be altered or relocated and without the facility the contracts could not be delivered. The impact on neighbouring residents was unavoidable and not disputed but had to be balanced against those policies contained within the Local Plan supporting economic growth and investment on the River Tyne. The development would lead to hundreds of new, highly skilled and well paid jobs and the applicant had agreed to a financial contribution towards employment and training opportunities in the borough.

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

- a) the statements from residents that information contained in the noise assessment, the solar exposure and shadow analysis and the townscape and visual impact assessment

- was inaccurate, inadequate and misrepresented the likely impact of the development;
- b) the outcome of the applicant's solar exposure and shadow analysis, undertaken by Desco, and the impact of the development on Railway Terrace in terms of shadowing and loss of daylight;
 - c) the nature and extent to which neighbouring residents were consulted in relation to the application;
 - d) the required timescale for the erection of the workshop to deliver the contracts for transition pieces;
 - e) the features of the workshop designed to reduce noise including the installation of acoustic doors; and
 - f) advice from the Committee's legal advisor that the option to grant permission on the condition that the workshop building be moved to a new location away from Railway Terrace was not an option available to the Committee.

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

On being put to the vote, 5 members voted for the recommendation and 4 members voted against the recommendation.

- Resolved** that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application; and (2) the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development be authorised to issue a notice of grant of planning permission subject to:
- i) the conditions set out in the planning officers report;
 - ii) the addition, omission or amendment of any other conditions considered necessary by the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development;
 - iii) further consultation with the Biodiversity Officer following consideration of supplementary information requested from the applicant in relation to the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. If in the opinion of the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development any issues or objections arise from this consultation that were not previously considered by the Committee then the application be referred back to the Committee for re-consideration; and
 - iv) completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a financial contribution of £43,660 towards employment and training initiatives within the borough.

(Reason 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 the impact on surrounding occupiers, the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the highway network and, on the basis of the information available at the meeting, on trees and ecology.)

PQ45/22 22/00292/FUL, 116 Station Road, Wallsend

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 Whitley Properties Ltd for change of use from gym to 12 self contained apartments with new front and rear dormer windows, to upper first and second floors.

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

Members of the Committee asked questions of officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to the impact of two rooms having no windows or roof lights and the size of the flats when judged against the Nationally Described Space Standards.

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 and 2 members voted against the recommendation.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application; and (2) the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development be authorised to determine the application subject to completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the following financial contributions;

- Affordable housing: 25% (3 units)
- Ecology: £2,340
- Parks and green space: £6,390
- Equipped play: £8,400
- Primary education: £37,500
- Employment and training: a financial contribution towards employment and training opportunities or apprenticeships
- Coastal mitigation: £1,812

PQ46/22 22/01512/FUL, Flat 98, Dolphin Quay, Clive Street, North Shields

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated at the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from Councillor F Lott for replacement of 3 metal grilles with plexiglass, due to corrosion. The Council's Constitution required applications by Councillors to be determined by the Planning Committee.

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

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

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application; and (2) the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development be authorised to determine the application subject to no further issues or objections coming to light before expiry of the consultation period. If in the opinion of the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development any issues or objections arise from this consultation that were not previously considered by the Committee then the application be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration.