

## Planning Committee

**Tuesday, 29 August 2023**

Present: Councillor W Samuel (Chair)  
Councillors S Burtenshaw, S Cox, J Cruddas,  
P Earley, C Johnston, P McIntyre, J Montague and  
P Oliver.

In attendance: Councillor A McMullen

Apologies: Councillors T Hallway, J O'Shea and M Thirlaway

### **PQ17/23 Appointment of substitutes**

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

Councillor P Earley for Councillor T Hallway

### **PQ18/23 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor J Cruddas stated that she had predetermined planning application 23/0925/FUL, G33-G48 Garages Adjacent to 71-73 Bellshill Close, Wallsend and so she would withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the item and take no part in the voting and decision making.

### **PQ19/23 Minutes**

**Resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2023 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

### **PQ20/23 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.

**PQ21/23      23/00925/FUL, G33-G48 Garage Adjacent To, 71-73 Bellshill Close,  
Wallsend**

(Councillor J Cruddas withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the following item.)

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 Tyneside Council for variation of condition 1 of planning approval 22/01672/FUL in order to show increase in height of walls, eaves and ridge height of the approved bungalows following receipt of detailed site levels.

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, a local resident, Caroline Armstrong had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. On behalf of residents in the area Caroline outlined her objections to the proposed increase in the height of the development. She disputed the planning officers' description of the proposed change as "slightly higher eaves and ridge height of the roof" as the development represented a 20% increase in height. She referred to the distances between the bungalows and existing dwellings and described how the development was out of keeping and would have a closed and claustrophobic impact on the area. She refuted the planning officer's judgement that the proposal would have no impact on daylight and sunlight for existing residents. She was concerned that the development would have a negative impact on the residents' mental health and safety, restrict access to outdoor space, create barriers and isolation, divide communities and have a detrimental effect on amenity.

Russell Edwards of Edwards Architecture addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant to respond to the speakers' comments. He referred to the need for affordable housing and for homes to meet the needs of an ageing population and to provide independent living. The conversion of the garages had involved sustainable building methods and would deliver high quality, energy efficient homes in accordance with the Council's standards. The proposed change in eaves and ridge height had been necessary to ensure that the properties were level and accessible following an assessment of the existing levels which had been undertaken after the granting of the original planning permission. Russell

outlined details of the proposed heat pump and solar panels and the applicant's approach to out of hours working, health and safety and engagement with residents.

Members of the Committee asked questions of Caroline Armstrong, Russell Edwards and officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the impact of the development on sunlight and daylight for existing residents;
- b) the reasons for the proposed change in eaves and ridge height; and
- c) the recommended separation distances contained in the Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document and how these applied in this case.

The Chair proposed acceptance of the planning officer's revised recommendation as set out in an addendum to the planning officers report.

On being put to the vote, 8 members of the Committee voted for the recommendation and none voted against with no abstentions.

**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 and addendums;
- ii) the addition, omission or amendment of any other conditions considered necessary by the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development
- iii) no further matters arising from the consultation period which, in the opinion of the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development, would justify reconsideration by the Committee.

**PQ22/23      21/00174/FUL, 1-2 East Parade, Whitley Bay**

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with two addendums, one circulated prior to the meeting and another at 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 application had previously been considered by the Committee in September 2022 when it had been minded to grant permission subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a range of financial contributions from the applicant. However, since then, the applicant had reassessed the viability of the development and had subsequently submitted a financial viability appraisal to demonstrate that the development could not viably provide the proposed contributions. The Committee were therefore invited to reconsider the application in light of the viability appraisal. There were no other material changes which would affect the proposed development.

Members of the Committee asked question of officers in relation to:

- i) the guidance and criteria applied in assessing the design of proposed developments and its impact on the character and appearance on an area;
- ii) the justification for continuing to require the applicant to make a financial contribution of £6,403 towards delivery of the Coastal Mitigation Strategy; and
- iii) whether the Committee were able to examine the financial viability appraisal to be satisfied that the financial contributions, and in particular the contribution towards affordable housing, were unviable. The Committee were advised that an executive summary of the appraisal was available to view on the Council's website and if the Committee wished to examine the appraisal in detail prior to determining the application it may wish to defer consideration of the application to a future meeting.

**Resolved** that consideration of the application be deferred to the next scheduled meeting to be held on 26 September 2023 to enable the Committee to examine the applicant's financial viability appraisal.