

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 30 August 2022

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

In attendance:
Councillors S Day, C Johnston and E Parker-Leonard

Apologies: Councillors J Cruddas and M Green

PQ22/22 Appointment of substitutes

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

Councillor L Bones for Councillor C Johnston
Councillor P Earley for Councillor M A Green
Councillor L Marshall for Councillor J Cruddas

PQ23/22 Declarations of Interest

Councillor L Bones stated that, with reference to planning applications 20/00136/FUL and 20/00137/LBC, Vacant Land to the South and North of Tynemouth Metro Station, he had campaigned on behalf of a candidate standing for election in the Tynemouth Ward but he had not expressed any personal opinions on the applications, he had an open mind to the arguments to be presented at the meeting and he had not predetermined the matters.

Councillor L Marshall stated that she had been contacted by residents living in the Wallsend Ward regarding planning application 22/01053/FUL, Football Pitches West of St. Peters Road, Wallsend but she had remained neutral on the matter with no fixed opinion and she had not predetermined the matter.

PQ24/22 Minutes

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 2 August 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PQ25/22 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.

PQ26/22 20/00136/FUL, Vacant land to the North and South of Tynemouth Metro Station Building to the East of the Metroline, Tynemouth

The Chair of the Committee explained that as planning applications 20/0136/FUL and 20/00137/LBC were both in relation to the same development, the Committee would deal with both applications together for the planning officer's presentation, speaking and questions. The Committee would then consider and vote on each application separately.

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum and supporting documentation circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from Station Developments Ltd for a mixed use scheme comprising 130sqm A1/A3/A4 use and 71no. one, two and three bedroom residential units with 43 car parking spaces, cycle parking, public realm improvement and landscaping on land to the south of Tynemouth Station; new access from Tynemouth Road; partial demolition of the stone perimeter wall to Tynemouth Road; and car parking on land to the north of Tynemouth Station; widening of access from Station Terrace.

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, Ms Joan Hewitt of Birtley Avenue, Tynemouth had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. Ms Hewitt described Tynemouth Station as being the jewel in the crown of the Tynemouth Conservation Area and a vibrant hub for social and community events. She stated that 150 local residents had come together to form the Tynemouth Action Group who had unanimously agreed to oppose the proposed development. She highlighted her objections in terms of:

- a) the amount of car parking to be incorporated within the residential development which fell short of the Council's standards. This shortfall would create intense car parking pressures on Tynemouth Road and would have negative impact on the air quality in the area;
- b) the impact of increased noise created by the canyon effect of constructing a six storey building next to the metro line;
- c) its detrimental impact on the conservation area;
- d) the risk of having another licensed premises within the cumulative impact area; and
- e) inadequate landscaping proposals for the site which was located within a wildlife corridor.

Ms Hewitt asked the Committee to reject the plan.

Councillor Lewis Bartoli, a ward councillor for the Tynemouth Ward, had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. As he was unable to attend the meeting Councillor Chris Johnston spoke on his behalf. Councillor Johnston stated that the scale, height and mass of the proposed development was totally unacceptable in the Tynemouth Conservation Area. He contended that the benefits to be derived from the development, whilst desirable, did not outweigh the harm which would be caused to the heritage assets. He set out details of a range of planning policies which would be contravened if the development were to be approved. He believed that there could be a viable development of the site which would be more sympathetic to its surroundings. He also expressed his concerns regarding the level of car parking to be provided and challenged the findings contained within applicant's Transport Assessment. Councillor Johnston urged the Committee to think about the Conservation Area and reject the applications.

Councillor Sarah Day, a ward councillor for the Tynemouth Ward, had also been granted permission to speak to the Committee. Councillor Day referred to the strength of public opinion against the application. She set out her objection to the development on the basis of its size being harmful to the conservation area, the site had not been designated as housing land within the Local Plan and she was concerned that the proposed number of parking places would exacerbate parking problems and traffic congestion in the area. Councillor Day concluded that the Committee should refuse planning permission.

Mark Stone of Station Developments Ltd addressed the Committee to respond to the speakers' comments. Mr Stone explained that the purpose of the company was to maintain the heritage of Tynemouth Station and this required significant investment. The company had worked with the Council and Heritage England to bring forward a viable proposal for sustainable development on a derelict site. He set out the range of benefits that would be derived including a high quality residential development, new cycling and pedestrian access to the station, extended CCTV coverage, new public toilets, canopy lighting, new car parking facilities, net biodiversity gain, a new retail unit and construction and retail employment. The company was proud of the restoration of Tynemouth Station and he asked the Committee for its assistance in continuing this process by approving the planning applications.

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 quantity and operation of the car parking to be provided as part of the residential development and at the site north of the station as set out in the applicant's transport assessment and interim travel plan;
- b) the proposed conditions requiring the applicant to monitor the impact of the development on car parking in surrounding streets and to provide any necessary mitigating measures;
- c) the design, height and scale of the residential development, taking into account the height and scale of other buildings in the area, the applicant's revisions to the design and the relevant planning policy documents;
- d) the opinions of the Council's design officer and Heritage England on the level of harm which would be caused to the listed building and the conservation area and whether any harm would be outweighed by the public benefits provided by the development;
- e) the outcome of the applicant's viability assessment and the Council's independent review of this assessment which demonstrated that, with the exception of a financial contribution towards the Coastal Mitigation Strategy, the financial contributions requested by service areas should not be sought;
- f) the impact of the development on existing and future residents in terms of noise and vibration and the risk of a "canyon effect";
- g) the impact of the loss of grassland and scrub habitat and the proposed mitigating measures and landscaping scheme; and
- h) the effect of Policy S3.3 of the Local Plan which identified Tynemouth Station as a key site for providing 1011m² of additional retail floorspace.

Following the planning officer's presentation, speaking and questions, Councillors Johnston and Day withdrew from the meeting during the Committee's deliberations and voting on the application.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application subject to completion of a legal 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) the Director of Regeneration and Economic Development be authorised to determine the

application following the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure a financial contribution of £23,927 towards delivery of the Council's Coastal Mitigation Strategy.

PQ27/22 20/00137/LBC, Vacant land to the North and South of Tynemouth Metro Station Building to the East of the Metroline, Tynemouth

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to an application for listed building consent from Station Developments Ltd for the demolition of a section of the stone boundary wall on Tynemouth Road and Tynemouth Terrace to facilitate access to a development comprising 130sqm Class E unit and 71no. one, two and three bedroom residential units with 43 car parking spaces, cycle parking, public realm improvement and landscaping on land to the south of Tynemouth Station and car parking on land to the north of Tynemouth Station.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs. In considering the application the Committee gave regard to the relevant comments made by Ms Joan Hewitt, Councillors Chris Johnston and Sarah Day and Mark Stone of Station Developments Ltd who had been granted permission to speak to the Committee.

(Councillors Johnston and Day withdrew from the meeting during the Committee's deliberations and voting on this item.)

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 its impact on the significance of Tynemouth Station as a Grade II listed building.)

PQ28/22 22/01053/FUL, Football Pitches West of St Peters Road, Wallsend

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 North Tyneside Council for the development of a new sports hub at St Peters Playing Field (west) which includes, new sports pavilion / clubhouse / multi use community space, new 3G AGP (artificial grass pitch), new site fencing, car parking and other ancillary facilities.

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:

- a) the height and design of the proposed boundary fencing;
- b) the impact of the development on existing public rights of way and informal paths around along the southern perimeter of the site which would remain open and unobstructed;
- c) the risk of flooding in Wallsend Dene;

- d) the proposed condition requiring the applicant to submit for approval details of the frequency and hours during which the floodlighting would be illuminated. The Committee agreed that if the application were approved it should be subject to a condition requiring the floodlighting to be switched off whenever the all weather pitches are not being used for sport;
- e) how the continued community use of the open space would be safeguarded by a community use agreement;
- f) the nature and location of other areas of open space in the area; and
- g) the impact of the development on the local highway network and the proposed condition requiring the applicant to monitor car parking in the area and take any necessary mitigating measures.

Resolved that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the planning officers report and a condition requiring the floodlighting to be switched off whenever the all-weather pitches are not being used for sport.

(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 the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, residential amenity, the highway network and biodiversity.)

PQ29/22 22/00755/FUL, Unit 14 Wesley Way, Benton Square Industrial Estate

The Chair of the Committee explained that as planning applications 22/00755/FUL and 22/00603/FUL were both in relation to the same site, the Committee would deal with both applications together for the purposes of the planning officer's presentation, speaking and questions. The Committee would then consider and vote on each application separately.

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full planning application from Jospeh Parr (Tyne & Wear) Ltd for the variation of conditions 1 (approved plans), 10 (holding area) and 11 (height limit) of planning approval 10/00552/FUL, to permit the display of goods externally.

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, Councillor Erin Parker Leonard, a ward councillor for the Killingworth Ward, had been granted permission to speak to the Committee. Councillor Parker Leonard stated that she had been contacted by residents who felt that there had been a lack of consideration given to their concerns. The history of variations to the original planning permission and enforcement actions had been difficult to follow but residents were now concerned that the latest proposed variations would not be possible to implement and the past conduct of the applicant suggested that the proposed developments would not happen. She stated that the proposals did not go far enough to satisfy residents wishes and that some earlier planting had already died. Whilst she hoped that a new storage area would help the situation, she did not understand why the original terms of the planning permission could not be enforced and why there was now a need for variations.

Marc Poppleton of Jospeh Parr Ltd had been invited to speak to the Committee to respond

to Councillor Parker Leonard's comments. As he was unable to attend the meeting the Committee considered a written statement submitted by Mr Poppleton. In the statement he explained that Joseph Parr had invested £1m to purchase the large warehouse adjacent to the site and the company was currently in the process of moving a large proportion of the materials on site into the new warehouse space. He appreciated the concerns of local residents and that was the reason for the proposed variations to the original planning permission. It was envisaged that the materials would be removed by the end of the week. Mr Poppleton hoped that these actions demonstrated that they had worked closely with the planning team to make the applications successful.

Members of the Committee asked questions of officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to how compliance with the varied conditions, if approved, would be monitored and enforced.

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 its impact on the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring residents.)

PQ30/22 22/00603/FUL, Unit 14 Wesley Way, Benton Square Industrial Estate

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full planning application from Joseph Parr (Tyne & Wear) Ltd for the variation of conditions 12 and 13 of planning approval 10/00552/FUL, amendments to landscaping layout.

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

The Committee gave regard to the relevant comments made by Councillor Erin Parker Leonard who had been granted permission to speak to the Committee in accordance with the Committee's Speaking Rights Scheme.

Marc Poppleton of Joseph Parr Ltd had been invited to speak to the Committee to respond to Councillor Parker Leonard's comments. As he was unable to attend the meeting the Committee considered a written statement submitted by Mr Poppleton. In the statement he explained that a substantial amount of planting had already been completed and that the company had worked closely with the planning team to prepare details of the landscaping scheme. All works would be completed in the November planting season, in accordance with the Council's specification and a full landscaping maintenance programme would be in place to ensure that the landscaping thrived over the coming years.

Members of the Committee asked questions of officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to the exact locations of the proposed landscaping and the preliminary groundworks that would have to be completed prior to planting.

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 its impact on the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring residents.)