

# Public Document Pack

## GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, 7 March 2018

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Goldsworthy (Chair)

Councillor(s): M Hood, L Caffrey, K Ferdinand, A Geddes, M Hall, L Kirton, J Lee, K McCartney, C McHugh, E McMaster, P Mole, I Patterson, J Turnbull, A Wheeler and N Weatherley

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor(s): S Craig, P Dillon, J McClurey, C Ord, K Wood, S Dickie and M Henry

### **PD208 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **PD209 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **PD210 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- RESOLVED -
- i) That the full planning applications and outline applications specified in the appendix to these minutes be granted , refused or referred to the Department for Communities and Local Government or deferred as indicated subject to the conditions, if any, as specified therein and to any other appropriate conditions of a routine or standard nature.
  - ii) That the applications granted in accordance with delegated powers be noted.

### **PD211 DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The applications determined since the last committee meeting in accordance with the powers delegated under part 3, schedule 2 were tabled for information.

RESOLVED - that the information be noted.

### **PD212 ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

Consideration was given to a report that informed of the progress of enforcement action previously authorised by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the information be noted.

**PD213 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS**

The Committee were advised of any new appeals against enforcement action received and any decisions of the Planning Inspectorate received during the report period.

The Committee were advised that there had been one new appeal received since an update was provided to Committee.

The Committee were advised that there had been no new appeal decisions received since the last Committee.

RESOLVED - that the information be noted.

**PD214 PLANNING APPEALS**

The Committee were advised that there had been two new appeals lodged since the last committee.

The Committee were advised that there had been no new appeal decisions received since the last Committee.

The Committee were advised that there had been no appeal cost decisions received since the last Committee.

RESOLVED - that the information be noted.

**PD215 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

The Committee received a report advising of the completion of Planning Obligations which have previously been authorised.

Since the last Committee meeting there have been no new planning obligations.

Since the last Committee there have been no new payments received in respect of planning obligations.

RESOLVED - that the information be noted.

**PD216 INTERIM POLICY ADVICE NOTES REVIEW**

The Committee received a report providing an update on the review of Interim Policy Advice notes (IPA) that has been undertaken by Spatial Development.

The Committee were advised that after consultation with Portfolio Holders, it was decided to:-

- Delete with immediate effect IPA 1, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16. This will be done by ceasing to reference them in decisions on planning applications, removing them from the Council website and uploading a notice to this effect onto the website.
- Retain IPA 4 and 17 and SPG 4 and 5 excerpts until they have been replaced by appropriate alternatives.

RESOLVED - that the information be noted.

**Chair.....**

This page is intentionally left blank

Date of Committee: 7 March 2018

<p><b>Application Number and Address:</b></p> <p>DC/17/01247/FUL</p> <p>The Dairy South Farm Lamesley NE11 0ET</p>	<p><b>Applicant:</b></p> <p>Dr Masoud Ardestani</p>
--	---

**Proposal:**

Erection of animal shelter including change of use of portion of field to form a fenced enclosure (amended 01/03/18)

<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
None	None

**List of speakers and details of any additional information submitted:**

Dr Ardestani (applicant) spoke in favour of the application.

Further information for members:-

Officers requested the submission of a drawing showing the internal floor plan of the proposed building to demonstrate that it will be laid out as four stables and to help explain why the building has the footprint proposed. The applicant has failed to provide the requested plan and thus has not been able to allay officers concerns that the footprint of the building proposed is excessive.

Referring to the British Horse Society's (BHS) website:

As a guide the BHS minimum stable size recommendations are:

- horses: 3.65m x 3.65m (12ft x 12ft)
- large horses: 3.65m x 4.24m (12ft x 14ft)

As a guide the Donkey Sanctuary minimum stable sizes for donkeys are:

- mules: 3.65m x 3.65m (12ft x 12ft)
- donkeys: 3.05m x 3.05m (10ft x 10ft)
- large donkeys: 3.05m x 3.65m (10ft x 12ft)

Based on the above, using the dimensions for large horses and large donkeys, the proposed shelter should have a minimum internal footprint of 53.3 square metres to adequately accommodate 2 horse and 2 donkeys. This application proposes a building with an internal footprint of 105 square metres, which is almost double what is recognised as appropriate accommodation for 2 large horses and 2 large donkeys.

Officers consider that this shows that the building proposed is excessively large and it fails to preserve the

openness of the Green Belt; therefore reinforcing that it can only be considered as inappropriate development, for which no very special circumstance has been demonstrated.

Further to the above, the BHS also provide guidance on the area of pasture required for each animal. They recommend 1.25-2.5 acres per horse and 0.5 acres per donkey. Based on the location plan submitted with this application it is considered that the total area of pasture available to the applicant is approximately 3.5 acres. Therefore, on the basis of having 4 animals on site, there is only enough space for 2 donkeys and 2 small horses. This further supports Officer's concerns that the size of the building proposed is excessively large and hence inappropriate in the Green Belt.

**Decision(s) and any conditions attached:**

That permission be REFUSED for the following reason(s) and that the Strategic Director of Communities and Environment be authorised to add, vary and amend the refusal reasons as necessary:

1. The proposed development represents inappropriate development, which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt and no very special circumstance has been demonstrated to outweigh the harm. Therefore, the proposed development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS19 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan.

**Any additional comments on application/decision:**

None.

**Date of Committee: 7 March 2018**

**Application Number and Address:**

DC/17/01358/OUT

Former Monkridge Gardens Residents Association and lands at 21 and 23 and land south of 9-23 Monkridge Gardens  
Dunston Hill  
Gateshead  
NE11 9XE

**Applicant:**

Mr Alan Kain

**Proposal:**

Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the clearance, lowering and levelling of site and the erection of up to 10 dwelling houses, with a new shared-surfaced vehicular and pedestrian access.

**Declarations of Interest:**

**Name**

**Nature of Interest**

None

**List of speakers and details of any additional information submitted:**

Councillor Peter Maughan spoke against the application.

Dr Anton Lang (Agent) spoke in favour of the application.

Further information for members

Withdrawal of objection/removal of refusal reason

Further to paragraphs 5.34 – 5.36 of the main agenda, the Coal Authority have reviewed the Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA) submitted by the applicant and have subsequently removed their objection to the proposal.

It is considered an appropriate level of information has been provided in regard to coal mining legacy issues, subject to appropriate planning conditions. Officers consider that refusal reason 4 should be omitted from the recommendation.

**Decision(s) and any conditions attached:**

That permission be REFUSED for the following reason(s) and that the Strategic Director of Communities and Environment be authorised to add, vary and amend the refusal reasons as necessary:

1. The proposed development by virtue of the quantum of development proposed and the physical characteristics of the site, including its access arrangement and shape would result in overdevelopment of the site with spaces between buildings being dominated by hard-surfacing and car parking, and leading to a likely need for inadequately sized family outdoor private garden spaces; compromised separation distances, and a generally poorly designed scheme; all of which would result in an unattractive environment and a poor level of amenity for future residents. The proposal would therefore be contrary to

policies DC2 and ENV3 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies CS14 and CS15 of the Council's Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne, the Gateshead Placemaking Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development by virtue of its proposed means of access would result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of 21 and 23 Monkridge Gardens, as a direct result of significant vehicle and pedestrian movements associated with the proposed development. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies DC2 and ENV3 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies CS14 and CS15 of the Council's Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne, the Gateshead Placemaking Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework

3. The proposed development by virtue of the inadequate nature of the proposed access width would result in conflict between vehicles and pedestrians to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS13 of the Council's Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne.

4. Insufficient information in the form of a Floor Risk and Drainage Assessment has been submitted to enable the Council to consider whether the proposed development site is suitable for development contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS17 of the Council's Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne.

**Any additional comments on application/decision:**

None



**Date of Committee: 7 March 2018**

**Application Number and Address:**

DC/18/00032/HHA  
33 Cromwell Ford Way  
Ryton  
NE21 4FH

**Applicant:**

Mr Carl Hodgson

**Proposal:**

Single storey rear extension

**Declarations of Interest:**

**Name**

**Nature of Interest**

None

**List of speakers and details of any additional information submitted:**

None

**Decision(s) and any conditions attached:**

That permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s) and that the Strategic Director of Communities and Environment be authorised to add, vary and amend the planning conditions as necessary:

1. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plan(s) as detailed below –

Building Plans  
Location Plan

Any material change to the approved plans will require a formal planning application to vary this condition and any non-material change to the plan will require the submission of details and the agreement in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any non-material change being made.

2. The development to which this permission related must be commenced not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials detailed and shown on plan number 'Building Plans', and on the submitted Application Form.

**Any additional comments on application/decision:**

None

This page is intentionally left blank