

PLANNING COMMITTEE

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday 6 November 2024.

Present: Cllr Mick Stoker (Chair), Cllr Michelle Bendelow (Vice-Chair), Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Dan Fagan, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Shakeel Hussain, Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Tony Riordan, Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Norma Stephenson OBE, Cllr Sylvia Walmsley and Cllr Barry Woodhouse.

Officers: Helen Boston, Simon Grundy (DoR&IG), Sarah Garvin (DoA,H and W), Martin Parker (DoCS,E&C), Julie Butcher and Sarah Whaley (DoCS).

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents and Members of the Public.

Apologies: Cllr Jim Taylor.

P/35/24 Evacuation Procedure

The evacuation procedure was noted.

P/36/24 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

P/37/24 Minutes of the meetings which were held on 4 September and 9 October 2024

Consideration was given to the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings which were held on 4 September and 9 October for approval and signature.

RESOLVED that the minutes be approved and signed as a correct record.

P/38/24 Planning Protocol

The planning protocol was noted.

P/39/24 24/0430/REM Land West Of Maynard Grove, Wynyard Village, Wynyard Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for a new local centre with associated hard and soft landscaping pursuant to planning consent LPA Ref. 20/2408/OUT

Consideration was given to planning application 24/0430/REM Land West Of Maynard Grove, Wynyard Village, Wynyard.

Reserved Matters was sought for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for a new local centre with associated hard and soft landscaping pursuant to planning consent LPA Ref. 20/2408/OUT.

The principle of a local centre including the provision of a community facility was established, in application ref 20/2408/OUT this application was not looking to

establish the principle of the development, it therefore focused on the site-specific material considerations.

The nature and scale of the development was considered to be acceptable, and the site could satisfactorily accommodate the proposal without any undue impact on the character of the area, amenity of any adjacent neighbours or highway safety.

The technical consultees and officers had reviewed all the supporting information and concluded that the proposed development would result in a satisfactory form of development subject to the imposition of the recommended conditions.

The proposed development would offer both economic and social benefits through the construction of the commercial units and community facility. These were all benefits which weighed in favour of the proposal albeit they needed to be balanced against other material planning considerations.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that given the considerations detailed within the report, the proposed development was considered to be visually acceptable, and it was not considered that the proposed development would have any adverse impacts on levels of residential amenity or highway safety to justify a refusal of the application. The proposed scheme was therefore in accordance with the relevant local and national planning policies and was recommended for approval subject to those conditions detailed within the main report.

Since the writing of the report a further letter of support had been received, however all points raised had already been covered within the officer's report.

Members were also informed that the Applicant had amended the floorplan use class which was reflected on the approved plan, and which would be conditioned if the Committee were minded to approve the application.

With the agreement of the Chair additional information provided by an objector was circulated to Members for consideration.

Objectors attended the meeting and were given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The Chair of Wynyard Parish Council gave a brief history of the site by referencing previous approved planning applications as follows:

13/0342/EIS
20/2408/OUT
23/0225/VARY

The original outline application was approved with a maximum of 500 houses which had now increased to 630. The changes to the site also included the key infrastructure being replaced by a local centre with great uncertainty as to what would be provided in

terms of local facilities, including upgrades to junctions and bridge. The proposed community hall had also been reduced in size by a third.

- It was also highlighted that a proportion of the additional 130 homes would be developed within the red line edge of the original outline application 13/0342/EIS.

- Members attention was drawn to the additional information provided to the Committee at the beginning of the meeting. The information was a diagram showing the layout of the local centre highlighting that there was only one access to enter and exit the car park which would be used by delivery and refuse vehicles as well as members of the public using the centre. Deliveries and refuse collection would be made at the front of the units unlike other centres where there were rear service roads. Delivery and refuse trucks could be as long as 18 feet and 38 tonnes and would be too close to customer vehicles posing health and safety risks to the public. To exit the site these large vehicles would need to carry out reverse manoeuvres, leading to congestion putting pedestrians at risk.

- There had been objections raised by the Highways Manager due to a significant lack of carparking spaces.

- Some of the findings from the Applicant appeared flawed and out of date, particularly the assumption of car ownership per household, which was considered too low, therefore the proposed number of carparking spaces at the local centre were considered inadequate.

- Residents welcomed the development of a community hub, however it needed to meet the needs of that community.

- The proposed development was not fit for purpose, instead of a much-needed doctors surgery, (which is what residents believed would be provided) a cosmetic medical facility and veterinary practice were proposed to occupy 2 of the units.

- There had been no consultation with residents resulting in a serious breakdown of trust with the developer.

- Members were asked to defer the application to allow the residents to enter into meaningful dialogue with the Applicant, and for the Applicant to consider modifications to address residents' concerns.

The Applicants Agent attended the meeting and were given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The Applicants Agent gave a potted history of the development site.

- Following the Masterplan in 2019 with Harlepool and Stockton on Tees Borough Councils, it was agreed that Cameron Hall would deliver a local centre.

- The centre would consist of 2 buildings, with 7 units and a carpark.

- It was envisaged that the units would be occupied by local businesses including a convenience store should an operator come forward.

- In terms of the provision of a doctors surgery, additional funding had been secured to increase appointment capacity at a nearby surgery in Sedgefield.
- There was a proposed medical centre which would provide cosmetic procedures alongside many other procedures.
- All concerns raised had been addressed and there was no adverse impact on amenity, ecology, highway safety etc.

A TPS Transport Consultant attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- TPS Transport Consultants had submitted a detailed assessment using TRICS which was an industry standard software which established the potential level of vehicle trip generation for proposed developments.
- There were 46 parking spaces and 4 accessible bays which was above the calculated maximum of 42.
- Deliveries and refuse collection would take place from the carpark which could be managed safely. A service management plan had been provided and staff at the local centre would meet vehicles on arrival to ensure safe deliveries etc.
- The maximum utility vehicle permitted would be a 11.6 metre fixed axle vehicle.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- There had been much debate regarding previous planning applications in terms of the number of dwellings and the outstanding S106 agreement, however the only consideration for the Planning Committee today was the principal of a local centre.
- The community centre would be 120sqm which was above the minimum of 100sqm.
- Officers confirmed that there was no identified users for the units currently.
- In terms of the number of carparking spaces. The software TRICS which had been used to calculate vehicle trips had been used on other planning applications across the Borough and was more accurate than the initial assessment, therefore 46 spaces were more than required.
- From a Highways perspective there were no grounds to object to the application.
- The proposed local centre was designed to serve the community and there were pedestrian links from the north and south, therefore not all trips to the centre would be by car. There were also cycle stores on the proposed site, providing a sustainable development.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions / make comments. These could be summarised as follows:

- Concerns were raised relating to the delivery and refuse vehicles as well as the size of the proposed village hall.

- Although there would be a service management plan, it was known in other areas of the Borough that when delivery vehicles arrived early at a destination, they would park in laybys close to residents with their engines running until they reached the time they were allowed to deliver their goods.
- Suggestions were made that the layout be re looked at so delivery and refuse collections could be made at the rear of the units.
- The layout of the local centre was not acceptable, there was no rear exit and only one way out which was not satisfactory if there was to be a fire.
- It was important that residents were listened too as the local centre was there to serve the local community.
- To access some of the units' pedestrians would be required to walk across the local centre which could be hazardous during delivery times and refuse collections.
- Questions were raised regarding the lack of a doctor's surgery and whether this was in breach of the original S106 agreement.
- Although it was unknown if there would be a veterinary practice or cosmetic medical centre, it was difficult to agree to the proposed development as there were too many unknowns.
- If a veterinary practice and cosmetic medical centre were to be provided would that not require specialist waste collection?
- Members queried where the refuse receptacles would be stored.
- It was acknowledged that a local centre was required, however it was felt that the proposed application should be deferred to encourage active discussion between the Applicant and local residents' groups rather than refuse the application. The application had to work for the local community.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- Refuse receptacles would be stored around the back of the units and pulled out on collection day to the front, refuse would be collected from the carpark, very similar to residential refuse collection.
- There was no confirmation of a veterinary practice or cosmetic medical centre, however if there was there would be statutory requirements to be met for waste collection.
- In terms of who would occupy the units, there was a condition that all end users had to be agreed by the local planning authority, however until the units were available end users would not come forward.
- If Members wanted to, they could condition use class in conjunction with traffic however could not condition exact use of each unit.

- The village hall was already larger than what had previously been agreed in the S106 agreement.

A motion was proposed and seconded that the item be deferred to allow the Applicant to consider further consultation with the local community and to reconsider the layout, design and servicing arrangements.

A vote took place and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that planning application 24/0430/REM Land West Of Maynard Grove, Wynyard Village, Wynyard for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for a new local centre with associated hard and soft landscaping pursuant to planning consent LPA Ref. 20/2408/OUT be deferred to allow the Applicant to consider further consultation with the community and to reconsider the layout, design and servicing arrangements.