

ADDENDUM 01.08.2019

Item No: 2

Application No:	18/01226/FUL	Author	Rebecca Andison
Date valid:	2 October 2018	:	
Target decision date:	1 January 2019	☎:	0191 643 6321
		Ward:	Collingwood

Application type: full planning application

Location: Land At Murton House Farm Rake Lane North Shields Tyne And Wear

Proposal: Demolition of the disused and redundant buildings and replacement with 10no residential dwellings including access, amenity space and parking (REVISED LANDSCAPING PLANS)

Applicant: Murton Farm Steading Ltd, C/O George F White LLP

Agent: George F. White, Miss Laura Dixon Arch 2 Westgate Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 1SA

RECOMMENDATION: Minded to grant legal agreement req.

Additional Representations

An existing objector has submitted further comments. These are summarised below.

- The requirement to use stone for units 1 to 4 is not reflected in the plans.
- The Planning Officer initially insisted that all the houses should be stone.
- The compromise, allowing a two storey approach and red brick to units 8-10, which can be viewed from Rake Lane demonstrates a lack of forethought and an unsympathetic approach to the development.

Officer comment – the plans have been amended to show stone to units 1 to 4.

The objector has requested that his previous comments are set out in full. These comments are as follows:

I was very surprised to read the support given to the Murton House Farmyard Planning Permission submitted by Murton Steadings Ltd by the Councillor for Collingwood Ward all as his letter dated 1st March 2019 attached requesting that his views be considered by North Tyneside Planning Committee.

He declares he has provided funding in excess of £300million in his professional career! Well there can't be many professionals around like this Councillor with this kind of funding, maybe only the Duke of Northumberland locally could match this!

However he states there is no conflict of interest in submitting his letter of support for this Planning Application. He has concluded, [after direct investigation], that the only feasible financial outcome is that proposed Option 2 submitted by Murton Steadings Ltd., that all 10 houses should be built in brick!

Much of what he has said about the condition of the site, overgrown and in need of investment is true. However he states that it is clear that much of the {existing} stone is in such a condition that it is not suitable for [in a condition to meet] Building Regulations [and presumably unsuitable for reuse]. Has he the qualification to make this claim? I hope in this respect he has received the views of a NTC Building Inspector before he has put his views into writing. In any event using existing stone is not the only option.

I ask the question why does this Councillor not investigate the views of the residents of New York and Chirton Grange and other residents in Collingwood Ward in which he represents before he writes this letter? It's not just what he thinks as a Councillor, but what those he represents think? They appointed him!

In my opinion a cheap brick faced solution for all time is not a satisfactory outcome compared with a thoughtful outcome of stone facia to the southerly elevations consolidating the Grade II listing of Murton House Farm.

The contingency or surplus in this project could allow the NTC Planners to require [or demand] a sympathetic solution for this site knowing that it is located in such an elevated, exposed and key location in North Tyneside so that its legacy can be resolved satisfactorily giving adequate thought to the future.

The objector has also requested that the scenarios included within Cllr Rankin's letter of support are set out in full. These scenarios and additional comments are as follows:

Scenario 1

- Conversion of three existing buildings with 4 x new build properties.
- Total Units = 7
- Cost contingency = 5%
- Professional Fees = 2.5%
- Finance Costs = 6.5%
- Total costs including finance costs, contingency costs but net of accepted developers profit = £2.404M
- Total Gross Development Value = £2.218M
- Development deficit / loss = £296K
- This scenario is clearly neither realistic nor feasible.

Scenario 3

- Retention of Building No. 1, Barn No. 3 and Stable No. 2 for conversion.

- The Barn and Stable are both too small to be classed as individual units and so could only be used for storage/ garage purposes.
- 7 x new build properties.
- Total Units = 8
- Cost contingency = 3%
- Professional Fees = 2.5%
- Finance Costs = 6.5%
- Total costs including finance costs, contingency costs but net of accepted developers profit = £1.949M
- Total Gross Development Value = £2.271M
- Development surplus = £322K (14%)
- This is way below an acceptable level of developer's profit (generally accepted at a minimum of 20%) and no developer would undertake such a scheme with such low returns. Added to this (and as below there are a number of other cost variances which would mean this scheme is not realistic or feasible.

Scenario 4

- Retain Building No. 1 for conversion
- 9 x new build properties
- Cost contingency = 3%
- Professional Fees = 2.5%
- Finance Costs = 6.5%
- Total units = 10
- Total costs including finance costs, contingency costs but net of accepted developers profit = £2.288M
- Total Gross Development Value = £2.801M
- Development surplus = £513K (18%)
- This scheme remains below the very minimum return expected. Again, I will highlight below why potential other cost variances/ commercial risks would make this neither realistic nor feasible.

Scenario 2

- Demolition and clearance of full site
- 10 x new build properties
- Cost contingency = 3%
- Professional Fees = 2.5%
- Finance Costs = 6.5%
- Total units = 10
- Total costs including finance costs, contingency costs but net of accepted developers profit = £2.014M
- Total Gross Development Value = £2.738M
- Development surplus = £724K (25%)
- Less current accepted scheme costs = £80K
- Development Profit £644K (23%)
- This scheme arguably provides sufficient headroom to mitigate the commercial risk of financing this development if granted in line with the developer's plans.

Whilst Scenario 2 is the applicants preferred option (and which I am supporting) it must be noted that some variances have been suggested which would again affect the viability of bringing the scheme forward.

1. Suggestion that the central units be built in stone. This would increase build costs by a further £220K and make the scheme neither realistic nor feasible.
2. Dwellings 8, 9 and 10 should follow the scale and mass of the existing buildings. This would lead to the loss of unit 10 (it would have to be merged into unit 9 to form 1 property) and likely unit 8 (it would become a 2 bed property which is not viable on this site).

Consultee comments

Heritage and Design Advice

There are two listed buildings on the site; Murton farmhouse and the associated gate piers which are separately listed. Buildings and other structures that pre-date July 1948 and are within the curtilage of a listed building are to be treated as part of the listed building. It has been assessed that the curtilage is defined by the boundary wall that runs around the site in which the listed farmhouse, gate posts and associated buildings stand. The close physical relationship of the buildings and visual appearance and function relate to the farmhouse and share a common theme in terms of materials used. Collectively, the buildings form a farmstead and appear to have been ancillary in use to the farmhouse. Most of the farm buildings date from before 1948. The buildings are therefore to be treated as part of the listed building. Some of the buildings have significance, particularly the two cottages, and make a contribution to the character of the farmstead. A heritage assessment has been carried out to support the application.

Many of the buildings on the site are in a very poor condition. During my last visit to the site some of the buildings were still in use for horse stabling. A structural survey has been undertaken which confirms the poor condition of the buildings. Although some buildings could be saved, the applicant has demonstrated that it is beyond current economic feasibility. I have therefore agreed to the principle of the demolition of the buildings. The application proposes to replace the existing buildings with 10 new residential dwellings. Again, I have agreed to the principle of 10 units subject to an appropriate design.

During the determination of the application and the associated pre-application, the planning authority have worked positively and proactively with the applicant to identify matters of concern and giving numerous opportunities to submit revised plans. Revised plans have been submitted and address some but not all of the concerns. Instead the applicant has provided further design justification for the proposed scheme. Despite all efforts, the current layout, scale, height and materials of some units is not supported as it would have harm on the setting of the heritage assets on the site.

The proposed building heights do not follow the current pattern of buildings on the site – there is currently a central group of dominant buildings with smaller

ones to the edges which I have repeatedly advised should be reflected in the proposal. The height of unit 7 is not supported which is 2.5 storeys and will change the focal point from a central group of dominant buildings to this unit. Units 8, 9 and 10 are located to the edge of the site and are two storey buildings which is not supported. I have again repeatedly advised that these units should follow the existing scale and mass of the current buildings located on the edge of the site which are single storey. The applicant has stated that due to viability issues that this is not possible and that two storey development is necessary. I have therefore taken a more flexible approach and advised that 1.5 storey development could be acceptable as it would retain the established pattern of development - a central group of dominant buildings with surrounding buildings having a reduced eaves and ridge height to the edges. The applicant has not amended the plans to reflect this and two storey development to the edges remain in the proposed plans.

An appropriate palette of materials is required for the scheme to be acceptable. Initially we requested natural stone to be used for all 10 units, however we have taken a more flexible approach to try to facilitate development of the site. To this extent, we advised that an appropriate brick may be considered for buildings around the edge of the site but as a minimum we would expect the central block of buildings to be constructed from stone. The applicant has now proposed to use stone on the southern elevation of the central elevation only and use red brick for the remaining units.

There are also concerns with the car port associated with units 5 and 6. Information submitted by the applicant show that the car port will allow glimpses of the open countryside beyond, however I consider that the car port tips the balance of an acceptable amount of development in this part of the site which was previously open. Without the car port, there would be a logical position for the attenuation tank which would subsequently allow units 5 and 6 to have more regular shaped gardens.

The listed wall around the site will also need to be demolished in part and reconfigured to accommodate a new access into the site. The loss of historic fabric in this area is also of some concern and should be noted.

In conclusion, there are concerns about several elements of the scheme. On balance, the harm caused by the proposal on the listed assets is considered to be less than substantial harm. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF advises that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I refer to the Case Officer to make this decision.

If the application is approved then the following conditions are recommended:

- No development shall take place until a schedule of samples of all materials has been submitted to the LPA and approved.

- The southern elevation of numbers 1 – 4 should be constructed in Natural Stone.
- The development shall use natural slate for roof planes; corrugated fibre cement may be used on selected units.
- Construction details of windows and doors shall be submitted to the LPA and approved. Windows should be set back within the window reveal unless otherwise agreed by the LPA.
- Rainwater goods shall be metal and details submitted to the LPA and approved.
- No alarm boxes or other external features, including meter boxes, satellite dishes or ventilation extraction shall be installed unless approved by the LPA.
- Details of boundary treatments should be submitted to the LPA and approved.
- Details of the location and design of waste storage should be submitted to the LPA and approved.
- Permitted development rights to be removed so the LPA can consider the effect of any future proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

Amended condition 13:

Notwithstanding any indication of materials which may have been given in the application, prior to the construction of any dwelling above damp proof course level a schedule and/or samples of all construction and surfacing materials and finishes for the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The materials shall include stone for the south elevations of units 1 to 4 and natural slate for the roof planes (corrugated fibre cement may be used on selected units). Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory external appearance having regard to policy DM6.1 and DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Council Local Plan 2017.

Additional conditions

Notwithstanding condition 1 prior to the construction of any dwelling above damp proof course the construction details of all windows and doors must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Windows should be set back within the window reveal unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory external appearance having regard to policy DM6.1 and DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Council Local Plan 2017.

Notwithstanding condition 1 prior to the construction of any dwelling above damp proof course details of the rainwater goods, which must be metal, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory external appearance having regard to policy DM6.1 and DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Council Local Plan 2017.

No alarm boxes or other external features, including meter boxes, satellite dishes or ventilation extraction, shall be installed unless the details of their position and type have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, they must be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory external appearance having regard to policy DM6.1 and DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Council Local Plan 2017.