

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
CASTLE MORPETH LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **Castle Morpeth Local Area Council** held in the Council Chamber on Monday, 9 April 2018.

PRESENT

Councillor S. Dickinson
(Planning Vice-chair, in the Chair)

COUNCILLORS

| | |
|---------------|-------------------|
| Armstrong, E. | Foster, J.D. |
| Bawn, D.L | Jackson, P.A |
| Beynon, J.A | Jones, V. |
| Dodd, R.R. | Sanderson, H.G.H. |
| Dunn, L. | |

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Bennett, Mrs L.M. | Senior Democratic Services Officer |
| Bracken, M. | Democratic Services Assistant |
| Bulman, M. | Solicitor |
| English, D. | Planning Manager (Neighbourhood Planning & Infrastructure) |
| Murphy, J. | Principal Planning Officer |
| Sinnamon, E. | Senior Planning Manager |
| Wood, J. | Senior Planning Officer |

110. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D. Ledger and R. Wearmouth.

111. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday, 12 February 2018 as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

112. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor R.R. Dodd declared an interest in planning application 18/00608/CCD and a personal interest in agenda item no. 10, as he owned land in Great Whittington.

Councillor P.J. Jackson declared an interest in planning application 18/00608/CCD.

Councillor V. Jones declared an interest in agenda item no. 10 as she had been member of the Steering Group.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

113. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The attached report explained how the Local Area Council was asked to decide the planning applications attached to this agenda using the powers delegated to it. and included details of the public speaking arrangements. (Report attached to the signed minutes as **Appendix A**)

RESOLVED that the report be noted

114. 18/00336/FUL

Conversion of existing Grade II listed building to accommodate 13 No. self contained residential apartments (C3 use class) and development of 1 No. 4 Bedroom Dormer Bungalow, 1 No. 3 Bedroom Dormer Bungalow and 2 No. 2 Bedroom Bungalows within former car parking area - Demolition of outbuildings to rear. 94 Newgate Street, Morpeth, NE61 1BU. (Report attached to the signed minutes as **Appendix B**)

Councillor D. Bawn joined the meeting after the commencement of this item and so did not participate in the discussion or decision.

Joanne Wood, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview and the following updates:-

- The Education Department had confirmed that a financial contribution of £70,400 would be necessary towards educational facilities.
- Correction at paragraph 7.51 - should read 'There is no first floor accommodation proposed'.
- References to the Poneland Neighbourhood Plan should read Morpeth

Mr. Colin Wardle spoke in objection to the application and his key points were:

- The scheme had been amended from the original plan, however, there were still fundamental issues remaining.
- There was unacceptable harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, Kirkville.
- In the report, the Conservation Officer states that 'the site of two buildings at this location neither enhances or better reveals the significance of the Conservation Area and fails to preserve those elements of its setting that make a positive contribution to its significance'. and 'the proposals result in harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, the character and setting of

the Morpeth Conservation Area and the significance of the identified non-designated heritage assets.’

- The removal of three substantial mature trees in a Conservation Area which were important to the amenity and setting of the area.
- The removal of the trees was said to be regrettable.
- There would be loss of amenity and general disposition of Orchard Mews.
- The access road was a single width road.

Mr. Stan Tindale spoke in objection to the application and his key points were:

- In general, no objection to the development, however, the amended plans still had two bungalows directly behind Kirkville.
- In 2015 an application relating to a garage had been refused because of its close proximity to Kirkville, however, these bungalows were even closer.

Councillor Andrew Tebbutt (Morpeth Town Council) spoke in the local member slot and his main points were:-

- The application has caused much anxiety and concern in the town but it is the development to the rear of 94 Newgate street, not the redevelopment of the property itself which was of concern.
- The rear development would cause overmassing, be intrusive to neighbouring properties and result in the loss of trees which were valued highly by residents.
- This area of Morpeth was steeped in history with buildings which are full of character and should not be spoiled by modern development.
- There was some sympathy for the developer but Northumberland County Council could help with the financial concerns and constraints.
- The development was out of step with the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan and could be rejected or changes made to enable 94 Newgate Street to be developed without the development to the rear.
- There were concerns about traffic congestion particularly in Cottingwood Lane and these would be exacerbated by this development.
- The traffic assessments had not adequately addressed the concerns of Morpeth Town Council. The concerns relating to Cottingwood Lane had not been adequately addressed. Why had there not been a full traffic assessment?
- The length of the officer’s report, the number of conditions and the long informative at the end suggests that there are real issues with this application.
- Morpeth Town Council urged refusal on the grounds of over-massing, damage to trees, out of character, impact on neighbouring properties and traffic congestion.

Gary Herron (Agent) spoke in support of the application and his key points were:-

- The site was identified as a key opportunity site within the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework favoured sustainable development.
- Reasons for refusal in January (overlooking, loss of privacy, and massing concerns) have been comprehensively addressed.

- The new build cottages and bungalows complemented the historic architecture of the area and the adjacent Grade II Listed Buildings.
- The costs of restoring 94 Newgate Street could only be counterbalanced by the new build element in the proposal.
- The Ecology Team supported the plans and there was a net increase in the number of trees on the site.
- Highways and Refuse were happy with the proposals and, although no parking was required, 27 parking spaces had been provided.
- The ridge height of the two cottages had been reduced and the dormer element removed. Views of Kirkville had been protected and the chapel remained dominant.
- There was no overlooking or overshadowing of the Butchers Lonnen properties and overbearing/overmassing impact was minimal to nil.
- Issues of massing and overshadowing at Orchard Mews had been negated by hiping the roofs on the rear gable and garages.
- The ridge heights were six feet lower than Orchard Mews and three dormer windows closest to Orchard Mews had been removed.
- There was no overlooking or overshadowing of the Orchard Mews properties and the overmassing impact was minimal.
- This was the sixth redesign and was the optimum design which matched the concerns of objectors.
- The developers believed that the proposal did no harm to the setting of the nearby heritage assets.
- The developer, Northumberland Ltd. was a local firm wishing to restore this Grade II Listed Building. It intended to use local labour and had set up an apprentice scheme with Northumberland College.

Members then asked questions to officers of which the key points from responses were:

- The proposal was in line with the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan and the design appropriate for the location
- Some of the buildings in the surrounding area were modern, however, there were also a number of very old buildings.
- The bungalows would have a small amount of amenity space to the right of both units. As this was the town centre there were many properties which did not have any garden area at all.
- The current car parking was in a private car park and so no vehicles would be displaced in planning terms.

Councillor E. Armstrong moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor R.R. Dodd.

Debate followed of which the key points from members were:

- There was sympathy for the developers who had revised the scheme several times. The conversion of the Listed Building was welcomed but the positioning of the two bungalows was not supported, along with the loss of trees.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 7 votes for to 2 against with 0 abstentions, that it be

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions and obligations as outlined in the report and by the officer.

115. 17/03367/OUT

Outline application for 2 no. 2.5 storey dwelling houses with garages all matters reserved (re-submission of withdrawn outline planning application 17/00666/OUT

Plots 5 And 6, Land North Of Dyke House, The Avenue, Medburn Northumberland. (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix C)

Judith Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview with the following update:-

- A condition should be added to restrict development to within the red line boundary.

Councillor Katrina Woodrow spoke in the local member slot and her main points were:-

- Ponteland Town Council objected to the proposal as it was contrary to Policy MBH2 of the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan, being neither brownfield nor infill.
- There were no schools, medical facilities or shops in Medburn.
- The Avenue had been decimated and was in very poor condition.
- Further development leading to more families in Medburn would put strain on facilities in Ponteland.
- There would be a detrimental impact on the agricultural/rural and largely undeveloped character in this area.
- Why had highways, waste and water authorities not objected?
- When did overdevelopment become acceptable?

Barry Mason (agent) spoke in support of the application and his key points were:

- Outline permission had been granted on this site in 2015 subject to reserved matters.
- The plot was a half hectare in size but two plots were being sought.
- Drainage was in accord with Northumbria Water's requirements as was surface water discharge.
- The development complied with parking standards, and refuse collection requirements.
- Highways considered that there would only be a minimal increase in the number of cars and there would be no detrimental effect.
- Ecology was happy with development and landscaping would enhance the biodiversity of the area.
- The proposal complied with all policies in the Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan, the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Members asked questions to officers and the key points from responses were:

- The highways response was based on two dwellings on this plot.
- An inspector's decision at an appeal for a development in Medburn viewed the settlement as sustainable. Even though this ruling was now six years old, officers would continue to be guided by this ruling until it was challenged at appeal. At the time of the decision there would have been much less development in Medburn.
- The proposal did not comply with the Castle Morpeth Local Plan which referred to brownfield sites. It was required to align with the NPPF which focused on sustainability.
- The proposal complied with the Castle Morpeth Local Plan.
- Highways had raised concerns regarding access to the Avenue, however, these had been overturned by an Inspector at appeal. Highways did have concerns about this development but there were insufficient grounds for refusal.
- This was an outline application but, if approved, the details would be brought back to the Local Area Council due to its controversial nature.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority had raised no concerns regarding flooding.

Councillor P.A. Jackson moved that the application be refused. This was seconded by Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson.

Reasons -

- The development would lead to an increase in vehicular traffic on the Avenue which was already sub-standard.
- The access would cause visibility issues.
- The proposal was contrary to the NPPF.
- The access problems would be made significantly worse by the large cumulative effect of development.

Debate followed and the key points from members were:

- The Avenue was a single track road and in very poor condition.
- It was important to secure a good standard of amenity to the current and future residents. Residents needed safe access to their properties.
- Medburn was not a sustainable community. Councillor P.A. Jackson agreed that this should be added as a reason for refusal.
- It would be difficult to defend refusal due to flooding risk at appeal. The SUDs team always looked at the cumulative impact of any development, however, small.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously that it be

RESOLVED that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

- The development would lead to an increase in vehicular traffic on the Avenue which was already sub-standard.

- The access would cause visibility issues.
- The proposal was contrary to the NPPF.
- The access problems would be made significantly worse by the large cumulative effect of development.
- Medburn was not a sustainable community.

116. 18/00608/CCD

Proposed refurbishment to the external building fabric at County Hall including the replacement of existing copper film roof covering with a standing seam aluminium stucco embossed covering, decoration of all existing timber windows with sprayed grey finish, decoration of all curtain walling with light teak sprayed coating, brickwork repairs where required, replacement of plant room doors with vented steel doors with paint finish, solar PV installation to selected roofs and installation of air vents
Northumberland County Council, County Hall, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE61 2EF. (Report attached to the signed minutes as **Appendix D**)

Judith Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview.

There were no questions.

Councillor D. Bawn moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor J. Beynon.

There was no debate.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously that it be

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

117. APPEAL UPDATE

To receive information on the progress of planning appeals. (Report attached to the signed minutes as **Appendix E**)

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

118. NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL PLAN - UPDATE AND SPRING 2018 CONSULTATION

Members received a report and presentation providing an update on the Northumberland Local Plan Local Plan and details of the Spring 2018 Local Plan consultation. (Report and presentation are attached to the signed minutes as **Appendix F**)

RESOLVED that the content of the report and presentation be noted.

119. WHITTINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Members were asked to note the content of the Submission Draft Whittington Neighbourhood Plan which would shortly be undergoing Independent Examination. (Attached as **Appendix G**)

RESOLVED that the content of the Submission Draft Whittington Neighbourhood Plan and the key issues identified within the report be noted.

120. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 14 May 2018, at 4.00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth.

CHAIRMAN

DATE