

**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, 8 April 2019.

**PRESENT**

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

**COUNCILLORS**

Armstrong, E.  
Bawn, D.L  
Beynon, J.A

Dodd, R.R  
Jones, V. (part)  
Wearmouth, R. (part)

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Bennett, Mrs L.M.  
Bulman, M.  
Horsman, Geoff  
Murfin, Rob  
Stanners, Ian  
Wood, Tamsin

Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Solicitor  
Senior Planning Officer  
Director of Planning  
Housing Enabling Officer  
Senior Planning Officer

**124. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors L. Dunn, D. Ledger, H.G.H. Sanderson and D.J. Towns.

**125. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday, 11 March 2019 as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**126. 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

Ch.'s Initials.....

included details of the public speaking arrangements. (Report attached to the signed minutes as **Appendix A**)

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**127. 17/03123/OUT**

**Outline permission for the erection of up to 9 dwellings  
Kirkley Sawmill, Kirkley, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Northumberland, NE20 0BD**

Geoff Horsman, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview.

**Mr. G. Brownlee** spoke in objection to the application and his key points included:

- The Environment Agency had raised no objections but residents still had a fear of flooding to their homes
- The construction of nine dwellings on the site could lead to potentially 18 more vehicles. Could Ponteland cope?
- The additional traffic generated by the development would increase risk on the roads in the Kirkley area.
- Two thirds of the site was retained by the developer and may lead to a further development on the site.
- The cul-de-sac and access arrangements could be used to provide for a future development

**Mrs C. Brownlee** spoke in objection to the application and her key points included:

- There would be additional congestion and queues in Ponteland with motorists using whatever route they could to enter Ponteland.
- There were no footpaths or streetlights in the Kirkley area.
- The development would create more vehicle movements in the area and may open the floodgates to more development.
- Responsibility must be taken for the environment and the welfare of the surrounding area.
- Their small settlement would be annihilated
- She hoped that Members would take heed of their concerns and consider the effect of the proposal on their lives and homes before proceeding.

**Councillor Christine Caisley (Ponteland Town Council)** spoke in the local member slot and her main points included:-

- Ponteland Town Council welcomed the fact that a site visit had been held.
- It still stood by its previous objections and reiterated its support for the residents.
- There were no shops, facilities or education provision at Kirkley.
- If the proposal was agreed it was hoped that robust conditions would be observed and enforced.

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

Ch.'s Initials.....

Castle Morpeth Local Area Council, 8 April 2019

- There would be a condition in place to ensure that the dwellings could not be occupied until the remainder of the site had been soft landscaped with details agreed by the planners.
- Anyone could submit a planning application to develop the rest of the Sawmill site and, if so, such an application would be considered on its merits.
- The development would not affect the Green Belt status of the site.
- That part of the Sawmill site outside of the application site was currently brown field but would become green field after the landscaping. As Green-Field land the bar had been raised for any future proposal which would have to meet a higher test.
- The land use classification on the site was currently industrial and not forestry/agricultural.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency had no objections subject to conditions and the proposals should lead to betterment in the area.

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

Debate then followed and the key points from members included:

- There was still concern that the remaining land was very valuable and there would be applications for more housing.
- It was reiterated that the remainder of the site must be landscaped before the dwellings could be occupied. This provided added protection and certainty.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 3 votes for to 0 against with 2 abstentions, that it be

**RESOLVED** that authority be delegated to the Director of Planning for the application to be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions as outlined in the report and the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure an education contribution as specified by the Council's education team.

#### 128. 17/04414/FUL

**Detailed Planning Application for the erection of 61 no. 2, 3 and 4 bedroom two-storey dwellings with associated works  
Land North East Of Pegswood First School, Butchers Lane, Pegswood,  
Northumberland**

Geoff Horsman, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview. In addition to the report, Members were informed that

- a further four letters of support had been received on the grounds of the affordable housing to be provided.
- further information relating to highways had been submitted and there were now no highway objections subject to conditions.
- refusal reason no. 3 had been amended as insufficient information had been provided to enable assessment of the ecological impact on the site.

**Mr. S. Gamble (Agent)** spoke in support of the application and his key points included:

- Gleasons specialised in low cost housing and currently had 70 sites in challenging locations
- Special care had been taken to keep house prices at an affordable level.
- Help to Buy mortgages would be provided to young buyers.
- Two bed roomed houses would be sold at a discounted price and would be affordable on a minimum wage.
- To rent a similar property would cost £90 per week.
- Most of their homes were sold to younger people, aged around 31 on average. These people often lived at home with their parents in overcrowded conditions.
- The company had a community matters initiative and junior sport foundation
- Housing was designed to be suitable for the disabled.
- Local tradespeople would be employed.
- The company did not sell houses to landlords
- The low cost housing provision would remove people from social housing waiting lists.
- He hoped that if the application was supported that some agreement could be reached on the outstanding ecology issues.

Members then asked questions of officers and the key points from responses included:

- There had been issues with some affordable housing developments in that prospective buyers had difficulty in obtaining a mortgage due to very tight restrictions in S106 agreements.
- Gleasons developments had their place and were of benefit, but there was also a need for properties for affordable rent.
- Gleasons had offered to limit price increases but there was no restriction on prices on resale when they would revert to market price.
- The discount offered was only for the first time purchase and not in perpetuity.

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

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

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons as outlined in the report but amended as follows:

- (i) Refusal reason 2 in report relating to highways matters removed.
- (ii) Amendment to the wording of refusal reason 3 to read as follows:

The application had not been supported by sufficient ecological information to enable the County Council to carry out an appraisal of the likely on site impacts of the development on protected species and habitats. The proposal, therefore, failed to comply with Policy Env1 of the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan and Policy C11 of the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan.

**129. 14/01898/OUT**

**Outline application for construction of single detached dwelling house  
Land West Of Bramblings, Tranwell Woods, Morpeth, Northumberland**

Tamsin Wood, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview of the long planning history of this site.

**Dr. D. Tate** spoke in objection to the application and his key points included:

- Two important issues to be considered were consistency and fairness.
- He agreed with the reasons for refusal put forward in the officer's report
- Tranwell was not a village and had no pub, school, village green, no 30 mph signs etc.
- The nearest bus service was a mile away and there were no pavements.
- The Planning Inspectorate and Judges at Judicial Review ruled that this could not be considered as infill.
- The tree survey had been carried out in 2007 and it was questionable whether it was appropriate.
- The site was covered by a Woodland Tree Preservation Order which protected current and future trees. The applicant claimed that no trees would be lost.
- There was no need for a house to be built as there were other houses for sale at Tranwell

**Mr. B. George** spoke in support of the application and his key points included:

- The application was being recommended for refusal using Policy H4 which had been removed from the Local Plan in 2007 and so had no legal standing.
- Great weight was being placed on the ruling of the Planning Inspectorate.
- Pressure was being applied by Dr. Tate and the three Judicial Reviews had caused unnecessary public expense.
- The NPPF did not define a village or infill but allowed Planning Officers to use their judgement.
- Paragraph 8.14 of the report referred to Policy H4 in the Local Plan. He had thoroughly checked and this Policy did not exist.
- The site was small and surrounded by woodland
- Paragraph 2.7 of the report was incorrect in that it referred to the outcome of the Judicial Review, however, the only outcome was that the County Council withdrew in order to save money.
- There should be no errors in the report.

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

- The report had attempted to tell the story of the long running planning history and referred to the policies in place at the time.
- All of the Council, Court's and Planning Inspectors' decisions had been looked at.
- Paragraph 10.1 of the report stated that the planning considerations had been assessed against the relevant Development Plan Policies and the NPPF. Planning Officers had looked at each separately and independently along with the emerging Local Plan.

- This site could not be considered as infill.
- As this site was in the Green Belt and there was a sufficient supply of housing land, the bar was set much higher for this application than previously.
- If permission was refused, the applicant would have the right to appeal and have the matter heard completely independently.

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

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 5 votes for to 1 against with 1 abstention, that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons outlined in the report.

### 130. 19/00226/FUL

#### **Construction of a new single dwelling**

#### **Land West Of 65 Station Road, Station Road, Stannington, Northumberland**

Tamsin Wood, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview. She also handed out an update to Members at the meeting and a copy of which has been filed with the signed minutes. The handout detailed an additional reason for refusal which needed to be added as there was no legal agreement securing the coastal mitigation contribution. This had not yet been entered into and, therefore, the Council was unable to conclude at this time that there would be no adverse effect on site integrity in respect of this issue when undertaking the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the development. Paragraph 44 of the report would be amended as per the handout and the additional reason added if the recommendation for refusal was agreed.

She added that the agent had confirmed that the applicant would enter a UU for the contribution towards coastal mitigation, if the application was approved. The agent had submitted a letter of support stating that the report continually referred to a 2009 inspector's decision at The Bramblings, Tranwell Woods when 'defining' limited infill, but did not refer to more recent appeal decisions. However, in response she commented that the report referred to a recent appeal and to a high court decision where the Senior Judge had referred to the 2009 decision. The agent also referred to a court case which established that it was necessary to consider whether, as a matter of fact on the ground, a site appeared to be within a village. It was confirmed that this approach had been used and paragraph 7.6 of the report referred to this. The agent had also stated that you entered the settlement at the 'village' sign, however, this was not necessarily indicative of having entered into a village.

**Tony Carter (Agent)** spoke in support of the application and his key points included:

- The site was not in an isolated position.
- The report states that the proposals would not be in the settlement boundary for Station Road and also that Station Road did not have a boundary.

- The site was within the settlement and the settlement limit is at 77 Station Road, 200 m to the east. There were at least 33 dwellings between the site and 77 Station Road.
- The village sign was 200m to the east of the site.
- The site fell within the definition of a village.
- Another committee report regarding a site at 62 Station Road referred to the principle of development being acceptable.
- The development was clearly infill and strongly resembled other applications for developments on Station Road
- The proposal was for modest dormer type dwelling on a quarter of the site which was in the garden of 65 Station Road.
- It was well enclosed by mature trees and did not create urban sprawl. The proposed development at 58 Station Road could be considered urban sprawl.
- The design, scale, massing and use of materials was in keeping with other dwellings on Station Road, and met local and national design criteria.
- It was unacceptable that he was only informed of a further refusal reason regarding coastal mitigation contributions, which the applicant had agreed to pay. He had not had an opportunity to resolve the matter.
- A site visit should be carried out to allow officers time to consider the pre-app response and previous committee report referred to and to allow time for the coastal mitigation matter to be resolved.
- The recommendation to refuse was wholly inconsistent with other recent Green Belt approvals on Station Road and the surrounding area.

Members then asked questions of officers and the key points from responses included:

- Developments within a certain distance from the coast were required to make a contribution towards the coastal management plan. The County Council had duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to protect the coastline from damage from increasing tourism and visitors. Lack of an agreement to make a contribution was a reason for refusal
- There had been quite a few similar applications but this proposal could not be viewed as in fill, taking a common sense view.
- Every planning application was assessed on its merits. Other applications may have been approved for different reason such as if the land had had a previous use.
- The position of a road sign could not be used as an indication of a settlement boundary.

Councillor E. Armstrong moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application. This was seconded by Councillor J. Beynon.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons outlined in the report and update.

**131. 19/00134/OUT**

**Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for Construction of 5 no. dwellinghouses (C3 use) including new access  
Land North East Of 63 Station Road, Station Road, Stannington, Northumberland**

Tamsin Wood, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview. She also handed out an update to Members at the meeting and a copy of which has been filed with the signed minutes. The handout detailed an additional reason for refusal which needed to be added as a legal agreement securing the coastal mitigation contribution. This had not yet been entered into and, therefore, the Council was unable to conclude at this time that there would be no adverse effect on site integrity in respect of this issue when undertaking the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the development. Paragraph 7.43 of the report would be amended as per the handout and the additional reason added if the recommendation for refusal was agreed.

**Mr. F. Ford** spoke in support of the application and his key points included:

- Some of his family members were disabled and the proposed dwellings would be built in accordance with guidance published in 2015.
- His daughter would reside there and had suffered significant trauma in 2008 following being rescued from her flat during flood conditions in Morpeth.
- Stannington Station had seen significant change in recent years.
- The proposed development was small in comparison to other nearby sites which had been approved.
- It was astounding that this proposal was recommended for refusal.
- The bungalows would have less impact on the Green Belt.
- The bungalows would be disability friendly and provide lifetime homes
- If the proposal could not be supported then it should be deferred to enable the agent to seek further counsel.

**Mr. B. Sanderson** spoke in support of the application and his key points included:

- There was a failure to provide new build bungalows
- The bungalows would be built to a very high standard.
- Everyone would recognise the demand for this type of development.

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

- There was a need to provide a mix of different types of housing.
- No very special circumstances had been demonstrated.

Councillor E. Armstrong moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application. This was seconded by Councillor D. Bawn.

Debate then followed and the key points from members included:

- Points had been well made by the applicant but this development could not be considered as infill. Other developments referred to had different circumstances.



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

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons outlined in the report and update.

**132. 18/03424/OUT**

**Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for residential development (use class C3) of one x 1 1/2 storey dwelling with associated landscaping and access.**

**Land North Of 16 Park Drive, Park Drive, Hepscoth Park, Northumberland**

Geoff Horsman, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview.

Councillor R. Wearmouth moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor D. Bawn.

Debate then followed and the key points from members included:

- The report did not include reference to any impact on the Northumbria Coast SPA. It was confirmed that this would be checked.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 6 votes for to 1 against with 0 abstentions, that it be

**RESOLVED** that permission be granted with the conditions contained in the report and for the reasons as outlined in the report with the issue of whether a Coastal Mitigation Service Contribution is required to be delegated to the Director of Planning to resolve.

**133. PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE**

Members were informed of the progress of planning appeals. (A copy of the report is filed with the signed minutes as Appendix B).

**RESOLVED** that the report be received.

**134. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 13 May 2019, at 4.00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth.

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**DATE** .....

Ch.'s Initials.....

Castle Morpeth Local Area Council, 8 April 2019