



# Northumberland County Council

## CRAMLINGTON, BEDLINGTON & SEATON VALLEY LOCAL AREA COUNCIL 17 OCTOBER 2018

<b>Application No:</b>	17/02012/OUT		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline Planning Permission with all matters reserved for the erection of two dwellings		
<b>Site Address</b>	Land West Of 62 Station Road , Station Road, Stannington, NE61 6NN		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mrs C Maclennan and Mrs S Dixon C / O George F White	<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Craig Ross George F White, 4-6 Market Street, Alnwick, NE66 1TL
<b>Ward</b>	Bedlington West	<b>Parish</b>	West Bedlington
<b>Valid Date:</b>	12 June 2017	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	13 November 2017
<b>Case Officer Details:</b>	Name: Mr Geoff Horsman Job Title: Senior Planning Officer Tel No: 01670 625553 Email: geoff.horsman@northumberland.gov.uk		



This material has been reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright (Not to Scale)

### **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Under the provisions of the Council's current Scheme of Delegation, where applications raise significant planning issues they are referred to the Head of Planning Services for consideration to be given as to whether the application should

be referred to Committee for determination. The matter has been duly considered under these provisions at which time it was confirmed that the application should be determined by committee as the proposal raises Green Belt policy issues and implications re the Stannington Neighbourhood Plan.

- 1.2 This application was considered at the Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Planning Committee on 19th September, where Members resolved to a site visit prior to determining the application. At the time of writing the report, the site visit is scheduled to take place on Monday 16th October 2018.

## **2. Description of the Proposals**

- 2.1 Outline planning permission is sought for the erection of two dwellings within the application site. All matters of access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are reserved for later approval, although the applicant has stated that they would be willing to accept a condition that the dwellings are of similar height to a couple of existing 1-1.5 storey dwellings that lie to the east of the site. The application site covers an area of 0.1 hectares and lies within the Green Belt and open countryside. It is currently vacant but is considered to constitute previously developed land. In this regard the site was formerly occupied by a haulage depot which included 2 large single storey buildings. Whilst these have now largely disappeared from the site, the remains of those structures have not entirely blended into the landscape.
- 2.2 The application site lies on the south side of Station Road and east of the east coast main railway line. As stated above, there are a couple of dwellings to the immediate east of the application site. These are screened from the application site by tree planting. There are also 2 further dwellings on the other side of Station Road to the north. To the south of the site is an area of woodland. To the west is a water course called Pegwhistle Burn and beyond this agricultural land. The bulk of the linear settlement of Stannington Station lies further to the west.
- 2.3 Access to the site is from Station Road and is shared with the two dwellings to the east.

## **3. Planning History**

**Reference Number:** 16/00274/CLEXIS

**Description:** Certificate of Lawful Development of an Existing Use: The site being classified as previously developed land (PDL) as a result of its historic use as a coal yard and as a result of remaining infrastructure and buildings.

**Status:** REF

**Reference Number:** 96/F/0064

**Description:** Residential Development - Two dwellings (outline)

**Status:** REF

## **4. Consultee Responses**

The Coal Authority	No objection subject to a condition regarding further site investigation and mitigation re ground stability matters and ground gas protection should this be required.
Public Protection	Require the submission of a phase 2 contamination report and gas monitoring before they can advise on whether or not the proposals are acceptable.
County Ecologist	Further survey work required regarding trees, bats and nesting birds before they can advise on whether or not the proposals are acceptable.
West Bedlington Parish Council	No response received.
Highways	No objections subject to conditions regarding car/cycle parking, a construction method statement and refuse storage arrangements.
County Archaeologist	No objections.
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	No comment as application is for minor development.
Northumbrian Water Ltd	Surface water drainage should be provided having regard to the hierarchy that seeks to ensure that if possible such drainage is discharged into the ground. If this is not possible discharge should be into a surface water body. Next in line is a surface water sewer with discharge into a combined sewer being a last resort.

## 5. Public Responses

### Neighbour Notification

Number of Neighbours Notified	6
Number of Objections	1
Number of Support	0
Number of General Comments	0

### Notices

General site notice, 13/06/17

No Press Notice Required.

### Summary of Responses:

1 objection received from a nearby resident raising concerns regarding highway safety, rain water and sewage disposal, too many houses being built in the locality, construction disruption to local residents, loss of countryside when there is plenty of brownfield land that could be built on and lack of schools and children's play provision.

The above is a summary of the comments. The full written text is available on our website.

## 6. Planning Policy

### 6.1 Development Plan Policy

## Wansbeck District Local Plan 2007

GP1 – Locational Strategy  
GP2 – Green Belt  
GP4 – Accessibility  
GP5 – Landscape character  
GP6 – Trees and hedgerows  
GP13 – Biodiversity and wildlife networks  
GP20 – Archaeology  
GP22 – Flood risk and erosion  
GP22a – Land instability  
GP29 – Land contamination  
GP30 – Visual impact  
GP31 – Urban design  
GP32 – Landscaping and the public realm  
GP34 – Resource conservation and integrated renewable energy  
GP35 – Crime prevention  
H3 – Windfall housing sites  
H5 – The design and density of new housing developments  
H6 – Density  
T2 – Provision for buses  
T3 – Provision for cyclists  
T4 – Provision for walking  
T6 – Traffic implications of new development  
T7 – Parking provision in new developments  
REC7 – Indoor and outdoor sports provision by developers  
REC8 – Children’s play  
CF6 – Water supply and drainage  
CF7 – Planning conditions and obligations

## Northumberland County and National Park Joint Structure Plan (2005)

S5 – Green Belt extension

### 6.2 National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2018)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (2018, as amended)

### 6.3 Other Documents/Strategies

Northumberland Five Year Housing Land Supply (2017 – 2022)  
Wansbeck Provision for Sport and Play SPD  
Wansbeck Design Guide  
Wansbeck Residential Development Design Guidance

## **7. Appraisal**

7.1 Following officer assessment and in light of the comments received the main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are as follows:

- Principle of development comprising development in open countryside and accessibility to local services, housing supply and Green Belt matters
- Landscape and visual impact
- Residential amenity
- Transport matters
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology and trees
- Ground contamination and stability
- Sport & play provision

7.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for this site is comprised of the “saved” policies of the Wansbeck District Local Plan (2007) and the Northumberland County and National Park Joint Structure Plan (2005). The saved policies of the Local Plan and Structure Plan continue to constitute the development plan and therefore remain relevant to the determination of this application. However, the weight that can be afforded to these policies varies due to their differing degree of conformity, or conflict, with the NPPF. Furthermore, paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides definitive guidance on how applications should be determined by stating:

*Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means:*

*approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.*

7.3 The Stannington Parish Neighbourhood Plan has recently passed referendum stage and can therefore now be considered part of the Development Plan in respect of the area which it covers. However, as stated above, the application site lies adjacent to but just outside of the neighbourhood plan area and is therefore not a consideration in deciding this application.

### **Principle of development**

#### **Development in open countryside and accessibility to local services**

7.4 The application site is shown in the Local Plan as lying within open countryside outwith any settlement. The settlement of Stannington Station to the west (which lies within the former Castle Morpeth Council area) likewise

has no defined settlement boundary. It comprises a linear pattern of houses, bungalows, cottages and farm buildings sited along Station Road between the A1 trunk road and the A192 in the open countryside south of Morpeth.

- 7.5 Following publication of the NPPF the provisions of the Local Plan Policies GP1 and H3 are still relevant in the determination of this application and remain the starting point for determining the proposals. These policies set out basic principles against which new residential development proposals in the open countryside, outside of defined settlement boundaries, will be assessed with policies seeking to limit new house building in such locations to essential accommodation only e.g. housing for rural workers, in line with the advice contained within the NPPF.
- 7.6 In this location, the principle of new housing development would be contrary to Local Plan Policies GP1 and H3 regarding housing in open countryside and the previous application for 2 dwellings in 1996 referred to earlier in this report was refused for this reason. The NPPF does, however, seek to implement the Government's growth agenda by boosting significantly the supply of housing. The NPPF also stresses that, in the rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The example it gives is where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Stannington Station does have a number of services available for residents including a farm shop, and petrol filling station with a small shop and a restaurant/take-away, and public transport links. This means that the principle of new residential development on the site would accord with the NPPF so far as it would boost housing supply and would be located in a scattered settlement that has both services of its own and which would utilise services in nearby settlements, such as in Stannington Village itself which has the first school. There is also a retail shop and petrol filling station within walking distance to the south east on the A192. Bearing in mind all of the above it is not considered that the proposals fall within the terms of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF as the proposed dwellings would not constitute 'isolated' homes in the countryside.
- 7.7 Having regard to the relevant policies in the Development Plan and in giving due weight to emerging plans and national policy, it is considered that this would be a sustainable location for development in terms of accessibility by a choice of means of transport and accessibility to services, and would also be in accordance with the NPPF in this regard. This conclusion is in accordance with that reached in respect of other recent applications for housing on Station Road to the west.

### **Housing supply**

- 7.8 As set out above Station Road does not lie within an identified settlement boundary. In accordance with the NPPF, the Council is required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five year's worth of housing against their housing requirement. The five year housing land supply position is pertinent to proposals for housing in that paragraph 11 (d) and corresponding footnote 7 of the NPPF indicates that the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies where a Local

Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

- 7.9 As set out in paragraph 73 of the NPPF, where the strategic policies are more than 5 years old, local planning authorities should measure their housing land supply against their local housing need. In accordance with the standard methodology, Northumberland's local housing need figure is currently 717 dwellings per annum. Against this requirement, and taking into account the supply identified in the Council's latest Five Year Supply of Deliverable Sites 2017 to 2022 report, the Council can demonstrate a 12.1 years supply of housing land. Therefore Northumberland clearly has more than a 5-year housing land supply, and as such, in this context, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
- 7.10 This supply position updates that were presented in the Council's 'Position statement' following withdrawal of the draft Core Strategy (Nov 2017), and in the Five Year Supply of Deliverable Sites 2017 to 2022 report (Nov 2017) which used an Objectively Assessed Need of 944 dwellings per annum, are informed by superseded evidence. While the draft Northumberland Local Plan includes a housing target of 885 dwellings per annum, given that the plan is not yet adopted, this target has not been used for the calculation of the Council's five year housing land supply position, as to do so would not reflect the NPPF.

### **Green Belt**

- 7.11 The Wansbeck District Local Plan Proposals Map shows the application site as lying within the Green Belt. Policy GP2 states that appropriate development in the Green Belt comprises buildings for agriculture/forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport/recreation, cemeteries and other uses of land which preserve openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Limited extension/alteration of existing dwellings are also considered appropriate. Policy GP2 derives from Policy S5 of the Northumberland Structure Plan which established the general extent of a Green Belt extension around Morpeth.
- 7.12 Paragraph 133 of the NPPF attaches great importance to Green Belts, with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 134 sets out that Green Belt serves five purposes:
- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
  - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
  - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 7.13 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF highlights that *"inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances"*. Paragraph 144 requires Local Planning

Authorities (LPA) to ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, and that “*very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations*”. Paragraph 145 sets out that LPAs should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall into one of the exceptions categories in that paragraph.

- 7.14 The applicant considers that the proposed dwellings would be appropriate development because they fall within the scope of the exceptions criterion relating to previously developed land in the Green Belt. This refers to:

*limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.*

- 7.14 The applicant is not proposing that the dwellings for which permission is sought would be affordable housing and therefore the test is whether or not the redevelopment of this previously developed land would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

- 7.15 In support of their proposals, the applicant has submitted a massing study which examines the impact of the proposed development on the Green Belt. Their agent contends that a key aspect of character on Station Road is small pockets or clusters of development and the proposed dwellings would comprise part of such a pocket/cluster of development. Furthermore, the neighbouring dwellings to the east and north form a ‘bookend’ which marks the eastern extremity of the settlement of Stannington Station and the proposed dwellings would lie to the west of these dwellings within the settlement and would be seen against the built context of these when viewed from the east. In terms of views from the west they contend that the proposed dwellings would be largely hidden by existing vegetation and would also be seen within the context of built development to the west including new housing recently granted permission. They further state that new housing has been granted permission on other sites to the west within Stannington Station which ‘spill out’ into the Green Belt without substantial screening or landscape mitigation. Overall they submit that the proposals would have no adverse impact on the Green Belt.

- 7.15 In terms of officer response to the above, whilst a number of permissions for new development have been granted within Stannington Station in recent years, each proposal needs to be considered individually in terms of its impact on the Green Belt. Key considerations in deciding whether or not the proposals would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development are the extent of existing built development on the application site, the extent of the surrounding built context and views of the above from nearby public vantage points. A difficulty with this site is that there is very little built development on it at present and little surrounding built



context to reduce the impact of development on the openness of the Green Belt in terms of views from key public vantage points - in particular the view from Station Road to the west looking towards the site which is at present a view of undeveloped open countryside. Whilst additional screen planting could be provided, it is not considered that this would entirely screen the proposed dwellings from view, particularly during the winter months.

- 7.16 Overall, it is the view of officers that the proposals would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development on the application site and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances that would override the harm by way of inappropriateness and the proposals are therefore considered to be unacceptable in terms of their impact on the Green Belt.

### **Landscape and visual impact**

- 7.18 Despite the site being previously-developed, the development will have a greater impact on the character and appearance of the area due to the very limited built development on the site. Although this is an outline application with all matters reserved for later approval, the agent has advised that they would be willing to accept a condition stating that the height of the proposed dwellings should not exceed the height of the existing dwellings to the immediate east. The size of the dwellings in footprint/floorspace terms is not clear at this stage.
- 7.19 Whilst it falls within the Green Belt, the site does not have any other landscape designation upon it. Policies GP5, GP30 and GP31 of the Local Plan sets out criteria for new housing development including issues such as local character, materials, environmental impacts, separation distances/layout, access/parking and landscaping. In addition the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and, through the NPPF, recognises that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development which is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- 7.20 Stannington Station comprises a linear form of development that has been built up to varying degrees on either side of Station Road. The area is characterised by some low density residential development in a mixed form of terrace housing, semi-detached, detached and bungalows, some of which are set in relatively substantial plots. There is a mix of materials from traditional stone to a mix of stone, brick and render. As such there is no predominant building style or vernacular in the immediate area.
- 7.21 Notwithstanding this, officers consider that the proposed development will alter the character of the area and introduce new housing development to the site in comparison to the existing very limited built development on site. As per the adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt referred to above, it is considered for the same reasons that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful urbanising impact on the open countryside character of the locality in terms of views of the site from Station Road to the west which

are currently rural in nature given the location of the application site at the eastern edge of the scattered settlement of Stannington Station.

- 7.22 The proposal would therefore not be in accordance with Policies GP5, GP30 and GP31 of the Local Plan and the NPPF in this regard.

### **Residential amenity**

- 7.23 The development of the site could have impacts upon the amenity of existing residents in the vicinity, particularly in relation to matters of increased level of use on the site, visual amenity, outlook and privacy.
- 7.24 The nearest neighbouring dwellings to the site are those to the immediate east. However, the nearest of these would be in excess of 30 metres from the boundary of the application site and the agent has advised, as stated above, that they would accept a condition limiting the height of the proposed dwellings to no greater than the height of these neighbouring dwellings which are 1-1.5 storeys. Given the above it is not considered that significant harm would arise in terms of overlooking, loss of daylight/sunlight or visual intrusion.
- 7.25 Whilst the proposed dwellings would share the access to Station Road with these existing neighbours, it is not considered that 2 additional dwellings would significantly impact on the amenities of existing residents.
- 7.26 Construction impacts could be addressed by means of a condition as recommended by Highways.

### **Transport matters**

- 7.27 Consultation has taken place with the Council's Highways Development Management Team (HDM) on the proposed development. They raise no objections subject to conditions.
- 7.28 Sufficient space exists within the application site to provide the maximum of 4 car parking spaces per dwelling required by the Local Plan.
- 7.29 The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policies T3, T4, T6 and T7 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

### **Flood risk and drainage**

- 7.30 The application site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at lower risk of flooding. Nevertheless consultation has taken place with Northumbrian Water (NWL) and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in relation to matters of foul and surface water drainage.
- 7.31 The submitted application form states that surface water will be discharged to a nearby watercourse. Northumbrian Water and the LLFA raise no objections in principle and it is considered that the drainage proposals are in broad terms acceptable subject to a condition regarding the details of provision.

### **Ecology and trees**

- 7.32 Policy GP13 of the Local Plan seeks to promote biodiversity.
- 7.33 Consultation has taken place with the Council's ecologists on the application. They consider that further survey work is required regarding trees, bats and nesting birds before they can advise on whether or not the proposals are acceptable.
- 7.34 The agent has advised that were committee minded to approve this application, then their client would be willing to commission the required survey work and agree appropriate conditions with the Council's Ecologist prior to any decision notice being issued.
- 7.35 Should committee wish to refuse the application then in addition to the concerns highlighted earlier in this report regarding the adverse impact of the proposals on the Green Belt and landscape character/visual amenity, a further reason for refusal would need to be added in respect of insufficient information having been provided to assess the acceptability of the proposals in ecology terms.

#### **Ground contamination and stability**

- 7.36 Wansbeck District Local Plan Policies GP22a and GP29 require that consideration be given matters of ground contamination and ground stability related to the historic use of sites and coal mining legacy matters.
- 7.37 The application site is previously developed land that was formerly in commercial use and sections of the site also lie within the Coal Authority's development high risk area.
- 7.38 The Coal Authority advise that matters concerning ground stability and ground gas can be addressed by means of condition. However, the Council's Public Protection team advise that they require the submission of a phase 2 intrusive investigation contamination report and gas monitoring before they can advise on whether or not the proposals are acceptable.
- 7.39 As per the further documentation sought by the Council's Ecologist, the agent has again advised that were committee minded to approve this application, then their client would be willing to commission the required survey work and agree appropriate conditions with the Council's Public Protection team prior to any decision notice being issued.
- 7.40 Should committee wish to refuse the application then the refusal reasons would need to include the provision of insufficient information to address ground contamination matters.

#### **Sport & play provision**

- 7.41 Wansbeck District Local Plan Policies REC7 and REC8 state that all new housing developments should make provision on site or contribute to off-site provision in respect of sport and play. The Wansbeck Sport & Play SPD provides detailed guidance concerning off-site contributions and applying the

SPD would generate a need for a Section 106 contribution of £3176 towards the costs of off-site sport and play provision. The applicant has confirmed that they would be willing to enter into a legal agreement to make this contribution if committee were minded to approve this application.

### **Other Matters**

- 7.43 The Council's archaeologist has confirmed that no archaeology evaluation work is required.
- 7.44 The matters of water and energy conservation highlighted in Local Plan Policy GP34 could be addressed by condition whilst the matter of crime prevention highlighted in Policy GP35 could be addressed at Reserved Matters stage.
- 7.45 The scale of development proposed is not sufficiently substantial to warrant Section 106 contributions for affordable housing, education or primary healthcare.

### Equality Duty

The County Council has a duty to have regard to the impact of any proposal on those people with characteristics protected by the Equality Act. Officers have had due regard to Sec 149(1) (a) and (b) of the Equality Act 2010 and considered the information provided by the applicant, together with the responses from consultees and other parties, and determined that the proposal would have no material impact on individuals or identifiable groups with protected characteristics. Accordingly, no changes to the proposal were required to make it acceptable in this regard.

### Crime and Disorder Act Implications

Matters regarding crime and disorder would be addressed at detailed Reserved Matters stage.

### Human Rights Act Implications

The Human Rights Act requires the County Council to take into account the rights of the public under the European Convention on Human Rights and prevents the Council from acting in a manner which is incompatible with those rights. Article 8 of the Convention provides that there shall be respect for an individual's private life and home save for that interference which is in accordance with the law and necessary in a democratic society in the interests of (inter alia) public safety and the economic wellbeing of the country. Article 1 of protocol 1 provides that an individual's peaceful enjoyment of their property shall not be interfered with save as is necessary in the public interest.

For an interference with these rights to be justifiable the interference (and the means employed) needs to be proportionate to the aims sought to be realised. The main body of this report identifies the extent to which there is any identifiable interference with these rights. The Planning Considerations identified are also relevant in deciding whether any interference is proportionate. Case law has been decided which indicates that certain development does interfere with an individual's rights under

Human Rights legislation. This application has been considered in the light of statute and case law and the interference is not considered to be disproportionate.

Officers are also aware of Article 6, the focus of which (for the purpose of this decision) is the determination of an individual's civil rights and obligations. Article 6 provides that in the determination of these rights, an individual is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal. Article 6 has been subject to a great deal of case law. It has been decided that for planning matters the decision making process as a whole, which includes the right of review by the High Court, complied with Article 6.

## **8. Conclusion**

Overall officers consider the proposals to be unacceptable because although the site is previously developed land, the proposed dwellings would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. As such the proposals constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Other significant harm has also been identified in respect of impact on the landscape character/visual amenity of the locality. Overall it is not considered that there are any very special circumstances of sufficient weight to override the harm by way of inappropriateness and the other harm identified. In addition, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposals are acceptable in respect of matters relating to ecology and ground contamination.

## **9. Recommendation**

That this application be REFUSED permission for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the scale of development proposed, the very limited extent of existing built development on the application site, the very limited extent of the surrounding built context and views of the above from nearby public vantage points it is considered that the proposed redevelopment of this previously developed site would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. As such the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition. There are not considered to be any very special circumstances of sufficient weight to override the harm by way of inappropriateness and other harm arising. Given the above the proposals would be contrary to Policy GP2 of the Wansbeck District Local Plan 2007, Policy S5 of the Northumberland County and National Park Joint Structure Plan 2005 and the NPPF.
2. The proposed development would have a significantly harmful urbanising impact on the open countryside character and visual amenity of the locality in terms of views of the site from Station Road to the west. This would be contrary to Policies GP5, GP30 and GP31 of the Wansbeck District Local Plan 2007 and the NPPF.
3. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposals are acceptable in respect of ecology and ground contamination matters contrary to Policies GP13 and GP29 of the Wansbeck District Local Plan 2007 and the NPPF

**Background Papers:** Planning application file(s) 17/02012/OUT