

## NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

### CRAMLINGTON, BEDLINGTON AND SEATON VALLEY LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Local Area Council** held in Seaton Sluice Methodist Church, Taylor Gardens, Seaton Sluice, Whitley Bay, NE26 4RH on Wednesday, 19 December 2018 at 3:00 p.m.

#### PRESENT

Councillor C Dunbar  
(Chair, in the Chair)

#### MEMBERS

W Crosby  
B Flux  
B Pidcock

M Richards  
M Robinson  
R J Wallace

#### OFFICERS

H Bowers  
N Masson  
J Murphy  
R Soulsby

Democratic Services Officer  
Principal Solicitor  
Principal Planning Officer  
Planning Officer

Public Speakers: 2

#### 61. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Daley, Hepple and Swinburn.

#### 62. MINUTES

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Local Area Council held on Wednesday, 21 November, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

#### 63. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Planning Application: 18/03545/VARYCO - Councillor Pidcock would withdraw from the meeting whilst this planning application was discussed because of his close association with Seaton Valley Community Council. Although he did not

have a personal interest he would withdraw for the reasons of the perception of bias and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

#### **64. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The report requested members to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. Members were reminded of the principles which should govern their consideration of the applications, the procedure for handling representations, the requirement of conditions and the need for justifiable reasons for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications. The procedure at planning committees was appended for information. (Report attached as **Appendix A**).

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

#### **64. 18/03545/VARYCO - Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) and 2 (storage container temporary use) pursuant to planning permission 18/00649/FUL in order to change materials on the storage container and remove condition 2.**

Ryan Soulsby, Planning Officer, introduced the above application with the aid of a slides presentation.

Councillor Bowman representing Seaton Valley Community Association was in attendance and raised the following issues:-

- He hoped members had read the comments from Seaton Valley Communication Association
- The stables were on Green Belt, agricultural land which accommodated a Seagold container which was 40 feet long, painted green
- The applicant had decided to take one step further and apply for a variation in the hope that the container could be a permanent fixture
- The container was adjacent to a graveyard which was a place of peace and respect and was an eyesore
- The cladding would help but the container was supposed to be temporary
- These types of container were meant for transporting goods by sea, rail and road
- If the variation was agreed the container would become a permanent feature and this was not acceptable to the Community Council

Craig Ross on behalf of George F White agents, was in attendance and spoke in support of the application:-

- He had attended Committee when the original approval had been agreed for the temporary permission
- The container contained high value goods and was used as a tack room with a secure facility

- Through discussions they had tried to reach compromise with cladding, to fit in with the open countryside
- The timber cladding was a minor addition and he hoped that they would not have to re-apply for permission
- He hoped that the Committee would approve the variations

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was provided:-

- This was not a retrospective application. Temporary permission already existed until July 2019 for the container and the principle of the development had already been established. Members were solely looking at whether or not the temporary cladding was an acceptable condition. The Planning Officer was aware of the site history
- Whilst the container was not welcome by residents, that was no planning reason to refuse as the applicant had complied with policies
- It was reiterated the the only consideration in the assessment of the application was the visual impact the proposal would have in timber and any impact this might have on the open countryside and Green Belt
- The timber cladding would be visible from all elevations
- Additional trees had originally been planted to screen the container but the proposed timber cladding would make it more visually acceptable within the Green Belt.

Councillor Flux moved that the application should be granted subject to the conditions/reasons within the report. This was seconded by Councillor Crosby who stated that planning condition 2 must be complied with in that the timber cladding must be completed within 2 months of the date of the decision.

Upon being put to the vote members agreed the motion FOR 5; AGAINST 1 and it was therefore:

**RESOLVED** that members **GRANT** permission subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

## **65. PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE**

Members received information on the progress of planning appeals. (**Appendix C**).

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

## **66. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday, 23 January. Venue to be confirmed.

The meeting closed at 3:27pm.

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE** \_\_\_\_\_