

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held at St. James's Church Centre (downstairs hall), Pottergate, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 1JW on Thursday, 22 August 2019 at 3:00 pm.

PRESENT

Councillor G Castle
(Chair, in the chair for items 1 - 4)

Councillor T Thorne
(Planning Vice-Chair, in the chair for items 5 -12)

MEMBERS

T Clark	G Renner-Thompson
G Hill	G Roughhead
R Moore	C Seymour
A Murray	J Watson
W Pattison	

OFFICERS

M Bulman	Lawyer
V Cartmell	Principal Planning Officer
G Fairs	Highways Development Manager
T Lowe	Senior Planning Officer
K Norris	Democratic Services Officer
H Nilsson	Planning Officer
H Parkin	Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Officer
E Sinnamon	Senior Planning Manager

Also in attendance:

Public: 22

49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bridgett and Lawrie.

50. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the meeting of North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 16 July 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

51. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillors T Clark and G Castle declared an interest in application 18/03822/FUL - construction of a two-storey cafe and restaurant (A3) totalling approx. 522 sqm, 64 car parking spaces, improved access roads, play area/green space, landscaping and other ancillary works (amended 9th January 2019), Land South West of Sandy Lane Court, Bernicia Way, Beadnell, Northumberland due to the applicant being Northumberland Estates. Councillors Clark and Castle would leave the meeting for discussion of that item only and would take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

52. PETITIONS

Petition to Warkworth Parish Council to Reinstate a Litter/Dog Waste Bin in the Middle of River Walk into the Village

The Chair referred to the above petition and introduced Mrs Downs, the lead petitioner, who was in attendance to address the committee.

Mrs Downs informed members that she walked along the river every day and, since the winter, the area had deteriorated. Litter/Dog Waste bins had been removed and this had resulted in bags containing dog waste being hung from trees, which was a terrible sight. She had since heard from an Angler that he had recently collected over 200 bags of dog dirt.

She had contacted the Parish Council who had agreed to consider her petition for the provision of a new bin if she collected more signatures. She had done this and 62 people had signed the petition. Mrs Downs said she would be very grateful if the committee would consider the petition and agree to have the bin reinstated. The river walk was an area of outstanding beauty which was being marred by irresponsible dog owners.

The Chair referred to the officer's report in response to the petition and said it was his understanding that a new bin had been approved but would be relocated in a different position to avoid operational difficulties. The Local Member, who was also Vice Chair of the Parish Council, advised that there was a slight complication in that NCC was responsible for emptying litter and dog waste bins but the Parish Council was responsible for the purchase and fitting would have to agree to pay for a new bin. To clarify, he stated that the Parish Council had not yet taken this decision and it would be discussed at its next meeting.

On the wider issue of dog fouling, a member said she had made a request at full Council for updated figures on how many dog owners had been fined within the County. The Chair agreed to remind officers of that request and to have figures provided for the next meeting.

Chair's Initials.....

North Northumberland Local Area Council, 22 August 2019

RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted and members support the decision that the litter bin should be replaced, but not relocated in exactly the same position, subject to authorisation for payment by the Parish Council.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Councillor Castle then vacated the Chair, for Planning Vice-Chair Councillor Thorne to chair the development control section of the agenda, as was the arrangement for all Local Area Councils.

53. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The report explained how the Local Area Council was asked to decide the planning applications attached to the agenda using the powers delegated to it. (Report and applications enclosed with official minutes as **Appendix B.**)

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

54. 18/03231/FUL - Construction of 58 residential units with associated access, landscaping and amenity space, Land North of Fairfields, Longframlington, Northumberland.

Tony Lowe, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the above application which had been the subject of a site visit on 19 August 2019. Mr Lowe summarised the details set out in the report with the aid of a slide presentation.

Graham Fremlin spoke on behalf of Longframlington Parish Council and his comments included the following points:

- Three years ago this site received planning consent for 6 self build houses, followed by consent for a further 11 houses making a total of 17. Since then no plots had been sold or a single house built, but over 100 other houses had been completed which had swamped the market and were still to be sold with another 28 existing houses currently for sale.
- It was now being said that the village desperately needed this new plan for 58 smaller more reasonably priced houses with a mix of affordable housing for rent and sale included.
- In recent years there had been consent given for over 200 houses and of those built over 20% were social rented or discounted affordable homes and there were many other existing social rented homes and rent to buy properties in the village.
- More than half of these homes had gone to people who were not from the village or even from neighbouring parishes but from many miles away.
- The design of the site with large areas of communal parking at the front and shared drives and parking areas at the back could not be found anywhere else in the village and was completely alien to a rural environment.
- The developers had indicated that they would retain ownership of all communal spaces and charge each property a yearly fee for upkeep but this practice had

caused severe hardship in other developments around the country as there was no cap on charges and the government had indicated its intention to outlaw this practice.

- There would be little in the way of gardens and no green space for families except the grassed areas alongside the roads.
- Other concerns were that surface water would not be absorbed; the suds pond was too high up the hill and would be overwhelmed by the regular flood waters from the hill making the A697 impassable and large amounts of silt would impair its efficiency.
- Drainage and flood assessments were primarily desk based studies and like the recent failure of the supposed 100 year event system at Fenwick Park this would also fail.
- The sewage infrastructure would need to be upgraded before any new connections were allowed.
- The A697 used for access for all village services was a very dangerous road with extremely narrow footpaths through the village. Traffic numbers were increasing not just with cars but also with HGV's and that was expected to rise dramatically when the holiday park, recently given consent, was operational.
- Northumberland had produced 194% of the housing needed on a yearly basis and the housing land supply was either 12.1 or 15.2 years depending on the calculation method used, this meant the site did not benefit from presumed permission as a sustainable development and under the NPPF it should represent the housing needs of the community and be the right type in the right place with a high quality design.
- The Parish Council would argue that this plan did not meet any of these tests and should be refused.

Peter Elder, agent to the applicant, then spoke in support of the application:

- All relevant planning policy had been adhered to.
- The following consultees had been consulted and had not objected to the proposal: Natural England; The Highway Authority; the Fire Service; NCC Ecology Officer; NCC Conservation Officer; NCC Environmental Protection Officer; NCC Archaeology Officer; the Local Flood Authority.
- The proposed site was within the boundary of a sustainable village centre and the site had previously been approved for residential development.
- The application should therefore be approved.
- In response to objections raised, the proposed density was approx. 20 units per hectare which was lower than the density level of 30 units per hectare recommended under current planning policy.
- Permission was previously granted for 17 large detached houses but this proposal was considering the long term needs of Longframlington.
- There was currently a shortfall of 151 affordable dwellings per annum in the region and these figures were very concerning. This development would provide 10 affordable 2 and 3 bedroom houses for local people, protected by legal agreement.
- The development would provide a wide mix of house types and a number of bungalows to meet the needs of disabled residents; it would support the local services within Longframlington and allow for the future extension of the bus service, creating a suitable turning area and bus stop for residents.

- In relation to flood risk, as discussed in the Flood Risk Assessment and drainage statement provided with the application, a surface water attenuation system would be installed as part of the development, consisting of underground storage tanks and an attenuation pond. The attenuation tank proposed would manage surface water from the lower part of the site. The SuDS attenuation basin would manage the higher part of the site. The discharge rates from the site to the watercourse were the same as existing. The design would formalise drainage within the field and direct water into the watercourse. Flood Risk appeared not to have been increased.
- With regard to the impact on health services and education facilities, a legal obligation would be entered into by the developer to provide the sum of £17,400 to support health facilities.
- There were no schools within the village, children travelled to adjacent towns. To assist in improving existing school facilities, a legal obligation would be entered into by the developer to provide the sum of £96,000.
- In summary, the proposed development would provide affordable housing for local people and support local services.
- He urged the committee to reflect the officer's recommendation and approve the application.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following information was provided:

- The current application had always been for 58 homes.
- The density of the proposal was lower than the maximum density requirement recommended in the Core Strategy. It was broadly similar to other modern developments and was within the guidelines of Section S5 of the Development Plan.
- Members could not request that the number of proposed dwellings be amended, the application was for 58 dwellings.
- There were currently around 600 dwellings in the village.
- Longframlington was identified as a Sustainable Village Centre. If there was a lack of services in the village at present, that would not improve by having less housing. If services were to be improved, more housing would be needed so the case officer confirmed he was comfortable that services and facilities were available subject to the contributions for health and education as set out in the report.
- There was nothing set out in the application for play facilities. At the site visit members had been informed that the nearest play facilities had been identified as being on Rothbury Road, however, green space was accessible.
- BE8 of the ADLP specified the criteria to assess proposals for new dwellings and extensions and had not been stifled in any way.
- It was acknowledged that the current Core Strategy was an aging plan but it must be a balanced decision.
- In relation to the character and setting, the proposal was on the outskirts of the village but should be viewed within the context of the site.
- The SUDs pond had been designed at the lowest level. Drainage from the top of the site would be by gravity. Allowances had been made for storm events, climate change and extra tarmacing. The site would be landscaped to direct

water from the bottom of the site to storage crates released at a controlled rate to the watercourse.

- The previous application was clearly a much lower density scheme but still fell within the required parameters.

Councillor Thorne moved that the application should be refused on the grounds that it would destroy the character of the village. He stated that the village had started as a small hamlet, with a church built in 1108 by Walter de Framlington, and was subsequently named Longframlington. By the time his mother and father lived there in the early 1900's there were 40 to 50 houses and 20 farms on the Eshott Hall estate. This was followed by a social housing programme after the war when 3 large Council estates were built to accommodate mining families. In the 1960's and 70's some private estates were built with up to 250 houses and since then more housing had been built, taking the village to around 400 properties. He said the point he was making was that the village had evolved over time and had not exploded as it seemed to be doing today. In 2014 the NPPF had encouraged sustainable housing which had resulted in 200 approvals with Longframlington seeing an increase in properties of 50% in two years.

Longframlington was a busy village with a vibrant economy but there had been no improvements to infrastructure and there was a limit to the amount of residents that could be absorbed at a time. Parish Council/residents felt that their community spirit was being destroyed. There should be good planning reasons to approve this application and he felt it should be refused. He agreed with Graham Fremlin that the design was alien and bands of apartments were more for a city. There was not a lot of green space, there was a MUGA and village green in the centre but it was along a busy road with narrow pavements.

Councillor Renner-Thompson seconded the motion.

Members' Comments

- How could this be a sustainable village when there was no school and only one shop? The application had to be considered for the village as it was now.
- The need for affordable housing in Longframlington was questioned, there were few buses and residents would need a car.
- The original homes proposed for the site were more in keeping with the area.
- Road safety was of concern due to water running off the site.
- It was acknowledged that larger developments had been approved in other places in recent years but this proposal would change the village into an urban settlement and, on balance, members supported refusal of the application.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was unanimously agreed and it was therefore

RESOLVED that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- (i) There would be a detrimental effect on the character of the local area and the proposal would destroy the character of the village;

- (ii) The design was alien to a rural village and was out of character with the surroundings.

Councillors Clark and Castle left the meeting for discussion of the following application.

55. 18/03822/FUL - Construction of a two-storey cafe and restaurant (A3) totalling approx. 522 sqm, 64 car parking spaces, improved access roads, play area/green space, landscaping and other ancillary works (amended 9th January 2019), Land South West of Sandy Lane Court, Bernicia Way, Beadnell, Northumberland.

Vivienne Cartmell, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the above application and stated that a further letter of objection had been received to the proposal from a local resident but had raised no new issues. She then summarised the report with the aid of a slide presentation.

Dr Georgie Sowman spoke against the application and her comments included the following points:

- She was a GP with an interest in Lifestyle Medicine, Planetary Health and a mother of three.
- She objected to the proposal on the grounds of potential harm to people, place and prosperity.
- Policy 21a of the Local Plan stated that the planning for the new development at Beadnell would deliver a low impact water sports facility with visitors centre and cafe to promote nature based tourism. This had potential to provide physical, mental and environmental health benefits to individuals and the community.
- Instead the proposal would bring unhealthy food, sedentary behaviour and increased accessibility to alcohol.
- This was in breach of section 2.9 of the local plan.
- A new playground was not a community benefit, Beadnell already had two excellent playgrounds. This playground would be next to the pub/restaurant in which adults would sit while children played, exacerbating unhealthy behaviour modelling in children.
- The busy road was adjacent and increased accident risk to children and adults, especially when alcohol was consumed at the site.
- There were already seven eating establishments in Beadnell, four of which served alcohol.
- This was a coastal strip as described in Section 4.4b. The dunes at Beadnell offered little barrier between the inevitable increased rubbish and single use plastic waste that would materialise.
- Waste from Beadnell would affect every aspect of the AONB because of winds and coastal currents.
- Months after completion of building work at Beadnell point, litter from the building process was being collected despite precautions taken. The litter included polystyrene likely to be present for decades and centuries to come in the form of marine micro plastics which would impact on wildlife and human health.

- Any benefits afforded by public toilet access must be outweighed by the burden to impact to human and environmental health at Beadnell.

Carolanne Field also spoke in objection to the application:

- She lived in Beadnell and had been a resident for 30 years.
- There had been over 100 letters of objection but there had been no objections from statutory consultees which meant that residents only had committee members to turn to.
- For whose benefit was this application? Who would ensure that alcohol did not find its way onto the beach?
- Noise and antisocial behaviour did not seem to constitute relevant planning objections but what about noisy shouts and carnage on the beach?
- Unsuspecting dog walkers and children could be affected by discarded glass and broken bottles.
- 'Friends of the Beach' currently collected litter from the sand dunes and could find all of their hard work undone.
- She did not need to exaggerate the harm that alcohol could do to the beach.

Alison Nation, Chair of Beadnell Parish Council, then spoke on behalf of Beadnell Parish Council:

- Beadnell Parish Council had agreed not to formally object to the application.
- There were a number of objections from the public and they were pleased to see planners had addressed some of those through the recommended conditions relating to flooding, noise, odour and opening times until 11:00 pm only.
- They understood that one of the conditions of an alcohol licence could be to prohibit the taking of alcohol off the premises which they recommended should be added to the premises's licence when the Licensing Department considered the application.
- Although not formally objecting, Parish Councillors wished to see the following addressed if the application was to be approved. Whilst planning conditions could ensure the toilets, overflow car park and green space were created they had been told by the planning department they could do nothing to ensure they remained available in perpetuity to the general public and had been told that no Section 106 agreement could be put in place.
- If Councillors were minded to approve this application, they were asked to consider how they could assist in ensuring some level of protection for these community benefits. Could pressure be brought to facilitate commitment from the applicant to give a legally binding undertaking to respect these?
- Could a condition be attached, if approved, stating that a Change of Use application would not be supported/approved for any part of this application unless agreed by the NCC and Parish Council?
- They would like to stress the importance of the "overflow" car park which was sorely needed to help with traffic congestion and lack of space in the current NCC car park across the road. Could NCC take this over to protect it?
- What could be done? The committee's support would be appreciated.

Barry Spall, Northumberland Estates, then spoke in support of the application:

- The Council's Economic Strategy set out that tourism was a major part of the economy.
- One billion pounds had been spent in the County by visitors in 2018.
- Policies sought to balance the natural environment and development but development must be prioritised where growth could be accommodated and have potential to attract visitors.
- The proposal for a cafe and restaurant met this requirement.
- The Northumberland Tourism Plan referred to the need for a better range of visitor experiences and the need for diversification.
- The proposal would provide all year round employment.
- Many visitors were relatively disappointed by the quality of food on offer and this would offer more choice and operate all year round.
- It was part of the Beadnell Point development, was well sited and would provide a car park.
- The Parish Council had commented that an "overflow" car park was sorely needed for public use to help with traffic congestion and lack of space in the current NCC car park.
- The proposal was for a high quality cafe and restaurant which would bring significant investment to the local economy and bring jobs to the sector.
- There had been no objections from statutory consultees.
- He asked that the application be approved.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following information was provided:

- Unfortunately the original officer report from 2011 could not be located. The Section 106 Agreement which covered the management plan did not refer to community benefits. The planning statement did mention benefits but they were not secured. If the Case Officer, at the time, had felt the only way development could be approved was to secure a S106 it would have been done, so it must have been felt that the application stood up on its own.
- Officers had approached Northumberland Estates about the provision of toilets and they had agreed but it could not be secured through a S106.
- Each application was judged on its own merits.
- The history of previous applications could lead to mixed perceptions about what had been promised but members could only consider the planning application before them that day.
- A condition could be put forward but there was no policy to support it so it could be appealed.
- Northumberland Estates had submitted an amended floor plan. The toilets had been moved to the ground floor so that they would be accessible to the public but there was no legal undertaking.
- Applications for housing developments raised health issues due to increased numbers of residents putting pressure on doctor's surgeries but this application did not raise health issues in planning terms.
- Litter and drunken behaviour were not issues which could be controlled by the planning process.
- Reference was made to paragraph 7.47 which explained why there was no requirement for a financial contribution towards coastal mitigation.

Councillor Renner-Thompson moved approval of the application subject to 3 extra conditions. He said it was a very sensitive site and was separate to the centre of Beadnell. An application had been approved at the other side of the road for toilets and a water sports centre but this had not been progressed. He asked that the following conditions be added:

- 1) That alcohol could not be taken off the premises;
- 2) That the public be allowed to use the toilets;
- 3) That the car park be for general public use.

The Solicitor advised not to proceed with the first condition as all issues relating to alcohol were matters for the Licensing Committee. It was entirely outside of the planning process and would be immediately appealable.

The second condition could be added stating that it was for public benefit to outweigh the harm to the AONB.

The third condition may not be achievable as the car park was necessary for the development proposed. It was being requested that it alleviate car parking issues in Beadnell and that was not proportionate to the application and would therefore be appealable.

Councillor Renner-Thompson said he felt that the third condition was reasonable and clarified that his motion was to approve the application subject to the conditions within the report and two extra conditions as follows:

- 1) That the public be allowed to use the toilets;
- 2) That the car park be for general public use.

Exact wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning.

The Senior Planning Manager advised that some timings would be required.

Councillor Renner-Thompson suggested that the toilets be accessible to the public during the opening hours of the premises and that the car park should be open 24 hours.

Further to comments that a 24 hour car park could result in camper vans parking there, the proposal was amended to car parking being available to the public during opening hours of the premises.

Further to comments about the history of the application it was stated that it had been subject to delegated authority and had not been before the committee so reports would not have been included with agenda papers. It was noted that anyone could apply for planning permission but it was entirely up to them if, upon receiving consent, the proposal was implemented.

Councillor Moore seconded the motion.

Members' Comments

Chair's Initials.....

Discussion ensued about the proposed extra conditions. The Senior Planning Manager advised that, on balance, in planning terms, the request for the toilets to be used by the public during the opening hours of the premises could be argued as a public benefit but that was not the case for the car park as giving consent for a cafe/restaurant and associated car park would not impact upon parking for the village. The applicant would have control of the car park and could introduce charges for non-patrons.

The Chair said this was a message to the applicants that they could assist with parking problems in Beadnell.

A member said he did not support the speaker's comments about carnage on the beach as there was no carnage in other coastal areas such as Amble and Craster and if there were any alcohol related issues they would be a Police matter.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was agreed FOR 6; AGAINST 3 and it was therefore:

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, with reasons, as set out in the report and two extra conditions as follows:

- 1) That the public be allowed to use the toilets during the opening hours of the premises;
- 2) That the car park be for general public use during the opening hours of the premises.

Councillors Clark and Castle returned to the meeting.

56. 19/01026/VARYCO - Removal of Condition 8 (Highways Works) pursuant to planning application 18/03203/FUL, Acton Caravan Site, Felton, Northumberland, NE65 9NS

Hannah Nilsson, Planning Officer, introduced the above application and stated that the application should have included the variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and an amended plan should also have been submitted. The agent had agreed to change the title to reflect this and an amended plan had been provided. She then summarised the report with the aid of a slide presentation.

Alan Ferguson, objector, then spoke in objection to the application and his comments included the following points:

- The Highways Section had asked for his advice on the dualling of the A1.
- He owned a large transport company and was objecting to the application for a number of reasons.
- The access road to the site was inadequate to cope with additional development and was dangerous.
- Condition 8 should not be withdrawn, it was essential and was imposed to improve the access arrangements to the site.
- He used the access road on a daily basis and knew how dangerous it could be.
- The road was not just used by locals who were aware of dangers next to the site.

Chair's Initials.....

- The road was used by everyone in the community and a diverse range of people including pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders, residents and farm traffic.
- Once the caravan site was open there would be more traffic generated by people new to the area.
- The site had never been used by more than two caravans in the last 20 years.
- It was worth noting that, not only had he had an accident on that stretch of road due to its narrow and winding nature, but his wife had suffered a very near miss on Monday.
- Visibility was extremely limited around bends in the road and the applicant had only just trimmed his hedge today.
- It was therefore essential that Condition 8 was fully implemented to ensure improvements were made.
- Current local and national planning policy required that adequate access to a new development was fully considered and deemed safe.
- Some of the other residents who had objected were present to listen to the committee's decision.

Craig Ross, agent to the applicant, then spoke in support of the application:

- He represented Mr and Mrs Campbell, the applicants and owners of the site.
- Following approval in February the applicants had been working hard with different Council departments to ensure all conditions were met and all requirements were in place ready for the site opening.
- The applicants were nearly there and, with the removal of condition 8, they would be a step closer.
- Following planning permission being granted on 26 February a review of conditions was carried out. NPPG at Paragraph 3 reiterated the guidance within the NPPF which stated planning conditions should only be imposed where necessary; relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted; enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
- The guidance stated that the tests must all be satisfied each time a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions was made.
- Following a review of Condition 8 and the six tests there were significant concerns over the imposition of Condition 8.
- The option to apply to remove the condition was chosen as opposed to appealing the condition as this was considered to be the quickest route for the applicant at the time.
- As part of the application the Council's Highways Officer had re-checked the proposed development and concluded the removal of condition 8 would not have an adverse impact on users of the highway or the highway network.
- The extant and historic use of the site had a greater impact than the proposed development, which excluded touring caravans.
- It was unnecessary for highways drainage works to be undertaken to make the scheme acceptable as the problem was with drainage on the public highway which was the responsibility of the highway authority, not the applicant.
- The condition was wider in scope than necessary, it failed the tests for necessity, it failed the tests for relevance and it was unrelated to the development.
- The condition was not worded in a way that demonstrated the level of works either for the 2017 planning consent or the 2018 planning consent, as a result the condition failed the test of precision.

- The condition would impose unjustifiable and disproportionate burdens on the applicant and therefore the condition failed the test of reasonableness. As a result it was not enforceable.
- He therefore asked members to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendations and allow the removal of condition 8 for the reasons identified.

Members' Questions

In response to questions the following information was provided:

- On a point of clarification the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that this application had been before the committee previously and had been deferred for a site visit after which it had been approved subject to highways conditions.
- The Highways Development Manager explained that extant permission existed at the site which included provision for touring caravans. In the most recent application the touring element had been removed. The extant permission did not refer to passing places.
- The most recent application had a plan submitted with it which showed passing places on it so the condition that was recommended required details to be submitted. The applicant and agent then reviewed the conditions and asked for condition 8 to be removed. Highways officers had considered that at face value and did not have any evidence base to say it was needed.
- To say it would make the road more or less safe would be making a comparison with the extant permission, it was arguably a safer proposal now as it did not include touring caravans.

Councillor Thorne moved that condition 8 should not be removed. He said it was a very good application for glamorous camping and it would be an active, busy site. Unlike the former site it would generate a lot of traffic and, as the objector had said, it was a very busy road. Passing places were fundamental to the application and it was unreasonable to say that drainage was the Council's responsibility. The road regularly flooded and water from it flowed down and flooded the highway. A lot of work had been done to get the application approved and the applicants were now reluctant to provide passing places and drainage. He said that condition 8 should remain on grounds of highway safety. Councillor Seymour seconded the motion.

Members' Comments

- Vehicle movement had been commented upon at the site visit. It was a particularly dangerous road and there were no good reasons to remove the condition.
- The objector who spoke had technical experience and gave a personal anecdote.
- Public safety must be paramount.
- Members wanted to see good positive development coming through, they had mitigated doubts by having a site visit but the only doubts they had were about highway safety.
- There would be additional road usage and the road would be less safe. It did not make sense to remove the condition.

- The latest application was considerably different from the original one. If the road was unsafe surely the Council should do something about it. On balance the member said he was struggling to come to a conclusion.

The Senior Planning Manager said that before members made a decision it was important to consider that the original application was for touring caravans; the applicant had retained passing places then amended the application; the applicants then queried if they needed condition 8. The Highways Development Manager had confirmed that the removal of condition 8 would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway.

In response the Planning Vice Chair said the original application was not just about touring caravans it was for a mixed project. There would be extra traffic and farm traffic, so cars could park safely in passing places whilst allowing large vehicles through.

A member referred to the wording of condition 8 on page 58 of the report and stated that there was no mention of touring caravans. The Senior Planning Manager responded that touring caravans had been the justification for condition 8 in 2017, in 2018 the applicant had retained the passing places and officers hadn't asked for them to be removed but would not have insisted on them.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was unanimously agreed and it was therefore:

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused for the removal of condition 8 as doing so would create an unacceptable impact on the highway network.

At 5:20 pm the meeting was adjourned for a 5 minute break and resumed at 5:25 pm.

57. 19/01026/VARYCO - Change of use of the existing land and buildings to a mixed B1 (Business)/BB (Storage or Distribution) & D1 use (Non Residential Institution) with ancillary garage (Retrospective) (amended description 02/08/2019), Former Alnwick Fire Station, South Road, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2PA

Vivienne Cartmell, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the above application and updated members as follows:

Condition 2 was recommended to read:

“Except where modified by the conditions attached to this planning permission, the development hereby approved relates to and shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:

- Site Location Plan 21/11/18 (Old Fire Station, South Road, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2PA)
- Uses Plan 20/08/19 (Old Fire Station, South Road, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2PA)

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of proper planning.”

Additional Condition 3

“The space within the development hereby approved shall be utilised in strict accordance with the use class details shown on the plan ‘Uses Plan 20/08/19 (Old Fire Station, South Road, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2PA).”

Reason: To ensure the amenity of residents is protected.

The Principal Planning Officer then summarised the report with the aid of a slide presentation.

Councillor Castle moved approval of the officer recommendation, with the amended condition 2 and additional condition 3 as detailed above. Councillor Moore seconded the motion.

Councillor Castle said the application was by NEED which was a social enterprise and of value to the town. It was contrary to the Alnwick and Denwick Local Plan and would not be supported unless there were very good reasons, however, the change would not have any impact and it was a beneficial application. With regards to the comments by the Civic Society that it could potentially allow unwelcome development in the future, that would be discussed if and when it happened.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was unanimously agreed and it was therefore:

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, with reasons, as set out in the report; amendments to condition 2 and additional condition 3.

58. 19/01303/FUL - Extension of existing car park into adjacent scrub land to create additional car parking bays, The Chandlery Car Park, Quayside, Berwick upon Tweed, Northumberland, TD15 1HE

Vivienne Cartmell, Principal Planning Officer, summarised the above application as set out in the report with the aid of a slide presentation.

Stephen Scott, Chairman, Berwick Chamber of Trade spoke in support of the application and his comment included the following points:

- He was speaking in support of the application on behalf of 110 members of the Berwick Chamber of Trade.
- For a number of years there had been a reduction in car parking spaces in Berwick and recently a further reduction of 10 in the immediate vicinity due to the building of the Premier Inn Hotel.
- Loss of parking spaces meant loss of income to traders.
- When the hotel opened at the end of the year the proposal would alleviate but not eliminate parking problems.
- Visitors had to leave if they were unable to park.

Chair's Initials.....

- This application would help that part of the town to thrive and help economic growth.
- Objectors had raised concerns about congestion but in peak times congestion was due to drivers looking for a parking space.
- With regard to appearance, this was a small extension to the existing car park, yes it would be preferable for car parks to be out of sight but in the medium term this proposal was for the benefit of the town.
- It was not expected to be a long term solution but would create economic benefit when the hotel opened.

Councillor Seymour acknowledged that there was an acute shortage of parking in Berwick but said she would like to find a solution elsewhere as this site was an outstandingly beautiful place and would be more suited to other things. It was very difficult as many people were in favour of the proposal and many were against it and she would be interested to hear the committee's views.

Councillor Watson said Mr Scott had put forward an excellent case and moved approval of the application, as set out in the report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Pattison who said Berwick desperately needed more parking.

Members' Comments

A member said she was uncomfortable about the proposal which should not be rushed through. There were very strong opinions for and against it - car parking was desperately needed but the Quayside was a beautiful area in need of regeneration. Once it became a car park it would not change back and she was undecided which way to vote as she could see both points of view. She felt that the best way forward was to have a site visit so members could see the site for themselves.

The Solicitor advised that the current motion would need to be dealt with before any other proposal could be made.

Another member suggested that if the application was approved a condition should be imposed to have greenery around the car park to camouflage it and that it should be a temporary car park for say 5 years.

The Solicitor advised that if conditions were to be added the proposer and seconder would have to be willing to amend the motion. If they were not, there would need to be a vote on the proposal to amend.

Councillor Watson confirmed that he did not intend to amend the motion. The Committee voted on the proposed amendment to the motion FOR 1, AGAINST 8, 2 members did not vote.

As the amendment failed, the original motion was put to the vote, the motion was agreed 7 FOR, 2 AGAINST with 2 abstentions and it was therefore:

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, with reasons, as set out in the report.

59. PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE

Members received information on the progress of planning appeals.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

60. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Thursday, 19 September 2019 at St James's Church Centre, Pottergate, Alnwick.

The meeting closed at 5:45 pm

Chair _____

Date _____