

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

At a meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held in the **Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth, NE61 2EF** on **Tuesday 4 December 2018 at 4.00 pm.**

PRESENT

Councillor CW Horncastle
(in the Chair)

MEMBERS

Flux B	Renner-Thompson G
Gibson RM	Richards ME
Gobin JJ	Robinson M
Lang J	Stewart GM
Ledger D	Thorne TN
Pidcock B	Swithenbank ICF
Reid J	Wearmouth R

OFFICERS

Armstrong N	Senior Planning Officer
Bulman M	Solicitor
Feige D	Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer
Horsman G	Senior Planning Officer
Little L	Democratic Services Officer
Murphy J	Principal Planning Officer
Payne M	Consultant Engineer
Sinnamon E	Interim Head of Planning
Thompson C	Principal Highways Development Management Officer
Wood T	Senior Planning Officer

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor J Watson
Press/ public: 22

52. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor G Castle.

53. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee held on Tuesday 6 November 2018, as circulated, be agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair with the following amendment noted:-

Minute Number 49, the vote should be recorded as follows:-

FOR - 10; AGAINST - 2; ABSTENTIONS - 0. 1 Member did not vote.

54. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Ledger advised that he would declare interests in applications 17/04330/FUL as he had a caravan on another caravan park owned by the applicant and who was a friend and 18/03001/REM as he had been involved in the purchase of the land related to this application and would leave the Chamber for both of these items. Prior to the commencement of application 16/04305/OUT Councillor Ledger also advised that he was a friend of the applicant and would also withdraw for this item.

Councillor Wearmouth advised that he was the Chair of Advance Northumberland and would leave the Chamber for application 18/03001/REM. Councillor Reid also advised that he was a Board Member of Advance Northumberland and he would also withdraw for this application.

55. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The report requested the Committee 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.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

Councillor Ledger left the Chamber

56. 17/04330/FUL

Hybrid planning application comprising: Full planning permission for a holiday park comprising the installation of up to 275 hard standing bases for static caravans; 200 all weather pitches for touring units and tents associated car parking and toilet/shower block, main reception and amenity building, outdoor play area, workshop; internal access roads; footpaths; landscaping; water based leisure uses. Outline planning permission for a further 475 hard standing bases for holiday homes, landscaping and cafe, with all matters reserved.
Land East Of Widdrington Moor, Widdrington, Northumberland

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. Updates were provided as follows:-

- A further response had been received from Widdrington Village Parish Council advising that they now objected to the application following further consultations with residents for the following reasons:
 - ○ More time was needed for residents to assess and comment on the proposals.
 - There had been a lack of developer and County Council consultation with residents.
 - Proposals were contrary to Castle Morpeth Local Development Plan (CMLDP) Policy E12 regarding traffic and amenity impacts.
 - Traffic concerns regarding the use of C115 to the west and north which was a single track road, and increased pressure on the road between village and Druridge Bay.
 - Pedestrian safety concerns regarding those getting to/from local bus services and existing pedestrians/cyclists using C115 road.
 - Concerns regarding safety of C115/A1 junction.
 - Increased pressure on local services resulting in increased car parking problems in nearby villages.
 - The Parish Council not being consulted regarding proposed improvements to bus stops in the village.
 - Concerns at ecological impact and mitigation.
 - Network Rail had not been consulted on the application. Concerns regarding impact on level crossings and increased use of Widdrington Station
- Network Rail had registered a Holding Objection as in their opinion there was significant potential for the development to import further risk on to existing adjacent level crossings and the applicant needed to provide further information to demonstrate that such risk could be satisfactorily addressed before the development was considered further. In this regard further work was required on the applicant's submitted Transport Assessment regarding the implications of the development for nearby level crossings. Queries were also raised about increased patronage of local footpaths by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and implications of this for safety of Felton Lane level crossing.
- Additional public objections had now been received from 22 individuals (largely residents of Widdrington Village). Additional issues raised from those contained in the report were as follows:
 - The proposal was overdevelopment.
 - There was inadequate access for emergency vehicles.
 - Distance from site to Widdrington Village misquoted in the report and travel plan.
 - Proposals would overload local services.
 - Previous uses of opencast mining and burial of foot and mouth carcasses make site unsuitable for the proposed development.

- Proposed development was unsuitable due to shooting which took place on adjacent agricultural land.
- Increased parking problems in local villages.
- Concern that Northumberland County Council Highways had changed their advice regarding the need for a lit footpath/cycleway on C115 and issues re liability claims.
- Opencast restoration not carried out in full.
- Human Rights of villagers adversely affected by proposed shuttle bus.
- Economic benefit not significant due to residents spending most of their time on the holiday park.
- Need to provide for public access to proposed holiday park facilities.
- Obstruction of C115 by low loaders delivering static caravans, refuse and other commercial vehicles to the detriment of current road users.
- Traffic volumes cited by applicant were disputed.
- Widdrington was already adversely affected by wind farms and opencast mining.
- More time should be allowed for consultation as consultation undertaken to date was not compliant with Northumberland County Council Local Plan Statement of Community Involvement 2015.

He advised that a revised recommendation was now proposed as follows:-

"That Strategic Planning Committee be minded to approve the application and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as detailed in your report, a Section 106 Agreement being entered into by the applicant and adjacent landowner to secure a coastal mitigation contribution of £271,200, further ecology mitigation in respect of Maiden's Hall lake to the north of the application site and compensatory off-site bridleway provision and subject to resolution within 3 months of matters raised by Network Rail and the Department for Transport to the satisfaction of those consultees and any conditions agreed between them and the LPA regarding railway infrastructure matters".

M Dallard addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The incorrect Ward and location of the proposed development was contained in documents and residents along with the relevant Ward Councillor were not notified of the proposed development.
- The site notices were incorrect and were therefore in breach of planning conditions.
- The report contained a number of errors, inconsistencies and wrong details and there had been a failure to amend these.
- Maps were incorrect and therefore no credence could be given to other documents which might also contain incorrect information.
- There was an outstanding Stage 2 complaint in respect of this application.
- The Officer could not explain why the wrong site had been used on information provided.
- There was an outstanding Freedom of Information request for information discussed at a closed meeting with the Parish Council in December 2017.

- The development could not be supported, there was no retail opportunity for local shops, no evidence that jobs would be accessible to local people and she questioned what the figure of just over 40% occupation of the site was based on as there was no evidence to support this.
- The statement regarding no loss of amenity to residents was false as the site would be visible from properties and construction traffic would enter the site through the Village.
- The statement in the report containing the words “notwithstanding the comments from objectors” was insulting to residents and she would hope that Councillors had read all objections to the proposal.
- This was a very important decision and would have a lifelong impact on residents of the Village and she asked that the application be refused.

Councillor D Page, addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of Widdrington Village Parish Council. His comments included:-

- The application should be rejected as it was contrary to policy E12 (iii), (iv) and (v) of the Castle Morpeth Local Development Plan. Policy E12 stated that development would only be allowed in the greenbelt if all five criteria were met.
- The site was outside the Parish Boundary, and the Parish Council could not accept that a development of potentially more than 900 units in a parish with a total of just over 80 properties and 130 registered voters could be considered to have no adverse impact on the local community. As the Parish Council were responsible for street furniture, bins etc for the area surrounding Druridge Bay the Council precept would have to be dramatically increased in order to pay for additional provision required for visitors which was grossly unfair. This point had been raised at the meeting with the previous Planning Officer at the meeting in December 2017.
- There would be a dramatic increase in the level of traffic through the Village where due to parking in some places was quite often reduced to a single width carriageway.
- Highways had previously indicated that they wished a footpath to be provided, however this had now been changed to the provision of a shuttle bus, this would not protect pedestrians / cyclists etc from traffic.
- The C115 to the west of proposed entrance would become the sat nav route between the caravan park and the A1 no matter what signage was put in place. This part of the C115 was a single track road without passing places and could not be considered capable of handling any additional traffic.
- There would be an increased number of vehicles using level crossings on the main east coast rail line at Widdrington, Chevington and Felton Lane and Network Rail had not previously been notified of the proposed development. Network Rail had concerns and had issued an holding order. He recommended that Members read the Network Rail document.
- The scoping for the Causey Park junction had been undertaken during the midweek in February whereas the busy times for this junction were during peak hours and the summer period.
- The proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the rare species of birds using the site and proposed mitigation was insufficient.

Peter Lead, the Agent acting on behalf of the applicant, Callaly Leisure addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included:-

- A meeting had been held with Councillor Dickinson, the Local Ward Councillor at the site at which he had voiced his support for the proposals. A meeting had been held with the Parish Council on 13 December 2017 which Councillor Dickinson had chaired at which full details of the proposed application were provided and all questions answered.
- The Parish Council had been consulted and had initially stated that they were in support of the application with some reservations. It had been presumed that in coming to that conclusion that the application had been discussed with residents. Amendments had been made and reservations resolved which were well documented over the 12 month period and all available on the website with the planning process transparent.
- There had recently been 30 objections received with 22 of these from 5 households.
- The applicants were a well established family company who already ran two caravan parks. The proposed caravan park would bring additional tourism into the region with an average spend for a static caravan of £7,500 each year which gave a total of over £5m not including touring caravans.
- The varied jobs created would be filled by local people. This was a huge investment of £17m and employees and materials required through the construction period would be locally sourced.
- There would be a community use agreement for the site allowing access for residents with local schools able to access the site for recreational and educational purposes in a protected and safe environment.
- A local precept from the business rates paid could be used to assist the Parish Council in providing the additional services required.

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

- The application had been scheduled to be heard at the previous meeting however this was withdrawn following concerns over the initial consultation process that had been undertaken. It was clarified that the consultation that had now been undertaken was over and above that legally required. Network Rail had now provided comments advising that further investigation was required.
- Public Protection had no objection on the grounds of noise including from the nearby wind turbines.
- The type of facilities to be included on the caravan park would normally be classed as town centre uses however these were sometimes acceptable in rural locations. In this instance this was a large holiday park which would need these type of facilities which would mostly be used by the users of the park thereby reducing the need to go off site however some community access would also be given.
- A sum of £271,200 was to be provided by way of a Section 106 agreement for mitigation of the coastal impacts of the development. Parish Councils were entitled to approach the County Council to request a percentage of the business

rates from any large company in their area. The applicant did not feel any additional contributions on top of this sum should be made.

- The Community Use Agreement condition required a document to be submitted stating what use of the facilities the community would have, the applicant would be expected to implement this and monitoring and enforcement could be used to ensure the use was allowed.
- The previous proposal for the area was the Blue Sky Project however that proposal was for a larger area than the current application.
- The open cast use of the site had ceased in 2011/12 and some partial restoration had been undertaken.
- The concerns of Network Rail needed to be addressed with the applicant undertaking further work on the Transport Assessment which would need to be further assessed by both the Local Authority and Network Rail. The recommendation was that the Committee be minded to agree subject to this issue being resolved.
- In respect of impacts to wildlife on the site the applicant had submitted detailed ecology mitigation measures and proposals in respect of biodiversity enhancement. It was recognised that additional disturbance to the coastal areas could occur from the development therefore the sum of £270,200 would be provided on a phased basis to the coastal mitigation service to manage any impacts within the coastal zone.
- The use of business rates was outside the planning process.
- A shuttle bus would be operated for the last part of the journey to the caravan park for visitors on an as and when required basis from the nearest bus stop or train station. Details of the shuttle service would be secured by a condition and would be for the lifetime of the caravan park. The travel plan for the development would encourage the use of public transport.
- The restoration proposals for the site which included the lakes also showed public footpaths through the site so it was envisaged some recreational aspect of the lakes would be provided however there was no legal agreement giving public access. The management of the lakes was not a part of the assessment of the application before the Committee. The safety and management of the lakes would be considered by the Council's Local Flood Authority team as they did form part of the drainage for the site and conditions attached to any planning permission included the requirement for a health and safety assessment of all SUDS features within the development.
- It was clarified that if Network Rail maintained their objection after three months then the application would be brought back to Committee for further determination.

Councillor Thorne proposed acceptance of the revised minded to approve recommendation as outlined above advising that he had previously been a member of the Steadburn Liaison Group and recreational use of the site had always been the vision of the Coal Authority. Councillor Pidcock seconded the proposal.

Councillor Reid advised that whilst he had previously been enthusiastic and had thought the proposal was a good idea that would boost tourism he was now of the opinion that it was too big, too disruptive and would impact negatively on too many lives. He also had concerns regarding the proximity to the railway line and the safety

and management of the lakes on the site. Other Members accepted that whilst this was a large development compared to the size of the Village they considered that there was no planning reason to refuse the application.

A vote was taken as follows:- FOR - 12; AGAINST - 2; ABSTENTIONS - 0.

RESOLVED that the Committee be minded to approve the application and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions as detailed in your report, a Section 106 Agreement being entered into by the applicant and adjacent landowner to secure a coastal mitigation contribution of £271,200, further ecology mitigation in respect of Maiden's Hall lake to the north of the application site and compensatory off-site bridleway provision and subject to resolution within 3 months of matters raised by Network Rail and the Department for Transport to the satisfaction of those consultees and any conditions agreed between them and the LPA regarding railway infrastructure matters.

Councillors Reid and Wearmouth left the Chamber at this point.

57. 18/03001/REM

Reserved Matters Application - for submission of details of access, appearance, layout and scale for 96no residential dwellings within Phase 2 of the development (Outline agreed under 14/03016/FUL)

Land South Of Aiden Grove And Lynemouth Road, Lynemouth Road, Ellington, Northumberland

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. An update was provided as follows:-

- The description of the proposal on the first page of the application should include landscaping, which had also been assessed as part of the report.
- The comments of the Local Lead Flooding Authority (LLFA) had been received advising that they had no objections subject to the conditions at the outline stage being still valid and appended to this application. The Officer clarified that the applicant would still need to discharge the conditions and they would be repeated on this application.

Councillor Flux proposed acceptance of the recommendation as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Pidcock.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the Committee be minded to approve the application and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the resolution of the outstanding matters in relation to the surface water drainage from the LLFA and the conditions in the report.

A five minute comfort break was held at this point with Councillors Ledger, Reid and Wearmouth returning to the Chamber following this.

58. 17/01677/OUT

Outline planning application for up to 272 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access

Land North East Of Amble Sewage Treatment Works, Percy Drive Amble, Northumberland

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation and explained that the application had been brought to Committee to consider the effect of the new NPPF. Amendments and additions to conditions attached to any permission granted were circulated to Members. A copy would be filed with the signed minutes and would be uploaded to the Council's website. He advised that a further objection had been received since previously being reported to Committee which raised concerns regarding ecology impacts of the proposals, adverse impact on heritage coast and the AONB, loss of open space. He advised that the proposals were considered acceptable on ecology grounds subject to no objections from Natural England. The harmful impact on the heritage coast and AONB were not considered to arise and there was no loss of open space as the site was not at present publicly accessible.

A revised recommendation was as follows:-

"That Members be minded to GRANT permission and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to determine the application, subject to conditions as specified in this report and the amended/additional ecology conditions circulated, the completion of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which secures 15% affordable housing and the various infrastructure contributions as specified earlier in this report and the resolution of outstanding matters relating to ground contamination and ecology to the satisfaction of the Council's Public Protection Officer and Natural England including, where necessary, the addition of further conditions or the amendment of currently proposed conditions as required by those consultees."

J Hope addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of LoveAmble in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The application site lies within the risk zone of protected species and the Council as the responsible authority had a duty to protect from the likelihood of harmful effects of development.
- The development was within 0.5km of internationally, nationally and locally important protected habitats located in the SSSI, Amble RAMSAR and Amble Dunes LNR.
- Within the development there was the potential for 950 plus residents and 180 plus dogs being directed via an adjoining Right of Way to the dunes and coast with no appropriate ongoing mitigation submitted. With the likelihood of an increased level of adverse post-development impact to the protected habitats and species any approval of the application would be unlawful.
- The application did not satisfy sustainability and biodiversity policies of the Alnwick Core Strategy or relevant policies of the Alnwick Plan.

- The NPPF made reference to the Government Circular: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system. Point 27 of the Circular stated that if the site hosted a priority habitat or species and there was no alternative solution the only considerations which could justify the granting of planning permission were those which related to human health, public safety or beneficial consequences of primary importance to the environment. Within Amble there were 20 priority species of birds that use the proposed development site and therefore the application should be refused.
- The provision of bird and bat boxes would not enhance the biodiversity of an undeveloped greenfield site that was a BAP habitat for multiple species; nor mitigate the loss of open farmland habitat which protected ground-nesting birds depended upon;
- A one off payment would not protect for the ongoing mitigation required for the life of the development.
- The NPPF advised that authorities must establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need can be met over the plan period. The Northumberland SHLAA identified that the number of dwellings to be provided for Amble over the development period of 2011-2031 should be 600 for the entire period.

M Sewell, applicant and Chief Executive of Cheviot Housing addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- This Committee had been minded to grant permission for this development one year ago. He believed it was a first class development and superb scheme of good quality and with a great range of houses.
- They had listened to local people during the consultation phase and had redesigned the application to incorporate bungalows as requested. They had worked closely with the Council to address the ecological, technical and planning issues and had now finalised the S106 Agreement which provided all contributions sought by officers and consultees.
- The Company had a policy for engaging with Communities on schemes and there was the potential for £40m to be put into the regional economy through the creation of local employment through construction and purchasing.
- The Company had an ethos for working with local communities giving a share in the Company's success and had already provided funding for young people and disabled adults in the area.

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

- The reason the application had been brought back was to allow the Committee to consider the material consideration of the new NPPF on the proposals. This had not affected the Officer's recommendation however in order for transparency in the process, consultees had been allowed to also come back to Committee to provide their views.

Councillor Thorne proposed acceptance of the revised recommendation as above which was seconded by Councillor Pidcock.

It was suggested that as this development crossed parish council boundaries these should be amended in order to prevent occupiers paying different precepts. The Committee was advised this was outwith the planning process.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the Committee be minded to **GRANT** permission and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to determine the application, subject to conditions as specified in the report and the amended/additional ecology conditions circulated, the completion of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which secured 15% affordable housing and the various infrastructure contributions as specified in the report and the resolution of outstanding matters relating to ground contamination and ecology to the satisfaction of the Council's Public Protection Officer and Natural England including, where necessary, the addition of further conditions or the amendment of currently proposed conditions as required by those consultees.

Councillor Ledger left the Chamber at this point.

59. 16/04305/OUT

Application for outline planning permission with some matters reserved for construction of residential development of up to 500 dwellings (including affordable homes), public open space, access to an existing highway and associated works

Land south and south-east of James Calvert Spence College, Acklington Road, Amble

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation and explained that the application had been brought to Committee to consider the effect of the new NPPF and to request the removal of a condition regarding the provision of a link road. He advised that a further objection had been received that raised similar issues to those already referred to within the September 2017 committee report and set out matters on which the application should be refused, including:

- impacts upon designated sites as a result of new population and dogs with inadequate ecological mitigation and suggested that approval would be unlawful as a result;
- current level of housing land supply;
- the environmental impacts had not been sufficiently addressed and therefore sustainable development was not achieved;
- loss of open space and undeveloped land;
- impact on Coastal Change Management Area;
- impacts on the natural environment, designated sites and ecological mitigation of cumulative applications for major housing development in Amble;
- no reasons or benefits proven for loss of habitat;

- application did not satisfy sustainability and biodiversity policies of the Alnwick Core Strategy or relevant policies of the Alnwick Local Plan;
- considers approval would be unlawful with regards to sustainability as insufficient consideration given to environmental requirements of the NPPF and sustainable development objectives and inadequate mitigation of ecological impacts and cumulative impacts.

The recommendation was that Members be minded to GRANT permission and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to determine the application, subject to conditions as specified in the previous report to the Strategic Planning Committee in September 2017, subject to the resolution of outstanding matters in respect of archaeology with any additional conditions as deemed necessary, and subject to the completion of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure 15% affordable housing provision; education contribution; healthcare contribution; sport and play contribution; highway infrastructure contribution; and provision of ecological mitigation.

J Hope addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of LoveAmble in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The objections outlined in respect of the previous application were also relevant to this application.
- In relation to the addendum report point 2.22 stated in terms of its environmental role there would not be any significant or unacceptable harmful impacts on the site and wider area. The truth was that this was a high density development of potentially 1700 plus residents including 300 dogs which would be sited within 1.5km of internationally, nationally and locally important protected habitats.
- No ongoing mitigation plan had been submitted to maintain safeguarding measures for the lifetime of the development therefore approval of the application would be unlawful.
- The development would have an unacceptable impact to a number of protected sites.
- The NPPF advised that authorities must establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need can be met over the plan period. The Northumberland SHLAA identified that the number of dwellings to be provided for Amble over the development period of 2011-2031 should be 600 for the entire period which equates to 30 per year or a similar figure. No retesting had been undertaken and therefore these figures should stand.
- The application should be rejected on the cumulative impact which was four times more housing and the application should be denied on these grounds.

Councillor J Watson, the Local Ward Member addressed the meeting advising that a lot of issues were talked about during the original consideration of the application. He considered that there had not been grounds for refusal, however they had tried to make the best of the situation with the creation of a link road. It had been recognised that this condition could not be enforced easily but he had been encouraged by the attitude of the developer and he still hoped that it would be a possibility as the site

access had been changed to allow the road to be built in the future if required. He now supported the removal of the condition. He highlighted the huge increase in the number of houses in Amble but stated that the £4m assistance to Amble would be welcomed. He accepted what the Officers said and the application had his support.

Michael Hepburn, the agent on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- The applicant was a local housing developer who delivered successful schemes.
- The report was a robust consideration of the new NPPF and did not alter the recommendation to approve.
- The Company had no objection to contributing to the local infrastructure and he highlighted the contributions to be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. Councillor Watson had made a request for the provision of a link road to be investigated and they had been happy to do so even though Highways had advised that it was not necessary. The only way for the road to be provided would be to reduce the other Section 106 contributions. It was agreed by the applicant and officers on balance that the impact on the other Section 106 contributions was too great and it was not appropriate for the road to be requested. However the Company had redesigned the junction onto Acklington Road so that it could be upgraded to include the new road if needed.
- The objections had been covered during the previous consideration of the application and mitigation provided.
- He asked that the Committee support the application.

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

- It was the intention that the applicant for the adjacent development where the possible link road would go through would be encouraged to ensure that the layout would look to provide access for a future road.
- Officers provided assurance that whilst the details of the Section 106 Agreement were not detailed in the report the full amount of contribution had been agreed and Officers confirmed what these would be. Negotiated triggers through the development phases would be used to provide the funds as contributions could only be requested when the need arose.

Councillor Pidcock proposed acceptance of the updated recommendation outlined above which was seconded by Councillor Thorne.

Members highlighted their concerns regarding the link road not being provided as they considered that this was the ideal opportunity to include the infrastructure. They were reminded that Highways had not advised that the link road was necessary to make the development acceptable and therefore its inclusion could not be enforced. The applicant now wanted to move on with the application and had agreed to all other Section 106 contributions required by consultees to address the impacts of this development.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the Committee be minded to **GRANT** permission and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to determine the application, subject to conditions as specified in the previous report to the Strategic Planning Committee in September 2017, subject to the resolution of outstanding matters in respect of archaeology with any additional conditions as deemed necessary, and subject to the completion of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure 15% affordable housing provision; education contribution; healthcare contribution; sport and play contribution; highway infrastructure contribution; and provision of ecological mitigation.

At this point, as the meeting was approaching three hours in length it was **RESOLVED** to suspend standing orders to allow the meeting to continue beyond three hours in duration.

60. 17/01675/OUT

Outline planning application for up to 166 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access

Land North West of Hauxley Moor House, A1068 Radcliffe to Amble, Amble, Northumberland

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a powerpoint presentation and explained that the application had been brought to Committee to consider the effect of the new NPPF and to request the views of the Committee in respect the removal of a condition for the provision of a link road. However he advised that the applicant had stated that they would be willing to reconsider the link road if prior to any reserved matters application being determined funding was identified from NCC or other sources to cover the additional costs of providing the link road. They would however, not be able to agree to design junction with A1068 to allow for link road at this stage as this would require re-siting of access further north to allow for connection with new roundabout.

Updates were provided as follows:-

- One further objection had been received since October 2017 Committee which raised concerns regarding ecology impacts of the proposals; adverse impact on the heritage coast & AONB; and loss of open space. The proposals were considered acceptable on ecology grounds subject to no objections from Natural England. The harmful impact on the heritage coast and AONB was not considered to arise and there was no loss of open space as the site was not at present publicly accessible.
- A minor change was proposed to part xii) of condition 10 in the addendum report regarding the Institute of Lighting Engineers document referred to should be 2018 rather than the 2009 report.

The recommendation was that Members be minded to GRANT permission and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to determine the application, subject to conditions as specified in this report, the completion of a legal agreement pursuant to

Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which secures 15% affordable housing and the various infrastructure contributions as specified earlier in this report and the resolution of outstanding matters relating to surface water drainage to the satisfaction of the Council's LLFA officers including, where necessary, the addition of further conditions or the amendment of currently proposed conditions as required by the LLFA and the minor change to condition 10 as detailed earlier.

J Hope addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of LoveAmble in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The objections outlined in respect of the two previous applications were also relevant to this application.
- Within the NPPF it was stated that the three objectives of sustainable development were independent and needed to be pursued in mutually supportive ways therefore the environmental objective had equal weight as the social and economic objectives. The environmental objective included contributing to the protection and enhancement which had not been sufficiently addressed within this application.
- In relation to points 7 and 29 in the addendum report the provision of bat boxes and leaflets to residents which residents could choose to ignore were not sufficient mitigation. There was only one place for residents to walk their dogs and this was the coast. There was the potential for 500 plus residents walking 100 plus dogs which were being directed to use the Right of Way to access Amble Dunes.
- There were no ongoing mitigation measures and to approve the application was unlawful.
- The provision of bird and bat boxes would not enhance the biodiversity of an undeveloped greenfield site that was a BAP habitat for 20 species or bird; nor mitigate the loss of open farmland habitat which protected ground-nesting birds depended upon; or replace the open farmland habitat used annually by flocks of migrating geese; and there was no guarantee that after bats had lost their natural roosts they would return at the end of the construction period to inhabit artificial boxes within a high-density brightly lit housing estate.
- A one off payment would not protect for the ongoing mitigation required for the life of the development and was not adequate.

M Sewell, applicant and Chief Executive of Cheviot Housing addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. He advised that the application mirrored the issues raised in the previous application. He confirmed the commitment to continue to work with the Council in connection with the provision of the link road to accommodate the best solution.

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

- The Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer advised that it had been recognised that housing developments increased recreational disturbance in protected sites and therefore a Coastal Mitigation Service had been developed to address this. A precautionary view was always taken and ensured that appropriate mitigation

- was provided. In relation to the view that the mitigation should be specific to Amble, he clarified that residents visited different locations along the coastline as well as those nearest to their own residence. In respect of wildlife returning on completion of the development to boxes he advised that different species liked different environments and it would depend upon the design and location of boxes. There was good evidence that swift boxes which resembled bricks/eaves and those that had built in features were particularly useful.
- The “titled balance” did not apply due to the loss of the proposed Development Plan rather where an excess of the five year housing supply was demonstrated the titled balance did not apply as was the case in this instance.

Councillor Flux proposed acceptance of the updated recommendation as above which was seconded by Councillor Thorne.

A vote was taken and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the Committee be minded to **GRANT** permission and delegate authority to the Director of Planning to determine the application, subject to conditions as specified in the addendum report, the completion of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which secured 15% affordable housing and the various infrastructure contributions as specified in the addendum report and the resolution of outstanding matters relating to surface water drainage to the satisfaction of the Council’s LLFA officers including, where necessary, the addition of further conditions or the amendment of currently proposed conditions as required by the LLFA and the minor change to condition 10 as detailed above.

61. PLANNING APPEALS

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.20 pm

CHAIR _____

DATE _____