

## **NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

At a meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth, NE61 on **Tuesday 5 January 2016 at 2.00 pm**

#### **PRESENT**

Councillor P. Kelly  
(in the Chair)

#### **MEMBERS**

Dickinson, S.  
Dodd, R.R.  
Douglas, M.I  
Fearon, J.  
Gobin, J.J.

Graham, K.O.  
Horncastle, C.W.  
Tebbutt, A.,  
Wallace, A.  
Watkin, R.J.D.

#### **OFFICERS**

Armstrong, N.  
Bracken, P.  
Cartmel, V.  
Carter, T.  
Dobinson-Booth, A.  
Green, J.  
Hitchings, J.  
Ketley, M.

Senior Planning Officer  
Solicitor  
Principal Planning Officer  
Senior Planning Officer  
Council Planning Consultant  
Senior Planning Officer  
SUDS Officer  
Senior Manager – Development &  
Delivery  
Senior Environmental Health Officer  
Democratic Services Officer  
Major Development & Delivery Manager  
Senior Development Control Officer  
Affordable Housing Senior Officer

Lathan, D.  
Little, L.  
Milburn, B.  
Thompson, C.  
Turnbull, N.

#### **ALSO PRESENT**

Councillor S. Bridgett  
Councillor D. Campbell

Councillor B. Flux  
Councillor G. Sanderson

Press/Public: 52

#### **70. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Castle and Thorne.

#### **71. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee on 1 December 2015, as circulated, be agreed as a true record and be signed by the Chair.

## **72. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Wallace declared a personal interest in Application 15/03266/FUL as this was within her Ward.

## **73. 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 report be noted.

## **74. 14/04099/OUT**

**Outline application for a residential development for the erection of up to 480 dwellings and a 40 bed care home (Class C3), with all other matters reserved, except for access (As Amended)  
Land North of Station Road, Cramlington, Northumberland**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee. The application had been deferred at the last meeting for more information to be provided in relation to stythe gas. The Senior Environmental Health Officer provided a power point presentation and detailed information on the ground investigations undertaken; location of boreholes, gas monitoring equipment, coal seams and the fan house which had been provided by the Coal Authority. He advised that since 2009 significant changes had occurred underground which meant that whilst the fan was no longer operating as intended it was still venting the workings. He outlined the results of tests and gas monitoring that had been undertaken in different atmospheric conditions which had indicated that the fan was still ventilating the area. A coloured plan indicating the areas which were affected when the fan was operating was provided, with the green area where no change was recorded being confirmed as the area for development. He further advised that development on the site should not impact on the regime in the wider area.

Mr Sisterson addressed the Committee in objection to the application and included the following points:-

- The high level of objections received which focussed on stythe gas.
- The Coal Authority response of 19.1.15 which indicated that the area fell within a defined high risk area for development and hazardous features needed to be considered. There were 5 coal seams which covered the site with 3 entrances and there was a strong possibility of unrecorded workings at shallow levels.
- The second Coal Authority response which stated that given the history of mine gas issues in the area the site should be considered as if characterised

under the NHBC system as Amber 1 which required measures put in place. It also highlighted that the wider area was in the ownership of the applicant and although the current investigations and remedial works proposed were acceptable for the part of the site currently under consideration this did not mean that future proposals for development of the wider area would be deemed as such.

- Existing properties were in the wider area and could not be protected by the provision of a membrane or sub floor void.
- There was nothing to give assurance that existing properties would not be affected and the Local Planning Authority should require a definitive assurance.
- Leebell had been questioned on who would be legally responsible for any future problems and the response had stated that tenants/property owners would be responsible along with the Local Authority and not the developer. Therefore there were financial implications for the Council and the application should be rejected.

Councillor Flux addressed the Committee as the Local Ward Member and in opposition to the application with the following points noted:-

- It had been the correct decision to defer the item at the last meeting as no guarantees could be given that existing properties would not be affected. Further information received from the Coal Authority had still only stated “should not” and did not state “will not”.
- Documents from the previous Blyth Valley Borough Council (BVBC) had indicated problems with stythe gas since 1987 during low atmospheric pressure, which had resulted in letter drops to residents.
- Recent flooding which had occurred.
- The potential for harm to residents along with the proximity of Manor Walks Shopping Centre to the site.
- Despite the operation of the fan, problems had still been encountered, even recently.
- British Coal had stated in 1987 that they had no legal obligation to provide works in connection with stythe gas. There was a lack of legal guarantee and therefore the application must be refused.
- Whilst new tenants would be protected, no protection would be provided for the 500 existing households.
- Possible risk to viability of the development of other sites within Cramlington and therefore to the emerging Core Strategy.
- The Developers have permission for other sites in Cramlington to which no objections had been made; however there were 900 objections to this particular site.
- Permission had been refused in 2007 by BVBC and nothing had changed since then, the site was too risky, posed a threat to public safety and the application should be refused.

James Hall on behalf of Barton Willmore, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application. His comments included:-

- A fan located at the north east area of the site controlled the flow of gas when necessary due to environmental conditions and was managed by the Coal Authority.
- Development would not impact on the operation of the fan.
- The process had taken years with everything that the applicant could do and had been asked to do to ensure that safety was paramount had been carried out.
- It was confirmed that development would only take place within the green area as highlighted previously during the presentation.
- Further meetings had been held with Public Protection Officers and he advised that the Public Protection Officer could answer questions and provide assurance regarding the surveys undertaken.
- The Coal Authority were the statutory body responsible for ensuring the safety of residents within former mining areas and had stated the application was acceptable and could be delivered safely.
- The application had no other technical or other outstanding objections.
- The site, included in the Local Plan, had long been envisaged as a development site and would make a valuable contribution to the housing need in Cramlington, the South East Delivery Area and County targets.
- If the Committee were minded to agree the application, the completion of a S.106 agreement would provide contributions for affordable housing and other items as outlined in the report.
- There were no planning grounds to refuse the application.

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

- The Coal Authority had been invited to attend Committee, however they considered that the information they had provided was sufficient and they had no objection to the application.
- Information provided showed that the area to be developed, highlighted green on the presentation, should not impact on the operation of the fan house. Development could be undertaken on NHCB classified amber sites with suitable protection provided. The results of surveys indicated that the development should not impact on the operation of the fan house. The issue of stythe gas was always considered very seriously.
- It was not the intention to build directly above mine shafts and therefore there was no requirement for these to be filled.
- Conditions 9 and 10 related to contaminated land and had no impact on gas. Conditions 7 and 8 protected buildings on the development site and not off site. A 100% guarantee could not be given that there would be no effects to off-site properties, however the likelihood was very low. Surveys had been undertaken with the best available techniques at this time. Officers must consider all information provided and be guided by Professional opinion.
- The Coal Authority has responsibility for gas emanating from any mines under their ownership.

Councillor Watkin stated that the Committee had considered the issue in great detail and proposed acceptance of the recommendation as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Pidcock. Votes were recorded as FOR : 10; AGAINST : 2; ABSTENSTIONS : 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** subject to the completion of a S106 agreement covering the matters and with the conditions as set out in the report. Delegated authority was also agreed to vary/remove/add any of the conditions following final comments from consultees.

**75. 14/03266/FUL**

**Erection of 57 dwellings (including 17 affordable homes) access to an existing highway, car parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure.  
Land South Of Lordenshaw Drive And Silverton Lane, Garleigh Road,  
Rothbury, Northumberland**

The Council's Planning Consultant introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a power point presentation. Members were reminded that the application had been deferred at the previous meeting in order to allow a site visit to be undertaken. Updates were provided as follows:

- Affordable housing would be provided on-site at the south west area of the site. The mix of affordable has been agreed with the Council's Housing team.
- As requested at the previous meeting further information has been provided from Education in relation to school places as follows:-

**'the development will only generate 1 child per year group. It will only have a small impact on King Edward Sixth Academy. It would not be worth seeking a contribution for this development as the figures would be too small.'**

Ms V Suckling addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. Her speech included the following:-

- In the context of the NFFP the benefits of development do not outweigh the harm, with few opportunities for the creation of new jobs.
- The loss of valuable farm land from the hill farm would contravene NPPF guidelines on green field sites.
- Housing numbers have already exceeded those required with large sites already approved for development.
- The proposed development would impact on views from St. Oswalds Way and Cragside.
- The proposed development was outside the village, on a steep hill and would require the use of cars to access the village itself.
- The school had objected due to the increase in traffic and increased road safety risks for pupils.
- The impact of light pollution on the Northumberland Dark Skies.
- The loss of habitat for migrant birds which use the site for the large amount of insects present.
- The application had been opposed by three parish councils and residents, the evidence showed that the harm outweighed the benefits of the development which was not sustainable and therefore should be rejected.

Mr J Rutherford also addressed the Committee in objection to the application and his speech included the following points:-

- The application did not meet the criteria of the emerging Core Strategy and previously adopted policies in relation to the assessed housing need in the area.
- Rothbury had been defined as a secondary service centre and this definition had been maintained in the emerging Core Strategy.
- There was limited population growth in Rothbury, 636 between 2001 and 2011 as had been shown by the 2011 census.
- The emerging Core Strategy stated that 200 homes would be required to be provided between 2011 – 2031, new applications had now reached 185, if this development was approved this figure would be 242 in year 3 of a 20 year plan.

Councillor Bridgett addressed the Committee as the Local Ward Member and spoke in objection to the application. His speech included the following:-

- He shared the objections of the three Parish Councils.
- Rothbury had been overdeveloped in the past and this should not happen again.
- The emerging Core Strategy stated that Rothbury should deliver 200 houses to 2031 and 185 of them had already been granted. There was no need for the extra 57 dwellings from this development.
- He highlighted the number of already approved applications, including affordable housing which had not been delivered by the same developer and stated these needed to come forward.
- He highlighted other applications on Thrum Mill Farm which had been refused due to unsustainability and being contrary to the NPPF guidance and stated that this application was also contrary to Section 13 due to the need to protect and enhance the open rural landscape.
- Development on this elevated green field site would increase flooding in the area.
- The application site was in an elevated position and viewed from nearby ancient monument and the National Trust property at Craggside.
- The 57 dwellings would be on a steep hill, far from local services with no public transport. It would be a 1.3km walk to the nearest bus stop.
- The School had objected due to parking and pupil safety with existing problems exacerbated by the proposed development.

Mr Spall, the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application. His speech included the following:

- Rothbury was a main service centre with the provision for 200 houses over the Local Plan period. Weight should be given to this.
- An identified need for housing in Rothbury had been demonstrated through the SHLAA process.
- The site was sustainable at the top of Rothbury was developable and deliverable without constraints.
- 30% Affordable housing was to be provided which was double the 15% required.

- All statutory consultees supported the application and there would be no environmental impacts.
- The development met all tests of sustainability set out in the NPPF and was in accordance with National Policy.
- The development would contribute to the sustainability of Rothbury and support economic growth and provide an opportunity for residents to live in modern, high quality accommodation.
- The application should be approved.

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

- The figure of 200 new homes for Rothbury in the emerging Core Strategy was a minimum figure and was not a ceiling/cap on the number to be provided. The Committee would need to consider if the level of development was sustainable for Rothbury at the current time.
- A mix of 30% affordable housing was to be provided on site with the intent that a registered provider take up the rented properties, however should this not occur then a commuted sum would be retained and other options for the provision of affordable housing explored.
- The SHLAA was an evidence based document which helped to inform preparation of the Core Strategy and the 5 year housing land supply position, however this was not a policy document and no weight could be given to this in the determination of the application.
- In respect of questions regarding highways issues raised at the site visit, the issue was the capacity of the network to serve the additional properties. Improvements to the network would be required and these included the widening of Garland Bank; vertical alignment to be improved; the relocation of the 30mph limit southward by way of a TRO.
- The increased traffic flow during peak hour flow during the school drop off/pick up times was less than one vehicle in four minutes and these would have a negligible effect on traffic flows and was not considered severe in respect of the NPPF.
- A construction method statement to be agreed by the Council would restrict the construction traffic arriving/departing the site during school drop off/pick up times.
- It would not be possible for the Local Planning Authority to impose a condition staggering development across the approved sites in Rothbury. Condition 8 would allow the regulation of routing/timing of vehicles to minimise impact on Rothbury from this particular development, and similar conditions were already in place on other consented schemes in the village, but it would not be reasonable in planning terms to prevent one site coming forward in favour of another.
- The Local Planning Authority could not delay the consideration of an application until other approved developments had commenced. The Committee had a duty to determine the application in accordance with policies in a timely manner and an Appeal could be made on non-determination if this did not occur.
- Whilst there was a higher density of properties on the western site, the density of a site was measured across the overall site and therefore in this instance was of low density. Registered Providers would normally require

their properties to be in one area as these would be considered easier to manage.

Councillor Horncastle proposed acceptance of the recommendation as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Fearon.

In discussing the application a suggestion was made for a phased approach to the approved developments, however the Committee were reminded this was not an issue that could be taken into consideration. Votes were recorded as: FOR : 9; AGAINST : 4.

**RESOLVED** that authority be granted to the Senior Manager – Development and Delivery to **GRANT CONDITIONAL PERMISSION** for the reasons and subject to conditions as outlined in the report and completion for a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and country Planning Act to secure the delivery of on-site affordable housing.

A five minute comfort break was held at this point.

3.58 Meeting recommenced.

**76. 14/03776/OUT**

**Development for up to 43 residential dwellings (Class C3), demolition, infrastructure, access, open space and landscaping (all matters reserved except for access)**

**Land north of Eilansgate, Hexham, Northumberland**

This application had been deferred at the last meeting in order to allow a site visit to be undertaken. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a power point presentation. Updates were provided as follows:-

- Since publication of the committee report, a further 5 letters of objection had been received. The issues raised were similar to those already summarised in the report and included concerns over land stability, surface water drainage and additional traffic. A total of 35 letters of objection had now been received.
- A further 9 letters of support had also been received with residents commenting on the benefits of the scheme including further housing provision and funding for the sports clubs. A total of 26 letters of support had now been received.

Mr R Wilkinson spoke in objection to the application. His address included the following information:-

- He highlighted that objections had been well documented and that letters of support received after the October deadline did not state that these were from directors of the Golf Club.
- He highlighted the traffic survey which had been undertaken by the property developers and questioned whether this should be believed. There was no reference to residents parking in the vicinity or the existing problem of vans/buses having to mount the pavements.
- He stated there were discrepancies in paragraph 7.5 of the report.

- The green fields at the South west were registered for permanent pasture and maintained as green belt with trees planted.
- The development of high value housing for commuters would have a high visual impact; detract from the landscape; and destroy a significant wildlife corridor.
- He questioned how the stability of his land could be guaranteed.

Ms C Hellowell also spoke in objection to the application. Her address included the following:-

- Hexham was an important and major centre for tourism in Northumberland with historical attributes.
- Development would detract from the panoramic views and beauty of the town.
- Concerns regarding the stability of the land as it had previously been a sand/gravel pit.
- She questioned what would happen to water run-off from the land once it was tarmacked.

Councillor T. Cessford representing Hexham Town Council addressed the Committee in objection to the application. His speech included the following:-

- The Town Council objected to the removal of trees and thinning of others on the site and referred the Committee to the objection by the County Ecologist who recommended refusal.
- The emerging Core Strategy stated that the biodiversity and value of strategic green space should be protected and enhanced.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the access; the detrimental impact on parking in the area; the visibility for drivers around the bend and problems with speeding.
- Objections to the removal of the green belt and strategic green space and questioned what the exceptional circumstances as it was not considered that a cash injection to the golf club could be classed as exceptional. If this was the case then profit could be used as exceptional circumstances for the removal of green belt in every application.
- The Town Council could not support the application and he asked that it be refused.

Mr Tirrell, the Chairman of the Hexham Golf Club addressed the Committee in support of the application. His speech included the following:-

- The application had been brought forward for the benefit of two Clubs.
- There was a decline in membership of golf clubs across the country and development was required in order to be able to attract younger members for the sustainability of the Club.
- The Club house facilities would be used by other groups within the Town.
- The sale of the land would allow both Clubs to improve facilities and attract new members.

Mr Wallace, on behalf of the Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application. His speech included the following:-

- The application would deliver much needed housing on land partly allocated for that use and partly in the green belt.
- Very special circumstances did exist – the need to invest in community facilities and the need for funds for essential maintenance.
- Funding for the two clubs would be realised and secured by a S106 agreement along with 30% affordable housing.
- The site was deliverable and the terraced garden approach was typical of development in Hexham.
- Highways were satisfied that the development would not have a significant impact on levels of traffic and parking provision could be achieved on site.
- There would be a minimum impact on trees with only five being lost. Three of the trees covered by the Tree Preservation Order were diseased and would need to be removed in any event.
- The site would be delivered without delay once approval of reserved matters had been agreed.

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

- The very special circumstances in relation to development in the green belt in this application were the economic benefits to both Clubs and the provision of affordable housing.
- The emerging Core Strategy proposed deletion of Green Belt status for the top of the site which was currently in the Green Belt. However as the Core Strategy was only at the Pre-submission draft stage and had not been adopted less weight could be given to this.
- Green Belt in this area was to prevent urban sprawl and of the application site 1.3 hectares was in the Green Belt.

Councillor Dickinson moved acceptance of the recommendation as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Douglas.

In discussing the application the Committee Members stated that the application site was close to the centre and within walking distance of the Town and that Green Belt was to prevent urban sprawl out of Town.

It was unanimously **RESOLVED** that authority be granted to the Senior Manager - Development and Delivery to **GRANT CONDITIONAL OUTLINE PERMISSION** subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the total proceeds of the land sale being split in equal measure between Hexham Golf Club and the Tynedale Athletic Association and to secure affordable housing provision and open space within the site and subject to referral to the National Planning Casework Unit as a departure from Green Belt policy.

**77. 15/02968/FUL**

**Planning permission is sought for the construction of 38 residential units including 2, 3 and 4 bed dwelling houses, 2 bedroom bungalows and 2 bedroom apartments on the site of the former Venture Workshops on Plessey Road in Blyth.  
Blyth Valley Venture Workshops , Plessey Road, Blyth, Northumberland NE24 4BN**

The Chair advised that the local Ward Member, Councillor Campbell had raised concerns regarding the application. Councillor Douglas informed Members that Councillor Campbell had requested in November that a site visit be undertaken in respect of this application and had been advised to attend the Committee to make this request in person. Unfortunately Councillor Campbell had failed to follow the protocol to register to speak and therefore on her behalf he proposed that a site visit be undertaken. This was seconded by Councillor Dickinson.

The Committee was reminded that site visits could only be taken where there was justification on planning grounds. Councillor Campbell stated that whilst local residents were not objecting to the development itself, they had raised issues regarding parking at a school in close proximity to the application site especially during peak drop off/pick up times. She questioned the possibility of the road being widened and highlighted that part of the road used at these times was owned by the Golf Club and access could be denied at any time.

The Chair advised that the application would be presented and questions asked of Officers prior to any consideration of a site visit being undertaken.

The report was introduced by the Senior Planning Officer with the aid of a power point presentation. Updates were provided as follows:-

- Typographical error on condition 21 which should refer to condition 20 within the condition and not condition 21.
- Section 4 and paragraph 7.43 of the report indicated that an update would be provided to members on the subject of food risk and drainage. The Lead local Flood Authority had now advised officers that they now had an acceptable agreement for this and had recommended 3 conditions to control maintenance and implementation, finished floor levels and flood resilience measures

Mrs A Wilkinson addressed the Committee in objection to the application and her speech included the following:-

- She questioned whether there was sufficient car parking for the development, highlighting the problems at school drop off/pick up times and when events were being held at the nearby playing fields.
- She stated that the three-storey houses were close to the school site, located on a corner where issues with traffic already existed.
- The three-storey houses would also provide evening shadow on existing properties on Delaval Gardens.
- She asked that if permission was granted conditions would control the hours of working on site and timing of delivery vehicles to avoid congestion.

Mr D Bowman addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- The application was for a quality low cost sustainable housing scheme for young people, families and the elderly.

- Highways issues had been raised during consultations in connection with school drop off/pick up times and the applicant has worked to address these concerns with the site access provided at the further point from the school site. Properties on the western boundary of the site had been rotated to ensure that all car parking was to the rear of the properties and no driveways were provided on three of the four boundaries.
- A footway had been introduced to the western boundary and a lay-by for five cars provided. A suggestion had been put forward for a one-way system, but this had been deemed as not appropriate.
- The development was on an existing brownfield site and would bring benefits to local shops.

## **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

At 5.00 pm it was **RESOLVED** that in accordance with the Council's constitution, standing orders be suspended and the meeting continue over the three hour limit.

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

- A viability appraisal had been undertaken in respect of the provision of affordable housing. There was a low profit margin due to the type of properties to be provided and low value of site and therefore it was not viable for affordable housing to be provided. The viability appraisal had been scrutinised by the Council's Estates Officer who had made the decision that the scheme would not be viable.
- Highways had considered the implications of the development in depth. It was confirmed that the access to the site would be from Plessey Road and there would be no other access. A footway would provide a pedestrian link to the school. There was an improvement required at the corner of Beatrice Avenue and the introduction of a TRO could be considered, however a decision on whether there was a need or just a desire, bearing in mind there was no conflict in traffic from the site, would have to be taken.
- The Highways Officer confirmed that with the proposed improvement at the Corner of Beatrice Avenue there would be sufficient space for two vehicles to pass, however it was possible further widening could be undertaken.

A short discussion took place regarding problems associated at schools at pick up/drop off times. The Service Manager – Development and Delivery advised that a condition could be provided to modify the scheme at relevant pinch points and therefore a site visit would be unnecessary.

A vote was taken in respect of the proposal to hold at site visit and was recorded as FOR: 7; AGAINST : 5.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** in order to allow a site visit to be undertaken.

## **78. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Chairman advised that due to the withdrawal of a public speaker the order of the agenda would be changed to allow application 15/03374/OUT to be considered before 15/03266/FUL.

Councillor Dodd left the meeting at this point.

**79. 15/03374/OUT**

**Outline application for erection of approximately 33no. residential units (including affordable homes)  
Land West Of Whitegates, Whitegates, Longhorsley, Northumberland**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report to the Committee with the aid of a power point presentation and advised that the Flood Authority had withdrawn their objection to the application subject to conditions being attached to any permission granted.

Ms D Primrose addressed the Committee in objection to the application on behalf of residents in the Village and included the following points in her speech:-

- The strength of feeling in the village against this application was high with 88 objections, no support and a 7 page petition.
- 94 Houses had been approved for development within the Village in recent months despite the local school being full and pupils having to attend Lancaster Park School.
- The proposed development was harmful to the Green Belt, outside the Village settlement limits and contrary to the emerging Core Strategy.
- No special circumstances had been demonstrated for development within the Green Belt.
- Existing residents of Whitegate experience flooding already during heavy rain with Paxton Burn recently flooding onto the roads.
- The existing Right of Way on the site, which was not shown on the application, was a well-used route by residents.
- The proposed development was inappropriate, not justified and contrary to the NPPF and the recommendation for refusal should be agreed.

Councillor Sanderson addressed the Committee as the local Ward Member. His comments included the following:-

- He asked that the Committee accept the Officer's recommendation for refusal.
- The application had come as a huge shock to residents of the Village following recent approvals for nearly 100 houses when it was not known how these new residents would merge into the village and be accommodated.
- The application had been handled sensibly and very carefully with the end result of a recommendation for refusal for a set of reasoned arguments for refusal.
- He thanked residents for their views and hard work and thanked the case officer, who had been very helpful throughout the process.

Mr D Pollard, the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- He appreciated the concerns regarding development in the area, as the Company was Morpeth based with local investment.
- The long term plan to build high quality homes and this had been the position at a pre application site visit in April 2015. Two other applications were being considered for development in Longhorsley at that time and a response was not provided until after those applications had been agreed. Since that time the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted and did not impact on this application.
- The applicant had been confident of an approval in the early stages and was still receiving information based on the fact that the Core Strategy had not been adopted.
- The site would be an asset to the Village and if this had been considered prior to the other two schemes being agreed this would have been approved.

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

- In April the emerging Core Strategy was not at the current stage and Green Belt was ambiguous at that time regarding the other sites, which was not the case in relation to this application given that the Core Strategy Pre Submission Draft sets out in detail the proposed Green Belt boundaries and the proposed inset boundary for Longhorsley. The application site lies outside of the proposed inset boundary for the settlement and therefore falls to be considered against Green Belt policy.
- Overdevelopment could not be used as an additional reason for refusal as it would be difficult to demonstrate that the Village could not cope with the proposed number of dwellings, however there was no demonstration of very special circumstances for development within the Green Belt.

Councillor Watkin proposed acceptance of the recommendation to refuse the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Dickinson.

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

Councillor Horncastle left the meeting at this point.

**80. 15/03266/FUL**

**Proposed demolition of the existing adult day care centre (Class D1) and erection of a Lidl foodstore (Class A1) with associated works Northumberland County Council, Bedlington Day Centre, Bedlington, Northumberland, NE22 5UQ**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a power point presentation. He advised that Highways Officers were continuing to review additional information that had been submitted by the applicant, and final comments are still awaited at this stage.

Councillor Watkin proposed acceptance of the recommendation as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Graham.

**RESOLVED** that authority be given to the Senior Manager – Development and Delivery to **GRANT CONDITIONAL PERMISSION** to the satisfactory resolution of all outstanding highways matters and any additional conditions and informatives that may be required.

**81. 15/03425/FUL**

**Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing Beresford Lodge building and the creation of a new 39 bed building and 12no. supportive housing units adjacent Beresford Lodge, Beresford Road, Seaton Sluice**

The report requested that a site visit be undertaken to allow Members of the Committee to familiarise themselves with the site and its surroundings prior to their formal consideration of the application

Councillor Watkin proposed acceptance which was seconded by Councillor Tebbutt.

**RESOLVED** that authorisation be given for a site visit to be undertaken.

**82. 15/00381/OUTES**

**Outline planning application for up to 237 dwellings with associated open space and landscaping, with all matters reserved except for access. Access to be taken from Cow Lane, Corbridge  
Land west of Milkwell Lane, Milkwell Lane, Corbridge**

The report requested that a site visit be undertaken to allow Members of the Committee to familiarise themselves with the site and its surroundings prior to their formal consideration of the application

Councillor Watkin proposed acceptance which was seconded by Councillor Tebbutt.

**RESOLVED** that authorisation be given for a site visit to be undertaken.

**83. URGENT BUSINESS**

It was agreed that the site visit in relation to application **15/02968/FUL** would be held on the afternoon of Monday 18 January 2016.

The Chair advised that a provisional date for a public meeting in connection with the Highthorn application had been suggested as 6pm on Thursday 25 February 2016.

**CHAIR**

**DATE**