

Wall Speech

I am disappointed to have to speak on the matter of this site again. The village is clearly against this application, and of course this application is tagged on the back of others. There seems to be a war of attrition going on here.

So, my colleagues, you firstly have to decide if this is a proper site, and if the drawings provided are a proper base to decide the application. I mention this as there are no written measurements on the site plan anywhere. There is no doubt that it is a tight site, and I want to know how wide the drive is going to be, how much gap there is between the western boundary, and the western elevation, taking into account the proposed hedge, and fence curve. And I would like to know how wide the so-called amenity area is in front of the houses.

On the elevation drawings, it seems to be a game of smoke and mirrors. The paragraph 2.4 in my view just cannot be correct. Where is the dimension from the Damp proof course to the ridge? I have a good idea that if this building is to be let in, it could be over a meter in places. That would put the amenity areas on

quite a slope to make them possibly unusable. What also has to be taken into account, is that if there is no fixed level height on site it would be very difficult for the enforcement department to prove the levels are wrong.

Does Wall deserve a type of house that has nothing remotely similar to it in the village? It is in the conservation area, and I can only say they will look totally featureless. No external features, and the overall impression of perhaps an original piggery. Is a stone outer leaf really enough?

Are the chimneys going to be plastic?

My personal view is that this application will have a significant detrimental affect to the village, and the neighbours, all because it is such a small and awkward site.

The next question is, was the planning appeal inspector, Chris Baxter wrong in his reasons for turning the previous application down? This is a very similar project, with the ridge possibly being only .500m lower

and the inclusion of the word “holiday”. His conclusion is “having considered all matters raised in support of the appeal proposal, I conclude that the considerable harm I have found and the conflict with the development plan would not be outweighed by other material considerations”

Northumberland is becoming a holiday destination. There are a lot of holiday cottages, and building conversions, which afford superior comfort on the whole, with tremendous outlooks and a natural enjoyment of space. This project is very much the opposite. Sited next to a main road. Squashed in. And effectively three caravans end to end. This project is not in keeping with what Northumberland is trying to project as a spacious county with wonderful vista's etc.

I will sum up by saying if you have a mind to refuse this application, that would be good, but if not, would you consider deferring the decision, so all the measurements and heights can be checked. I think we need to know if what is proposed is possible.