

**NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TYNEDALE LOCAL AREA COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the **Tynedale Local Area Council** held at Hexham House, Gilesgate, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 3NH on Wednesday, 26 September 2018 at 3.00 p.m.

**PRESENT**

Councillor G Stewart  
(Chair, in the Chair)

**MEMBERS**

T Cessford	N Oliver (nos 62-69)
R Gibson	K Quinn
C Homer	J Riddle (nos 62-69)
CW Horncastle	A Sharp
I Hutchinson	KG Stow
D Kennedy (nos 62-69)	

**OFFICERS**

N Armstrong	Senior Planning Officer
K Blyth	Principal Planning Officer
F Churchill	Interim Director of Planning Services
J Hitching	Senior Sustainable Drainage Officer
N Masson	Principal Lawyer
M Patrick	Principal Highways Development Management Officer
D Puttick	Senior Planning Officer
E Sinnamon	Interim Head of Planning Services
N Turnbull	Democratic Services Officer

**ALSO PRESENT**

15 members of the public  
1 member of the press

**58. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dale.

## 59. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Homer declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application 18/02176/FUL and would leave the meeting during consideration of that item as she had funded the back stop nets out of her Members' Local Improvement Scheme allowance.

Councillor Kennedy declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in planning application 18/02176/FUL as his son attended the school and his wife was a school governor.

***Councillor Stewart vacated the Chair, for Councillor Gibson, Vice-Chair Planning, to chair the development control section of the agenda.***

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

### 60. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The report explained how the Local Area Council was asked to decide the planning applications on the agenda using the powers delegated to it, and included details of the public speaking arrangements. (Report attached to the minutes as Appendix A.)

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

### 61. 17/04661/FUL

**Proposed development for eight dwellings, including access, landscaping and parking  
Land South Of Red Lion House, Corbridge Road, Hexham, NE46 1UL.**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. He provided the following update:

- Comments had now been received from the Council's Public Protection Team, Ecologists and Highways Officers, who raised no objections subject to:
  - Further conditions relating to the protection of the private water supply during construction
  - A construction method statement
  - Completion of highways works before occupation of any dwellings
  - Full details of surface water drainage to prevent run-off onto the highway
  - Details of refuse storage and
  - Appropriate ecological mitigation and compensation.
  - Additional informatives had also been recommended by consultees.

A copy of the additional conditions was circulated to Members of the Committee at the meeting. It was proposed that the recommendation be amended to read: 'Minded to approve subject to conditions as set out in the Committee Report and additional conditions received from consultees, and subject to resolution of outstanding issues with the LLFA, and subject to any new conditions being approved by Committee.'

In answer to a query as to whether it would be better for consideration of the application be deferred, the Interim Director of Planning confirmed that it was intended that the application would be brought back to committee in order that any additional conditions be considered by Members.

The Principal Lawyer provided clarification about the procedure and confirmed that planning permission would not be issued until the application was reconsidered at a future meeting if this was necessary due to new conditions being required. It was noted that other applications had been considered with a 'minded to approve' recommendation.

Councillor Homer, the local Member, was concerned that the application was to be considered without all of the information and proposed that the matter be deferred. This was seconded by Councillor Stewart.

Further clarification was provided on the motion to defer consideration of the application until all of the information and conditions could be considered by councillors. Officers had recommended that the application be considered with a 'minded to approve' decision.

The Interim Director of Planning commented that the LLFA consultee response could result in the addition of further conditions and was deemed to be good practice.

The Democratic Services Officer and Senior Planning Officer conferred and confirmed that the matter would not be resolved prior to the issue of the agenda for the next meeting, as the paperwork would be issued in the next few days.

A vote on deferral was taken as follows: **FOR: 4; AGAINST: 5**, with the motion failing.

The Senior Planning Officer completed his presentation.

Nicola Allen explained her background as a Chartered Town Planner and a Solicitor and spoke on behalf of objectors. She made the following observations:-

- More than sufficient time had passed for information to be submitted to the Council. She was of the opinion that there was insufficient information for a decision to be made and could lead to an appeal to the Planning Inspector or judicial review.

- The site was in close proximity and would be harmful to the grade 2 listed coaching inn.
- The SHLAA identified the site for up to 6 average size units. The proposal was for 8 large houses which totalled 13,000 m<sup>2</sup>, with 30 bedrooms and 25 bathrooms.
- The urban design was not right for the site.
- Parkwell demonstrated the harm of design if it not related to its context.
- The new access would destroy the setting of the coaching inn with the highway. The entrance would also have a huge impact on Red Lion Cottage as vehicles would only be a few metres from the kitchen and living room.
- There would be a significant number of vehicle movements per day for 8 large family homes when compared with the traffic for 3 modest houses the planning inspector had previously said would have been acceptable.
- There was uncertainty regarding the arrangements for sewage and surface water which was a concern given that the site and adjacent houses had flooded twice in the previous 10 years.
- Information regarding bin storage and arrangements for refuse wagons were unknown, particularly given the access road would not be adopted.
- They had not seen the additional conditions and suggested that it would be preferable for the application to be deferred and considered properly. The site, at the entrance of Hexham, merited a scheme to be proud of.

Bart Milburn, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, and made the following comments:-

- Delegated authority could be given to the Director in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee.
- Officers had recommended that the scheme be supported.
- The housing density for the site was very low with only 8 units proposed.
- The site was located in the centre of Hexham and therefore there would not be the level of vehicle movements speculated. Provision had also been made regarding an extension of the footpath.
- They had seen and had agreed with the additional conditions proposed. Information had been supplied to the LLFA, the only outstanding response, and were confident that the issue would also be resolved.
- The applicant was a local developer who wanted to build a bespoke family development to be proud of.
- The Conservation Officer had accepted the scheme as there would be no impact on the adjacent listed building.
- The Council's Public Protection Team, Ecologists and Highways Officers did not object to the application.
- Members should not be concerned about the comments regarding judicial review which was scaremongering.

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

- The public footpath would be upgraded to the east and west of the site.

- Condition 11 related to landscaping and replacement of plants for a period up to 5 years from the completion of the development as part of ecological mitigation and conservation. Land adjacent to the highway would be maintained by the Council.
- There would be sufficient space for 2 vehicles to pass on the private road. However, there was insufficient land either side of the carriageway for the road to be adopted and would therefore remain private.
- Condition 15 required that a refuse storage strategy be submitted and approved in writing before the development was brought into use. The latter was standard wording. A turning head was provided within the site so refuse vehicles would be able to enter and turn. There was space for the storage of bins, the detail of which needed to be confirmed.
- An assessment was being undertaken on the information provided regarding diversion of a watercourse at the rear of the properties into a new channel and culvert which would run under the layby and along the southern boundary of the site. This included detailed calculations to ensure that the provision and size of pipes was adequate for the site. The Senior Sustainable Drainage Officer was confident that the matter could be resolved, but it was imperative that this information was received and assessed before further comments could be made.
- The garage from plot 1 had been removed to ensure that the bore hole was not developed over.
- Provision had been made for connectivity to the town via a bus stop to the east of the site.
- The carriage way was 4.5 metres wide which was sufficient for 2 vehicles to pass including access by emergency vehicles.
- Paragraphs 7.28 - 7.30 set out the response of the Conservation team who thought it well designed and of high quality and would not be harmful to the setting of the listed building.

Councillor Hutchinson moved acceptance of the revised recommendation 'Minded to approve subject to conditions as set out in the Committee Report and additional conditions received from consultees, and subject to resolution of outstanding issues with the LLFA, and subject to any new conditions being approved by Committee.' This was seconded by Councillor Horncastle.

The time taken to reach this stage and the impact that this had on all parties was acknowledged. Members would have preferred to have considered the application with all of the relevant information, including a response and conditions by the LLFA.

They were given assurances by the Interim Director of Planning and the Principal Lawyer that outstanding matters would not be dealt with under delegated authority as the recommendation specified that any new conditions would need to be approved by the committee.

The revised recommendation was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee be **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application subject to conditions as set out in the Committee Report and additional conditions received from consultees, and subject to resolution of outstanding issues with the LLFA, and subject to any new conditions being approved by Committee.

**62. 17/03167/FUL**

**Demolition of existing former piggeries, stores, saw mill and joiner's shop. Erection of a single storey dwelling including basement. New timber garage and log store. Retain existing access Wright House, Howden Dene, Newcastle Road, Corbridge, Northumberland**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

Mr Wright, the applicant, addressed the committee in support of the application and made the following comments:

- They had been working with the planning department on the plans for 'The Living Wall' for quite some time. They had prepared revised applications and additional documentation, when requested.
- The matter was subjective.
- They agreed with planning law that the green belt should be protected from encroachment, urban sprawl and detriment to openness. However, there were some relaxations.
- 37 neighbours had not objected. The Village Trust had generally agreed with the proposals with no negative comments. The Parish Council had also not objected.
- They had been directed to withdraw by the planning department and submit a Paragraph 55 application as it was deemed the location within open countryside.
- Paragraph 7.7 of the officer's report stated that the proposal would not result in a dwelling being 'isolated' and the site being 'well related' to other development.
- There were references within the officer report to the innovative and unique nature of the design which had merit as a stand alone proposal that responded to its location and setting.
- Officers did not dispute the findings of the Design Review Panel which stated that the site would be better with a house on it. The panel removed the element of subjectivity and based the merits against a set of objectives, good design and sustainability.
- Officers were concerned about the harm to the openness and the permanence of the green belt.
- The design was based on the footprint of the existing buildings, wall, concrete aprons which existed historically on maps and were clearly visible on the ground that gave the proposal uniqueness and strength.

- Only one word would have needed to be added to the report and all the points raised by officers would have held true, ie 'in the opinion of officers this proposal would 'not' cause harm to the openness of the green belt.
- They were fully supportive of the requirements for the protection of the green belt. The development lay within the village boundary which was surrounded by walls and trees and was connected to the village and 37 neighbours via footpaths, bus routes, postal services etc.
- They questioned how the proposal could be responsible for harm as:
  - The land was derelict with walls and aprons from previous use which had no wildlife value.
  - The development would include wildflower meadows, working garden and managed woodland.
  - Officers acknowledged that it did not lie in open countryside and it was not isolated.
  - It was sustainable in nature and design.
  - Drainage and water were present on site.
  - It would not result in urban sprawl.
  - It was contained and mostly hidden behind walls.

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

- It was acknowledged that the site was not an open field; it was surrounded by walls and mature planting and views of the proposed development would be more limited.
- New buildings were regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it complied with one of the exceptions.
- The land was considered to be greenfield and not previously developed land given its former use and current condition and did not meet the exceptions within paragraph 145 of the NPPF.
- A comparison had not been undertaken of the previous buildings with the footprint of the proposed building although the boundary wall was to be utilised. The test within the NPPF considered the impact on openness and the extent of harm. Whilst the harm was more limited on this site than perhaps elsewhere, it was still considered that it would cause harm through a reduction in openness of the Green Belt.
- Reference was made to the statement of very special circumstances submitted by the applicant.

Councillor Oliver proposed that the application be approved due to the exceptionally high quality of the design which amounted to very special circumstances, there would be a limited impact on the openness of the countryside as it could not be seen from the road or other houses and it would not be an isolated building. This was seconded by Councillor Hutchinson.

Following clarification from the Principal Lawyer, Councillors Oliver and Hutchinson agreed to amend the proposal that they be minded to approve the application, subject to the inclusion and approval of conditions which would be considered by committee.

A vote was taken as follows:- **FOR: 3; AGAINST: 8**, with the motion failing.

Councillor Stewart proposed the officer's recommendation for refusal due to the location of the site within the Green Belt, which was seconded by Councillor Quinn.

A vote was taken as follows:-: **FOR: 9; AGAINST: 1; ABSTENTIONS: 2**.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** consent for the aforementioned reasons.

**63. 17/04501/OUT**

**Outline planning permission for construction of eight residential dwellings with associated parking, landscaping and open space (All matters reserved except access and layout) (amended description) Land South Of Ashlea, Melkridge, Northumberland**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. He provided the following update:

- Further comments had been received from Northumbrian Water highlighting the route of a public sewer running north to south through the site. They raised no objection to the application and the comments had been provided as an informative.
- An amended layout plan which sought to re-position the dwelling on Plot B1 to accommodate the sewer had subsequently been submitted by the applicant's agent. This had resulted in a minor change to the scheme.

Helen Marks, agent for the applicant, addressed the committee speaking in support of the application and raised the following key points:-

- The field had been purchased by the applicant's mother 20 years ago and permission had been secured to build the adjoining property; the remainder of the site had previously been used for grazing horses. It had always been the intention to obtain permission for housing on the rest of the site.
- The agent had attended a Parish Council meeting to present draft proposals, and revisions had been made to the scheme following this.
- Revisions had also been made to the scheme since its submission in November 2017 and further revisions had been made earlier in the week to address comments by Northumbrian Water. Officers and consultees were now happy with the scheme as submitted in outline.
- Melkridge was recognised by the Council as a sustainable settlement given the approval of 6 units at land south of East Melkridge Farm in June 2016 on the basis that it would support services in Haltwhistle and Bardon Mill.



- Development of the site was supported by Policy H15 of the Local Plan, and more generally by the National Planning Policy Framework, given its location and ability to support nearby services.
- A Partial SHMA Update had been prepared by the Council in 2018 as part of the evidence base to the emerging local plan which continued to identify the site within the West Delivery Area. An imbalance was identified between 1-2 bed bungalow requirement and the current stock profile. It was reinforced by the 2016 Housing Need Assessment for Hexham and position in the Tynedale Core Strategy in 2007, which identified the need for new housing to sustain communities and the wider rural area.
- The site was currently identified as 'suitable' in the current SHLAA of June 2018.

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

- The application and layout as set out was to be determined and consideration could not be given to future development on the remainder of the site.
- The sewer had been plotted by Northumbrian Water following a recent survey.
- It was proposed that the hedge be removed and a footpath installed in order to prevent occupants from exiting their properties straight on to the carriageway. The footpath would not extend beyond the site so the 'pinch point' near the west access would not be made any narrower.
- Whilst the site was situated on a slope, Northumbria Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority had not objected to the application and were satisfied with the proposed drainage strategy and conditions proposed for surface water within conditions 14 to 17.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Horncastle and unanimously agreed.

The application was welcomed as it would provide more bungalows suitable for the elderly and currently in short supply.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** permission for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report and subject to an amendment to condition 2 to update the list of approved plans following the amended site layout.

*The meeting adjourned for approximately 10 minutes at 4.50 pm and re-commenced at 5.00 pm.*

#### **64. 18/02065/FUL**

**Loft conversion to provide new staff room, combining 4no. existing rooms to provide 2no. enlarged classrooms and new external stair (As amended 30/07/2018)  
Prudhoe West First School, West Road, Prudhoe, NE42 6HR**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Stow and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED** that that the application be **GRANTED** consent for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

**65. 18/02175/FUL**

**The conversion of four existing car parking bays into four electric vehicle parking bays to include two new charging units, two new signs and one new feeder pillar. Bays to be painted green with logos and rubber bump stop  
Wentworth Leisure Centre, Alemouth Road, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 3PD**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

Councillor Homer proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Stow and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED** that that the application be **GRANTED** consent for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

**66. 18/02176/FUL**

**Placement of new back stop nets to line of existing fence on boundary of football pitch  
Hexham Priory School, Corbridge Road, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 1UY**

*(5.10 pm Councillor Homer having disclosed a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting whilst the application was considered).*

Councillor Kennedy disclosed a personal and non-prejudicial interest as his son attended the school and his wife was a school governor.

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

Councillor Oliver proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Quinn and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED** that that the application be **GRANTED** consent for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

*(5.15 pm Councillor Homer returned to the meeting.)*

**67. 18/02941/CCD**

**Proposal for the construction of a single storey detached log cabin to be used as an outdoor classroom**

**St Josephs RC Middle School, Highford Lane, Hexham, Northumberland NE46 2DD**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.

Councillor Kennedy proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Horncastle and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED** that that the application be **GRANTED** consent for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

**68. PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE**

A report was received which provided an update on the progress of planning appeals received. (A copy of the report is enclosed with the minutes as Appendix B).

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**69. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting would be held on 9 October 2018 at Hexham House, Gilesgate, Hexham at 4.00 p.m.

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

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