

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 Tuesday, 9 October 2018 at 5.00 p.m.

PRESENT

Councillor G Stewart
(Chair, in the Chair)

MEMBERS

T Cessford
A Dale
R Gibson
I Hutchinson
D Kennedy

N Oliver
K Quinn
J Riddle
A Sharp
KG Stow

OFFICERS

K Blyth
G Horsman
N Masson
M Payne
E Sinnamon
N Turnbull

Principal Planning Officer
Senior Planning Officer
Principal Lawyer
Consultant Engineer
Interim Head of Planning Services
Democratic Services Officer

ALSO PRESENT

9 members of the public
1 member of the press

70. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Homer and Horncastle.

71. MINUTES

In answer to a question, the Chair confirmed that the Leader of the Council had written on behalf of the Tynedale Local Area Council, in relation to Highways England proposals for the A69.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of Tynedale Local Area Council, held on 11 September 2018, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

Ch.'s Initials.....

72. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Gibson declared an interest in planning application 17/01931/FUL as he was the local Councillor and would be speaking on behalf of residents when the item was considered and therefore would not participate in that item.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

73. 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.

74. 17/01931/FUL

Erection of 15 dwellings with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure Land North East Of New Houses, Chollerford, Northumberland

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

- The application has been transferred into the name of Julie Guest approximately one week ago at the request of the former applicant.
- A minor correction be made to refusal reason 3 to add the word 'site' after the word 'application' in the first line.

Councillor Rupert Gibson addressed the Committee speaking as the local Member for the area. His comments included the following:

- This scheme was at odds with paragraph 6.3 of the new local plan Core Strategy consultation document that referred to ensuring that new homes were developed in the right places, at the right times and of the right scale and type for the right occupants.
- 64 houses had been built, or were in the process of being built, which represented an expansion of 30% of the 200 houses that the village previously consisted of.
- The site was outside the village envelope and would open up the possibility of building on ground to the north, east and west, which would swamp Humshaugh village.
- The area was popular with tourists using the Roman Wall walk route and Chollerford Bridge was used by cars and walkers in the area. The

paddock was in sight when leaving the bridge to go north and the proposal would have a negative impact on the bridge's setting and viewpoint.

- The George Hotel and Chollerford Bridge were listed buildings in close proximity to the site and the proposed development would have a negative impact as there would be an urban landscape, when viewed from across the river.
- It was unusual for an application to receive 108 objections in Humshaugh. More residents had objected about this proposal than any other in the 18 months he had been involved in planning committees.
- Councillors were requested to agree the recommendation for refusal on the 3 grounds identified.

Councillor Dick Moules, addressed the Committee on behalf of Humshaugh Parish Council, which objected to the application. He made the following comments:-

- Humshaugh was a special village as a result of the hard work and vision of its residents.
- More than 40 residents had volunteered to run the village shop when it had been threatened with closure. They had also run the Crown Inn for 6 months until a buyer could be found when Punch Taverns had pulled out.
- They had done this to ensure that their village was sustainable with a school, playing fields, affordable housing, village hall, church, doctors surgery, pub and shop all dependant on each other. If they had lost the shop the affordable housing may not have been built. Without the affordable housing there would be fewer young families and the school could close.
- The parish council had not objected to any of the 64 homes built or under construction in the last 3 years as they recognised the need to grow and change, but 30% in 3 years was enough. They had done their fair share to meet the needs of housing in Northumberland. They needed time to assimilate the new residents into the village and for them to become active members of the community.
- There was a real risk that any further development would damage the delicate balance of the village.
- Tourism was important to the village, the Crown, The George and the bed and breakfast premises depended on it.

Joe Ridgeon, agent, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, and made the following comments:-

- They had been working positively with the Council since the application had been submitted in May 2017 and were disappointed that it had been recommended for refusal.
- The Government's aim was for 300,000 homes to be built per year and the Council should therefore be supporting housing proposals in rural areas. New homes would help support local services.

- The site was a logical infill gap between Hadrian Court and existing houses to the west and therefore accorded with the Local Plan and saved policies GD2 and H1.
- The Council's approach to the 5 year housing supply was incorrect as discovered during the New Hartley appeal and a more recent appeal decision in Durham. The Northumberland argument did not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework. A decision dated September 2018 confirmed that if a housing supply had not been established in a recently adopted plan or subsequent annual position statement, the Council's supply could not be considered to have been demonstrated in the terms of paragraph 74 of the Framework. This meant that the tilted balance did apply, contrary to paragraph 7.2 and that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.
- The impact of 15 dwellings was likely to be limited and confined to a very small area.
- The National Park and Historic England had no objection. The Conservation Officer considered that there would be less than substantial harm and only from one viewpoint from the southern end of the valley.
- The less than substantial harm could be fully mitigated by the landscaping strategy proposed. Once trees and hedges were established the initial impact would change to beneficial effects.
- A road safety audit assessed the access as safe.
- The concerns of the Highways Officers in relation to plots 1-4 could be addressed via conditions or prior to approval if delegated authority was given to officers to agree the final detail.
- Benefits of the scheme included:
 - 15 high quality stone built new homes, including bungalows and 3 affordable homes for local people.
 - Highway improvements to the adjacent roundabout including crossing points.
 - Improved drainage and flood risk management.
 - Ecological improvements.
- Approval of edge of settlement locations would take pressure of the need to build on Green Belt land.
- In conclusion, the provision of family housing in a sustainable location had significant benefits which should be supported. There would be no urbanising effect once the landscaping mitigation was established.
- The planning balance had been inappropriately applied and case law with within the county and neighbouring authorities should not be ignored. Members were requested to approve the application.

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

- 108 objections had been received in total over 3 neighbour notification exercises and it was therefore likely some residents would have responded more than once.

- The purpose of a buffer zone was to protect the setting of heritage assets. It was confirmed that Heritage England, the responsible body for Hadrian's Wall had not objected as they did not believe the proposal would impact directly on archeological remains on the site. The proposal had been assessed against criteria in Tynedale District Local Plan Policy NE17.
- The development was considered to encroach into the open countryside as it would introduce a significant amount of built development to the west of B6320 and would give rise to a significantly harmful urbanising effect. The starting point of assessment was local plan policies which were checked against the National Planning Policy Framework. It was confirmed that the policies were aligned on this point.
- All planning applications were assessed on their own merits although a view was taken on adjacent sites.
- Paragraphs 7.19 to 7.21 of the officer report set out the Council's position with regard to housing land supply. Whilst the consultation exercise on the draft plan was mid process, an interim position had been approved in November 2017 to ensure that housing land supply was up to date. It was under regular review and it was anticipated that another update would be prepared in the near future.
- The aerial view displayed as part of the presentation did not include recent development.
- Clarification was provided regarding the timeline of the application. The initial outline application for 36 dwellings near to The George Hotel, Chollerford Bridge and within a World Heritage Site buffer zone had not been considered acceptable and therefore the Council had served notice that it was not willing to consider an outline application for the site. The applicant had agreed to amend their proposals which had resulted in the application under consideration which had been received at the end of 2017. After several months of extensive discussions and consideration of detailed reports with internal and external consultees, the application had been ready to be considered at committee in June / July 2018. At the request of the former applicant, the application had been submitted to the Local Area Council in October 2018.
- The Council was of the view that there was in excess of a 12 year housing land supply and therefore the Government's expectations had been exceeded.

Councillor Hutchinson moved acceptance of the recommendation for refusal which was seconded by Councillor Stow and unanimously agreed.

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

75. 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.

76. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 13 November 2018 at Hexham House, Gilesgate, Hexham at 4.00 p.m.

CHAIR _____

DATE _____