

# Public Document Pack

## NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

### TYNEDALE LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a virtual meeting of the **Tynedale Local Area Council** held on Tuesday, 9 February 2021 at 2.00 pm.

#### PRESENT

T Cessford (Chair)  
in the Chair)

#### MEMBERS

C Homer  
A Dale  
JI Hutchinson  
N Oliver  
J Riddle  
G Stewart

R Gibson  
C Horncastle  
D Kennedy  
K Quinn  
A Sharp  
K Stow

#### OFFICERS

K Blyth	Planning Area Manager - Development Management
M Francis	Senior Planning Officer
P Jones	Service Director - Local Services
N Masson	Legal Services Manager (Deputy Monitoring Officer)
C Mead	Highways Development Manager
R Murfin	Director of Planning
M Patrick	Principal Highways Development Management Officer
D Rumney	Principal Programme Officer (Highways Maintenance)
N Snowdon	Principal Programme Officer (Highways Improvement)
N Turnbull	Democratic Services Officer

#### 184      **PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED AT A VIRTUAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chair advised members of the procedure which would be followed at the virtual meeting and of the changes to the public speaking protocol.

#### 185      **LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN PROGRAMME 2021-22 AND HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE INVESTMENT IN U AND C ROADS AND FOOTWAYS PROGRAMME 2021-22**

Ch.'s Initials.....

The Local Area Council received a report which set out the draft Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme for 2021-22 and the draft Highway Maintenance Investment in U and C Roads and Footways programme for 2021-22 for consideration and comment prior to final approval of the programme. (A copy of the report is enclosed with the minutes as Appendix A).

The Service Director – Local Services explained that the programme had been devised following discussions with Town and Parish Councils along with Local Ward Members, to tackle issues of local concern. Confirmation of the settlement from Department for Transport funding was awaited; but a programme totalling over £19 million had been assumed, based on the allocation received the previous year and additional unallocated funds received for highways maintenance. £5 million had also been allocated as part of a three-year investment to improve U and C roads and footway maintenance from the Medium Term Financial Plan. The funding was divided across four key areas: Walking and Cycling; Safety Works; Road Maintenance Improvement Schemes and Bridges, Structures and Landslips.

The following information was provided in response to questions from Members:

- Discussions were in progress with the Planning Department regarding Section 278 agreement regarding the new development on Corbridge Road, Hexham.
- An update would be obtained regarding the status of plans to introduce 20 mph around the middle school and high school in Hexham.
- £80,000 was included within the maintenance programme to make improvements on roads leading to the new high school which were deteriorating with use by HGV construction vehicles.

Members made the following comments:

- Work on a feasibility study for a cycle route between Corbridge and Hexham and Haydon Bridge and Hexham, be progressed, prior to works commencing for sand and gravel extraction at the Anick Grange site.
- Funding allocated for Park Lane, Prudhoe be utilised where work was required more urgently.
- There was a lack of understanding by members of the public regarding delivery of projects on the LTP Programme.
- Ditching and drainage work continued to be of high importance to prevent flooding and further deterioration of the road network.
- Appreciation for progress of schemes that had been delivered.
- Replacement signage would be required at West Woodburn.

Updates on schemes would be obtained for Councillors Cessford, Gibson, Oliver, Sharp and Stewart, as requested.

The Chair and members expressed their gratitude to officers involved in the preparation and delivery of the LTP programme.

**RESOLVED** that:

- a) The report be received and noted.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- b) Members' comments be considered in the finalisation of both the LTP Programme for 2021-22 and the Highway Maintenance Investment in U and C Roads and Footways Programme for 2021-22.

186 **DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The committee was requested 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.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

187 **20/01708/FUL**

**Construction of 17 dwellings at a mix of 3 three bed properties, Ten 4 bed properties and 4 three bed affordable homes  
Land North and East of Ashlynd House, Church Lane, Wark,  
Northumberland**

There were no questions arising from the site visit videos which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. She advised that Wark Parish Council had written a letter of support which had been received after the report had been published and circulated to members the previous day.

At 14.47 the meeting was halted for a few minutes during the officer's presentation to resolve technical difficulties with the YouTube broadcast.

A statement in objection to the application from Mr Keep was read out by K Blyth, DM Area Team Manager (West), and would be attached to the signed minutes and uploaded to the Council's website.

A statement made by Councillor Gibson is attached to the signed minutes and uploaded to the Council's website.

A statement in support of the application from the agent Mr Milburn was read out by K Blyth, DM Area Team Manager (West), and would be attached to the signed minutes and uploaded to the Council's website.

The Director of Planning drew Member's attention to the following points for consideration:

- The existing now out of date plan did not allow schemes in the open countryside but did not set out a settlement boundary.
- A decision from the Planning Inspectorate regarding the soundness of the Northumberland Local Plan which was expected imminently. It did set a settlement boundary and Wark was identified as a service village and a

Ch.'s Initials.....

focus for future growth.

- The site had not been included within the settlement boundary when housing sites had been identified, due to access issues, however these been addressed as part of the detailed scheme.
- The applicant had engaged well with officers and had provided an extremely high-quality scheme. However, the existing local plan did not support this scheme. If this scheme was interpreted as providing a high-quality scheme which met local need and was desired, more weight could be attached to the benefits it delivered providing quality housing. A strictly consistent approach following the strategic policy where additional housing numbers were not required in the county, would see it refused.
- The decision was finely balanced and would fall where members placed the most weight.

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

- This application differed to a recent decision regarding a planning application for a site in Longframlington, which was the second phase and adjacent to a site which had been allowed on appeal.
- The previous appeal decisions within the village of Wark were in different parts of the village.
- There had been significant local opposition to the application in Longframlington whereas this application had some local support, including from the Parish Council which gave added weight to an exception site.
- A decision by the Planning Inspectorate had been required on the settlement boundary in Longframlington as it had been disputed by the applicant. Wark was defined as a service village, did not have a set boundary and this was not disputed by the current applicant.
- Decisions for each site were made on their own merits and under the planning framework relevant at that time.
- There was no strategic reason to trigger the release of additional land for housing land supply as there was a deliverable 5-year supply. However, this was a county wide supply and disguised areas where there was a demonstrable local need and the affordable housing requirements were exceeded.
- Comparison could not be made with sites in different parts of the county or with decisions made several years ago because the housing need and housing delivery rate had changed.
- The current scheme went beyond the policy requirement for provision of affordable housing.
- More housing was needed in Wark as it was defined as a service village and was considered as a sustainable location in the context of the NPPF.
- The detailed information submitted as part of this application had not been available when the boundary for the village had been set under the Northumberland Local Plan.
- The decision as to whether the application be refused or approved was extremely finely balanced in this case and the suite of documents which comprised the development plan needed to be read in their entirety. Under the Northumberland Local Plan, Wark was identified as a service village where growth was permitted, although the site was outside the settlement boundary. The decision would need to take into account the housing needs at the time of the decision. However other caveats allowed weight

Ch.'s Initials.....

to be given to local support from the parish council when considering an exception site. Significant weight could not be given to the new plan as it had not yet received approval, however it aspired to not want to allow rampant incursions into the countryside as opposed to Wark needing growth, the site had been considered when housing sites had been under consideration, but discounted due to the aforementioned access issues, now resolved. The site could be put forward for inclusion in a future review of the plan.

- It was proposed that the 30 mph zone was to be extended to the north of the site so that traffic was slowed before reaching the access to the development, if approved.
- Work had been undertaken with the applicant to address flooding and drainage concerns as officers had recognised the decision was extremely finely balanced. Even though technical issues had been addressed, it did not make the scheme any more acceptable.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons set out within the report. This was seconded by Councillor Stewart.

Upon being put to the vote, the results were as follows:-

**FOR: 3; AGAINST: 8; ABSTENTIONS: 0.**

The motion fell.

Councillor Oliver proposed that the application be approved on the basis that there was considerable local support, the scheme was of a high-quality design, provided affordable housing above the minimum requirement and supported a service village in a rural area. This was seconded by Councillor Horncastle.

In answer to a question from the Chair, the Director of Planning suggested that if the application be approved, delegated approval be given to him to agree conditions with the applicant. This would include a Section 106 agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing, sport and play provision and to protect the ecological belt of trees to the north of the site. He confirmed that if conditions were not agreed, the application would be brought back to the Tynedale Local Area Council.

Councillor Oliver agreed to include an amendment for delegated authority to be given to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair, to agree the wording of conditions and section 106 agreement.

Upon being put to the vote, the results were as follows:-

**FOR: 8; AGAINST: 0; ABSTENTIONS: 3.**

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** permission and that delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Tynedale Local Area Council, to determine appropriate wording of conditions and subject to a Section 106 agreement.

**Proposed development of 1 no. dwelling house**  
**Development at The Barn Sparty Lea, Allenheads, Hexham, Northumberland**

There were no questions arising from the site visit videos which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. There were no updates.

Councillor Horncastle addressed the Local Area Council as the Ward Councillor and expressed his surprise that the application was recommended for refusal. A copy of his statement is attached to the signed minutes and uploaded to the Council's website.

A statement in support of the application from the agent Ms Wafer, who had written on behalf of the applicants, was read out by K Blyth, DM Area Team Manager (West), and would be attached to the signed minutes and uploaded to the Council's website.

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

- Allendale Parish Council previously had no objection to the scheme. They had then submitted a further response which confirmed that they supported the application.
- The planning history of the site was documented between 1988 – 2006 which confirmed that the former building was in existence during that period with photographic evidence. The Council's records indicated that the property had collapsed approximately 10 years previously.
- The officer had not dealt with the planning applications for the sites referred to by the local Councillor and therefore was unable to comment on the materials used on those buildings.
- Timber cladding was used for chalets and shepherds' huts but traditionally not on other buildings within the AONB. The AONB design guide had been reviewed when considering this application.
- The principle of development accepted the construction of a replacement building on this site and reference was made to the permission which had been granted for the conversion of the previous building, which had collapsed. However, the policy being relied upon within the Allendale Neighbourhood Plan was the rebuilding of a collapsed building with the inference that the replacement building should reflect the former building as much as possible. Officers had tried to resolve the design issues that were in dispute, such as the removal of the dormer windows, which were not a traditional feature of a barn structure.
- Officers had to be careful that there was not 'design creep' resulting in buildings which did not reflect the character of the area. The previous permission had been more similar to the characters of a barn.
- The scale of the proposed dwelling and position on the site were acceptable, however officers wished to see changes regarding the dormer windows, cladding and car port which were not traditional features of the former building. There had been some small changes to the original

Ch.'s Initials.....

application, but they were not considered sufficient to recommend approval of the application. Suggestions included the removal of the dormer windows, use of stone on the building and doors on the garage. The applicant had wanted to test whether the proposed scheme would be approved as it was. Detailed discussions had been held with the applicant / agent regarding the changes that would make the application acceptable.

- Bold and assertive designs could work in protected areas; however, in this case the features in dispute were considered to introduce a suburban feel to the design of the building losing the original character.
- Sparty Lea was a small settlement of stone-built houses in close proximity to the road between Allenheads and Allendale.
- No response had been received from the North Pennines AONB on this application. They did work with officers on larger applications but were likely restricted on where their resources could be directed.
- The application had been assessed against Policy ANDP8 which permitted development where a building had collapsed and mirrored the features of the previous building. Comparison could not be made with the examples referred to by the local Councillor as the extensions of existing dwellings or conversion of buildings would not have been assessed in the same way as this application.
- The AONB design guide did make reference to climate change and sustainability issues but no reference had been made to these by the applicant or their agent.
- The style of building proposed in the current application was dissimilar to the permission granted in 2016, which had moved away slightly from the original position, so some flexibility had been permitted. The details did not conform to the design guide or the character of the AONB.

Councillor Gibson proposed that the application be approved if the applicant made acceptable amendments within 7 working days.

The Principal Solicitor explained that Members needed to make a decision on the application before them. He suggested that the application be deferred and that delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning to agree the details under the scheme of delegation. If he was unable to do this, the application be brought back to Committee for a formal decision.

Councillor Gibson agreed to withdraw his previous proposal and moved that the application be deferred in order that the Director of Planning could consider amendments within 7 working days. The Director of Planning recognised the urgency that the matter not be unnecessarily delayed and resolved as soon as possible. If amendments to the scheme were unable to be agreed, the application be brought back to Committee for a formal decision. This was seconded by Councillor Riddle.

Members were in agreement that the matter be deferred to allow a further period of negotiation with the applicant on the areas which were under dispute.

Upon being put to the vote, this was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** and that delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning to approve the application if amendments were

Ch.'s Initials.....

made to the scheme to his satisfaction as soon as possible.

189    **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 C).

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

190    **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting would be held on Tuesday 9 March 2021 at 2.00 p.m.

**CHAIR**.....

**DATE**.....

Ch.'s Initials.....



## 1

### Written Representations of Objectors

Thank you for this opportunity to communicate directly with the Planning Committee.

My name is Neville Keep and I am representing a number of Wark residents who object to this planning application.

Wark is currently NOT dying a slow death. I have lived in Wark for over 37 years and have worked in the village for most of those years. During that time the village has been slowly growing with small infill developments and developments on brown field sites such as the old bakery and engineering works. There has also been housing built for older people in Westacres now managed by Karbon Homes.

There is a First School in the village with 50 pupils. There is a GP surgery, a multi award winning hotel, two pubs (currently closed because of Covid) a Post Office and general store and a butcher's shop. The owners of the Black Bull and Grey Bull pubs are currently making a significant investment to extend a building to open a Mini Market shop. There are other numerous independent businesses operating from the village.

A recent planning application in Wark for 9 dwellings in an agricultural field west of Westacres was refused permission in August 2019. The main reasons for refusal were that the location was in open countryside contrary to Tynedale LDF Core Strategy Policies and that the development would encroach into the open countryside and would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area contrary to various current planning policies.

On appeal on August 2020 the Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal, upholding the permission refusal. The Inspector confirmed that the site although adjacent to the existing build development it was in open

countryside and not within the village and would conflict with various adopted Northumberland planning policies.

Another recent planning application for Barrasford village, originally for 26 dwellings, resubmitted for 18 dwellings, was refused permission in May 2020. Quoting from the delegated report *“By virtue of its location and scale the proposed development would result in encroachment into the open countryside beyond the established build form of Barrasford and would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area “* ... Contrary to various policies of the Tynedale Local plan, Tynedale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

This application under consideration is for a LARGE development of 17 dwellings off Church Lane Wark. This is similar in size to the recent Barrasford application and it is also in open countryside on an agricultural field. It is outside the Settlement Boundary and would dominate visibility approaching Wark from the North and would also be visible from the road down from Birtley Village. The development would therefore have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Policy GD1 only supports SMALL scale developments and Wark already has outstanding permission for a proportionate level of new housing for the plan period. There is therefore NO compelling need to release more land and there are NO exceptional reasons to allow an extension of the village into open countryside beyond the settlement boundary.

The SHLAA report 2018 identified this site as “Not Suitable” - because of “...a lack of safe access off a busy road near the brow of a hill.”

Despite the plans submitted by the applicant to improve access, local residents still have significant concerns as the road is normally a busy tourist route and is used regularly by large heavy timber wagons going to and from Kielder forest. This traffic causes many near misses at Chapel House and at the entrance to the village.

The FRA submitted by the applicant states that the site is not susceptible to surface water flooding. Surface water flooding actually occurs every winter and some summers. The water flows down the field from the North

across the site and overflows into the garden of Braeside. Photographs taken on 12.8.19 and 2.2.2020 submitted to the planning department show this extensive surface flooding. Further submitted Photographs taken this year on 20.1.2021 show surface flooding across the site.

This scheme is clearly contrary to policies GD1 and H3 of the adopted development plan and is identified in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan as in open countryside where development is strictly controlled.

In view of other recent planning decisions rejecting similar applications outside village boundaries we would urge the planning committee to refuse this application.

This page is intentionally left blank

Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am Rupert Gibson, Ward Councillor

I went to a Parish Council meeting in the Wark Town Hall on a winter's night three years ago and much to my surprise forty plus people were in attendance. In rural parish council terms, that is an enormous crowd. They had come to ask about one subject only. They had come to ask why there was such a lack of housing for those who wanted to stay in Wark, or the lack of new housing full stop.

In the mean time the need has not waned. The Parish council is in favour of this project. The school needs more pupils. More trade in the village etc. Looking at the papers there are more people supporting the project than objecting. That is a very unusual situation, for a new housing development.

Two years ago, this applicant came to a Parish Council meeting to present his application, to very little objection. It has evolved a lot since then to become a very well designed site, which will have all types of houses including more affordable units than required by planning law. The houses are very well designed, which also have a very high specification. The site now includes enhanced landscaping, zoned shelter belts, so in effect causing a buffer zone for more development.

There are two outstanding planning points which are, that this site is to be built in open countryside. And my answer to that is, how can you **not** build in open countryside if you live

in a rural situation. And of course, the Persimmons and Bellways only build in open countryside. So, I consider that to be hardly a point. The more serious point is that the site is just out of the new settlement boundary. If anyone has looked at the “boundary” for this village there is no where vacant to build a small site like this. Infill is not possible. There isn’t any available ground! There is a “special consideration” mechanism however, to free sites such as this, and the special consideration here is that the developer has ticked all the planning department boxes. They say it is the best designed and engineered site to appear in Northumberland in a very long time.

I know some of the councilors here this evening, including the esteemed member for Allendale are very uneasy about voting against the officers recommendation. The thinking being that there is no respect for the officers work on these applications. But in this case, it has got to be a very close call. There are items in the papers that give this away. 7.26 “it is considered that based on the layout of the site this would not be to the extent where planning permission should be refused”. 8.2 & 8.3 are worth reading as well. And in fact at the end application paperwork. I would consider the reasons for refusal very weak.

I wouldn’t be in favour of this site if any of the following were in these papers. Green Belt. 100 letters against the application. Poor design. No benefit to the village etc

We are here this afternoon as the local area committee to consider how the application sits with the locals. They want this site building. Please appease them.

This page is intentionally left blank



**7<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2021.**

**Tynedale Local Area Council.**

**Planning Committee Presentation. 9th February 2021.  
Item 7. Re: 20/01708/FUL.**

**Construction of 17 dwellings at a mix of 3 three bed properties, Ten 4 bed properties  
and 4 three bed affordable homes  
Land North And East Of Ashlynd House, Church Lane, Wark, Northumberland**

The suitability of this site for housing has been discussed with senior officers in the planning team for two years. It is appreciated that officers have worked so hard to assist us in putting forward a scheme that has taken on board all the advice from them, resulting in a proposal that is acceptable in all regards other than being located immediately adjacent to the northern edge of Wark.

This scheme does everything other than meet the policies of the now out of date Tynedale Local Plan, therefore on the basis of the site being adjacent to the open countryside officers have recommended refusal on policy grounds. This statement sets out the significant benefits of the scheme and that approving the homes for Wark would not undermine the emerging strategic policies in the NCC Local Plan.

On a Strategic level it's accepted that sufficient housing is available to serve Northumberland, however this is about Wark, this is a local scheme that will bring the benefits of a carefully considered development and help to build on and maintain the sustainability of the village for future generations. The overwhelming support demonstrates that the scheme is needed and wanted.

The site is not speculative, it has been carefully thought through and bought forward by a farming family who have lived in Wark for generations. The layout, scale, use of traditional materials, stone boundaries, landscaping and ecology belt have all been carefully considered to ensure that this is a bespoke scheme designed to meet the needs of the community of Wark.

The proposal has no technical constraints to restrict it from coming forward. The points raised regarding heritage are outweighed by the ecological benefits the scheme brings. As well as the wider economic, social and environmental benefits that the homes will bring in the form of vitality and viability of the existing shops, pubs and community facilities, more children attending the school and the environmental benefits that tree planting brings within the ecological strip clearly outweigh any harm.

The need for the scheme has been expressed by the community in the 26 letters of support from residents, the strength of support from the Parish Council, the support from the school, who have seen numbers fall significantly in recent decades and need more pupils to maintain a sustainable service and letters of support from the business's in the village. This represents an overwhelming need for these family homes and the benefits it will bring to Wark. Wark wants these homes as it recognizes that it needs them.

NCC planners have worked so hard with the applicant and his team to bring the development to this point of being finely balanced, the weight being the concern that its approval could have on the LP. The LP is a strategic document seeking to deliver strategic objectives, this housing proposal is a local scheme, bespoke to Wark village and its needs. This proposal will not undermine the LP. The LP will still come forward, however it may be delayed, the inspector may request further clarification. This site, the support it has from the community of Wark and the benefits it will bring should & needs to happen now,

This proposal meets and exceeds every technical & design requirement, it provides affordable housing and suitable mix with no harm caused. The concerns regarding flooding, highway safety, trees and amenity have all been met and exceeded. It has been carefully designed, reflecting the best characteristics of Wark, using natural stone and slate, ensuring homes are all reflective of the local vernacular. It will also create an ecological corridor of 1400m<sup>2</sup> including planting of 200 native trees secured through S106.

## **To Conclude**

The benefits of the scheme are extensive and no harm is caused by the development. The scheme brings only benefits, including family housing, exceeding required affordable housing high quality traditionally design, biodiversity enhancement and a clear landscaped edge to the north of the village. Housing should be located where it will enhance & maintain the

■

vitality of rural communities, The Parish Council, the school, local businesses and 26 residents have all expressed the need for housing to help ensure these vital services are retained for future generations.

We request Councilors approve this application, this is an opportunity to finish and approve the ground work your officers have done to push this finely balanced scheme to being an approval ensuring significant benefits to Wark village with no adverse impact.

Thank you for your time.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear members,

I am speaking as the ward councillor not because I have been involved in any way with this application but because the applicant and agent have copied me in to numerous emails from the start which was over a year ago. Since this was an application to change the design to a smaller dwelling and move the proposed dwelling into a more sensible location on a site that already had planning permission i assumed it would be relatively straightforward and would just be a delegated approval.

However I was very surprised to find the Officer recommendation is for refusal. The report is rather negative towards the application and uses certain information that i find factually incorrect.

Paragraph 7.4 brings into the discussion sustainable location and Sparty Lea is not listed as a smaller village in the Tynedale core strategy. The Allendale Neighbourhood plan, which is the most up to date polices we have allows new housing in all villages, settlements and hamlets in the parish so I'm not sure the relevance of this paragraph.

The report mentions a car port which conjures up something more urban. The application simply has an internal garage which doesn't have an external door.

The report states the application has large dormer windows, the submitted plans clearly show small dormer windows. In a discussion with an officer yesterday it was agreed they are small.

Timber cladding is not traditional. Well if that's right please explain how a delegated decision allowed timber cladding on a massive scale on a house just a few miles away in the same parish with the same neighbourhood planning policies?

The AONB design guide may say timber cladding is rarely used it doesn't say it objects to it. But timber is being used more often in the parish now with numerous Shepherds huts, glamping pods, log cabins for tourist accommodation and two log cabin dwellings.

Most of this proposed dwelling is stone built using stone from the original barn that fell down many years ago with a traditional slate roof.

The report hints that dormer windows are not a local feature,there is a couple of semi detached properties 40 metres away with dormer windows , two properties 200 metres south with dormers and many of the old miners cottages because of the lower roof height have dormers and in the wider parish there must be hundreds.

On the subject of unsuitable materials in an AONB perhaps someone could explain to the committee why delegated approval was given to a traditional farmhouse renovation 200 metres away on the side of the main road where about a third of the house is clad in black tin. Certainly not to peoples taste but obviously acceptable to officers.

This application has the support of the Parish Council, a body which takes its Neighbourhood plan very seriously and also has my support.

The application proposes better siting, better access, a lower roof height and a smaller building to give more amenity space and gardens.

Hopefully during members questions and debate you the committee can come to a sensible decision and bring some consistency back to decision making in the Allendale area.

I cannot understand how swathes of black tin is acceptable but small scale timber cladding isn't when it is on a massive scale a few miles down the road.

Furthermore, with the lower roof height to the previous approval it will have a lot less impact and will hardly be noticed from the main road which is adjacent but at a much greater height

Colin Horncastle

South Tynedale

Good Afternoon Members.

The Report confirms a new house is acceptable on this site as a result of the principle of development being established. There are no technical objections to the development from any consultee including the North Pennines AONB Partnership. No neighbours have objected and following amendments the Allendale Parish Council offer their full support. The Report confirms at Para 7.17 that the proposal would not significantly or adversely affect the AONB and it accords with Policy ANDP 1, Tynedale Local Plan Policy NE15 and the NPPF.

The reason for refusal is due to design concerns on the form, style, car port, timber cladding and dormer windows. Taking account of the site, the dwelling has been designed to be 1.5 storeys so that it is less dominant than the surrounding properties, set back into the corner of the site at the lowest point and designed to form an 'L' Shape to ensure that the dwelling looks in on itself. The outward facing elevations are natural stone and the dwelling will be topped with slate to ensure that the materials match those of the surrounding dwellings. As a result of these decisions the roof of the dwelling will sit level with the height of the adjacent highway. Views into the site will be of traditional stone and slate materials and that there will be no overlooking or loss of privacy to any neighbours.

The west facing elevation will be half natural stone and half timber cladding. As can be seen on the drawings a minimal amount of timber is proposed. Timber is also proposed to the front and sides of the two dormer windows which within the context of the size of the roof should not be considered oversized but instead simple double windows constructed of lightweight materials and set into the roof slope. The garage, as shown, features two open doorways, forms part of the layout of the building and is by no means representative of the image that is drawn to mind by the term car port.

The use of timber cladding and the incorporation of dormer windows are features which are commonplace in the Allendale Neighbourhood Plan Area and also the North Pennines AONB. Examples within close proximity to this site have not only been approved but built and it is hoped that members will see this design as sympathetic to the site and its surroundings.

For those that know the site and using the photographs from the Officer it is clear that this dwelling has been designed to take account the site levels, its position adjacent to the raised highway and the outlook to the west. Set at 1.5 storeys its of an appropriate scale. The form of the building allows for it to be tucked into the corner providing excellent access, in site movement, garden space and parking whilst largely being unseen from the majority of public vantage points. The use of natural stone and slate perfectly match the materials of the surroundings and the minimal use of timber to both the west elevation and also the two dormer windows will compliment the stonework whilst adding interest to a single elevation.

It is hoped that members will recognise that the dwelling has been designed to fit this site, it is of a very modest scale and of an appearance that will be consistent with the other dwellings in the area and the wider surrounds. The materials are predominately natural stone and slate with only half of one elevation being timber clad. The resulting dwelling is a vast improvement on the original approval, which was substantially larger, located awkwardly in the middle of the site and had difficult access arrangements. Members are therefore asked to approve this dwelling as it provides an excellent solution to the constraints of the site, is an improvement on the existing planning permission, is of a form and scale appropriate to its surroundings and will be built of materials and include design features that not only compliment but are common place in the existing and surrounding dwellings.

Thank you, Anne and Julian.

This page is intentionally left blank