

## **NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

### **NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL AREA COUNCIL**

At the meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held in the Meeting Space - Block 1, Floor 2 - County Hall on Thursday, 24 February 2022 at 2:00 p.m.

#### **PRESENT**

C Hardy  
(Vice-Chair Planning - In The Chair)

#### **MEMBERS**

T. Clark  
G. Hill  
I. Hunter  
G. Renner-Thompson

C. Seymour  
M. Swinbank  
W. Pattinson  
T. Thorne

#### **OFFICERS**

M. Bulman  
V. Cartmell  
P. Jones  
R. Kain  
R. Little  
D. Love  
T. Lowe  
R. McCartney

Solicitor  
Planning Area Manager  
Service Director - Local Services  
Built Heritage and Design Officer  
Assistant Democratic Services Officer  
Senior Planning Officer  
Principal Planning Officer  
Local Services - Infrastructure Manager

#### **102 PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED AT A PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

#### **103 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: Bridgett, Castle and Mather

Ch.'s Initials.....

104 **DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor Hunter advised that she was the Clerk for Beadnell Parish Council but had taken no part in the discussion at the Parish Council for agenda item 9 and would be taking part in the debate and vote.

Councillor Clark advised the committee that he had a personal interest in items 6 and 7 of the agenda and would be leaving the room and taking no part in determination of the applications.

Councillor Watson advised that he had applied for the Tree Prevention Order - item 10 on the agenda and would not take part in any discussion or vote and would leave the room whilst it was being discussed.

105 **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 20 January 2022 as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and be signed by the Chair.

106 **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.

It was noted that item 6 and 7 would be introduced and presented as the same application but would be debated and voted on separately.

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

*Councillor T. Clark left the room.*

107 **21/03038/VARYCO**

*Councillor Patterson arrived after D. Love had began the presentation, the presentation was restarted to allow Councillor Hunter to take part in the debate and subsequent vote*

D. Love – Senior Planning Officer, addressed the committee and gave the following updates:

- The Independent examination of the Northumberland Local Plan (NLP) had concluded, and the inspector considered that subject to

Ch.'s Initials.....

a number of recommended Main Modifications, the NLP was “sound” and provided an appropriate basis for the planning of the County. The plan was on the final stage of preparation, with no unresolved objections. The plan was consistent with the national policy, therefore significant weight could be given to the policies in the NLP.

- Paragraph 7.5 on both reports read “The principle of replacing historic windows is accepted where it can be demonstrated that there is some benefit to the building for doing so”. Although the act provided generalised support in principle for sustainable development, the loss of historic windows in a listed building and replaced with modern replicas would be assessed on a case-by-case basis to evaluate whether removing the windows would be harmful to the building’s significance.

Following the PowerPoint presentation, it was explained that applications 21/03038/VARYCO and 21/03039/VARYCO were both recommended for refusal with R. Kain – Built Heritage and Design Officer, explaining that the building was 225 years old, with Georgian windows which should be retained and repaired.

It was noted the Councillor Swinburn arrived during the presentation and would not be able to take part in any debate or vote for applications 21/03038/VARYCO and 21/03039/VARYCO

Guy Munden, spoke in support of the application and gave the following information to the committee:

- The original planning application for the development was submitted in April 2020 and approved in April 2021.
- The original scheme was intended to repair the existing windows where possible.
- When the building was a school, it had lacked proper maintenance and the building was in urgent need of repair, as windows had been vandalised and dry rot had spread significantly.
- The windows were beyond repair as dry rot had spread to the original window frames.
- The replacement window frames were proposed to be a like-for-like hand-made timber frame, replicating the exact form of the historic windows.
- The replacement glass would be cylinder glass, replicating the reflective quality of the historic glass.
- Secondary glazing was deemed inappropriate as would cause greater harm to the internal appreciation of the building.
- Double glazing would improve the thermal efficiency of the building.
- The benefits of the site included: bringing back into use a vacant Listed Building, tourism, investment into the local economy and numerous job opportunities.

Following members questions to the Planning Officers and the Built Heritage Officer, the following information was provided:

Ch.’s Initials.....

- The building had many of its original shutters, but officers were unable to confirm if they were in working condition.
- Some of the windows on the rear of the building were showing signs of dry rot however the Built and Heritage Officer did not agree that all the windows were beyond repair.
- Historic England guidance stated that thermal upgrading should be approached as a whole building, not only windows, this included: loft insulation, draught proofing and efficiency of heating systems.

Councillor Hill proposed to accept the officers recommendation to refuse the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Seymour.

Councillor Thorne explained that he would be voting against the motion as he believed that fit for purpose double glazed windows would benefit the development, this was agreed by Councillor Watson and Councillor Renner-Thompson.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 4; AGAINST 3, ABSTAIN 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** as the proposal would lead to “less than significant harm” to a Grade II listed heritage asset and it had not been demonstrated as necessary or justified. The proposal would not therefore accord with the Core Strategy Policy S15, advice from Historic England or the paragraph 202 of the NPPF and plan or paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposes would also be contrary to sections 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

## 108      **21/03039/VARYCO**

An introduction to the report had been provided as part of the previous application.

Councillor Hill proposed to support the officers recommendation to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Seymour.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 4; AGAINST 3, ABSTAIN 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** as the proposal would lead to “less than significant harm” to a Grade II listed heritage asset and it had not been demonstrated as necessary or justified. The proposal would not therefore accord with the Core Strategy Policy S15, advice from Historic England or the paragraph 202 of the NPPF and plan or paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposes would also be contrary to sections 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

*Councillor T. Clark then returned to the meeting.*

109     **21/03766/FUL**

T. Lowe – Principal Planning Officer, addressed the committee and gave the following updates:

- The Independent examination of the Northumberland Local Plan had concluded, and the inspector considered that subject to a number of recommended Main Modifications, the NLP was “sound” and provided an appropriate basis for the planning of the County. The plan was on the final stage of preparation, with no unresolved objections. The plan was consistent with the national policy, therefor significant weight could be given to the policies in the NLP.
- Officers had assessed the proposal against the policies of the Local Plan and confirmed that the change in weight of the Plan did not result in a change to the recommendation.

Following a Powerpoint presentation, the Planning Officer confirmed that no other houses on the street had dormers and that the conservation officer had not been consulted.

Councillor Clark proposed to accept the officers recommendation to approve the application, which was seconded by Councillor Watson.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 9; AGAINST 0, ABSTAIN 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

110     **21/03848/FUL**

T. Lowe – Principal Planning Officer, addressed the committee and gave the following updates:

- The Independent examination of the Northumberland Local Plan had concluded, and the inspector considered that subject to a number of recommended Main Modifications, the NLP was “sound” and provided an appropriate basis for the planning of the County. The plan was on the final stage of preparation, with no unresolved objections. The plan was consistent with the national policy, therefor significant weight could be given to the policies in the NLP.

Geoff Martindale, spoke on behalf of the Beadnell Parish Council and gave the committee the following information:

- The application site was part of 36, L-shaped chalets in Longstone Park.
- At the time of construction, the chalets were subject to an agreement, dated 25 June 1968 between the estate developers and Northumberland County Council, prohibiting the erection of any building or structure on the amenity areas.
- The AONB Officer had not been consulted on the Sunrise Cottage

Ch.'s Initials.....

- planning application but had been consulted on the Beach Lea Bungalow, which they did not support.
- The Parish Council were concerned that a precedent was set by Sunrise Cottage.

Following questions from members to the Planning Officers, the following information was provided:

- The planning officer did not agree with the AONB Officer, explaining that the visual impact was acceptable due to the application being a small extension and it would not impact the wider area.
- No additional car parking would be required.

Councillor Renner- Thompson proposed to refuse the application, based on policy 5 of the North Northumberland Coast Neighbourhood Plan, stating the application failed to respect the local context and character of the area. This was seconded by Councillor Seymour.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 8; AGAINST 1, ABSTAIN 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED**.

*Councillor Watson left the room.*

#### 111 **NEW TREE PRESERVATION ORDER: PKT 0686**

T. Lowe – Principal Planning Officer, introduced the preservation order and informed members that there had been an error in the report regarding paragraph numbers.

Following the presentation, members were informed that a public right of way did not affect any tree preservation orders.

Councillor Thorne proposed to move the officer's recommendation to approve the Tree Preservation Order, which was seconded by Councillor Patterson.

A vote was taken and was unanimous, it was:

**RESOLVED** that it was recommended that the Tree Preservation Order was confirmed with modification.

*Councillor Watson re-joined the meeting.*

#### 112 **APPEALS UPDATE**

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

Ch.'s Initials.....

113     **SECTION 106**

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

*A comfort break was announced to allow officers to change over.*

114     **LOCAL TRANSPORTS PLAN PROGRAMME 2022-23**

A comprehensive introduction to the report was provided by P Jones, Service Director, Local Services with R McCartney, Infrastructure Manager also in attendance. The report set out the details of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme for 2022-23 for consideration and comment by the Local Area Council prior to final approval of the programme by the Interim Executive Director of Planning and Local Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Local Services.

In response to questions from Members the following information was noted:

- Northumberland County Council was oversubscribed in the level of demand for schemes to be included in the programme compared to the funding allocated.
- There had been additional funding of £2 million made available to undertake an additional programme of maintenance schemes on U&C roads and footways, as part of the County Councils Medium-Term Financial Plan.
- Schemes that were in the 2021-22 LTP that had not been delivered, would roll forward and would be completed during the 22-23 LTPP using the previously allocated monies.
- EV chargers had a separate funding allocation.

Members requested a report to be presented to the North Northumberland Local Area Council in three or four months on progression of members small schemes and the timescales for completion.

Members thanked Paul and the team for their continued hard work.

**RESOLVED** that this was **NOTED**

115     **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

**CHAIR**.....

**DATE**.....

Ch.'s Initials.....