

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

CASTLE MORPETH LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At the meeting of the **Castle Morpeth Local Area Council** held at Council Chamber - County Hall on Monday, 13 June 2022 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT

J Foster (Vice-Chair Planning) (in the Chair)

MEMBERS

S Dickinson
L Dunn
V Jones

R Dodd
J Foster
M Murphy

OFFICERS

A Ali
H Bowers
T Crowe
J Murphy

Planning Officer
Democratic Services Officer
Solicitor
South East DM Area Manager

Around 6 members of the press and public were present.

9 **PROCEDURE AT PLANNING MEETINGS**

The Chair outlined the procedure which would be followed at the meeting.

10 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beynon, Darwin, Sanderson, Towns and Wearmouth.

11 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday 9 May 2022, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and be signed by the Chair.

12 **DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Councillor Foster, Vice-Chair Planning introduced the report which 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

Ch.'s Initials.....

for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications.

The Vice-Chair, planning informed members that planning application 21/02485/FUL – land at north of Bewick Drift, Cresswell had been withdrawn from the agenda and would be determined at a future planning meeting.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

13 **22/00900/OUT**

**Outline planning applications (some matters reserved) for residential development of up to 5 no. dwellings
Land South West of Field Head House, Longhorsley, Northumberland**

Adam Ali, Planning Officer introduced the application with the aid of a power point presentation. Members confirmed that they had viewed the site visit videos circulated in advance of the meeting.

Giles Birch, objector, addressed the Committee. His comments included the following information: -

- He was speaking on behalf of all the residents of Cragside Mews who fully supported the officer's recommendation for refusal of the application
- There had been a total of 24 objections to the application with 22 letters of support from people who did not live locally with no legal reference why the application should go ahead. Reference had been made to: -
 - A reduction in agricultural traffic – realistically the development would add another 10 vehicles to the properties
 - Help support local services – the village had one shop, a pub and a school
 - Additional jobs – these would be temporary
 - To allow the farm to relocate – this had no bearing with the relocation of the farm. The applicant already had planning permission approved for a barn
- Concerns around the Green Belt and the prospect of inappropriate development in the open countryside. This was supported by Longhorsley Parish Council who had also objected and made reference to unacceptable development in the Green Belt; contrary to local policies and no additional need for housing in the area. Accessibility would almost double Fieldhead in size.
- The Planning Statement from George White accepted that the development was on Green Belt and that the Neighbourhood Plan did not give any support to the development
- The development did not meet the housing requirement. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment had identified housing for 4200 new houses which was almost 600 more than required up until 2024
- The applicant had stated that this was previously developed land, and it was not. The definition in the glossary of the Northumberland Local Plan stated that previously developed land was land which is or was, occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excluded any associated fixed surface infrastructure and excluded land that is or had been occupied by

Ch.'s Initials.....

agricultural or forestry buildings, therefore, none of the proposed site fell under the definition of previously developed land.

- The development would contravene the Land Registry document (ND132865) signed by the applicant's parents and grandmother and warranted 24/7 access to the 2m strip of land along the South and West boundary of the current structure
- As a small hamlet there were huge concerns in relation to road traffic along the narrow single-track lane (U6017) which already struggled with traffic and in a poor state of repair. Traffic often cut through from the A1 to the A697 or vice versa, which often included articulated lorries, buses and other large vehicles.
- The road was a 60 mph National Speed limit and vehicles often tried to stick to the speed limit as opposed to driving for the road conditions; pedestrians, horse riders and other road users were at a significant risk.
- Lack of passing places.
- A recent accident on both the A1 and A697 had caused significant congestion.
- Highways had objected to the development stating that it was an unsuitable location that was only accessible by car and no reasonable action was likely to address the concern. The site was in an unsustainable location.
- Concerns around contamination and asbestos. The screening assessment by the applicant stated that there was none on the site, yet a recent bat survey made mention of the majority of both barns being constructed of asbestos, as did paperwork within a previous application.
- The proposed development documentation by George F White appeared to contradict itself. There was mention that the development was for the demolition of existing buildings, yet the very next sentence mentioned that the application sought to reuse the land and buildings associated with an extant Class Q conversion. There was no clarity as to the proposed intention for the buildings.
- In summary, as a collective, of all the 17 residents of Cragside Mews, objected to the development on the legislation from the Longhorsley Neighbourhood Plan Policies LNP2 and LNP3, National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 79 and 80. Northumberland Local Plan Policies STP1, STP2, STP3, STP8, HOU1, HOU2, HOU8 – Section 1 (a) (b) (d) and (h) and Section 3 (a) and (b). The development would also contravene Land Registry ND132865.

Guy Middleton applicant, was in attendance and spoke in support of the application: -

- In 2017, the applicant received planning permission, half a mile from the site and expressed the intention to move the farm operation from the site which had been well received
- The building to be developed was not suitable for modern agriculture and could not accommodate the main tractor
- The initial intention was to reduce disturbance to residents
- The development would not go beyond existing boundaries
- He requested that the Committee defer the application for a members' site visit.

Ch.'s Initials.....

Craig Ross, George F White was also in attendance in support of the application. His comments included the following: -

- The application site already had permission for 4 residential units
- The development would infill Belsay and Holystone and would enhance and provide separation from neighbouring properties
- The development would be contained within the existing footprint
- In terms of planning, Previously Developed Land could be considered acceptable because of infill
- He also requested that members defer the application for a site visit

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

- There would be no benefit from a site visit
- Highways had objected as the development was in an unsustainable location
- There were no bus services

Councillor Foster proposed that the application be refused, this was seconded by Councillor Richardson. Members echoed their support for the refusal of the application as the development was recognised as being of the Green Belt; was in a unsustainable location with no service facilities; the main road was too close to the development with no pedestrian access.

Councillor Foster summed up and reiterated that the application should be refused for the three reasons in the report.

A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application which was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED that the application be **REFUSED** subject to the reasons in the report.

14 **APPEALS UPDATE**

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....

Ch.'s Initials.....