

## **NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

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

At the meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held at Main Hall - St James's URC, Pottergate, Alnwick, NE66 1JW on Thursday, 20 April 2023 at 2.00 pm.

#### **PRESENT**

G Castle (Chair)  
(in the Chair)

#### **MEMBERS**

T Clark  
G Renner-Thompson  
C Hardy  
M Mather

G Hill  
J Watson  
I Hunter  
M Swinbank

#### **OFFICERS**

J Blenkinsopp  
H Booker

V Cartmell  
R Little  
D Love  
E Scott  
J Sharp

Solicitor  
Principal Highways Development  
Management Officer  
Planning Area Manager  
Assistant Democratic Services Officer  
Senior Planning Officer  
Built Heritage and Design Officer  
Senior Planning Officer

Around 15 members of the press and public were present.

Ch.'s Initials.....

145 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors S. Bridgett, W. Pattison, C. Seymour and T. Thorne.

146 **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 23 March 2023, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record, and be signed by the Chair.

147 **DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor Swinbank disclosed that he had a prejudicial interest in item 6 of the agenda, planning application 21/02775/FUL, and would leave the room when the application was discussed and voted upon.

Councillor Hunter disclosed that she had a personal, but non-prejudicial interest in item 5 of the agenda, planning application 21/04246/FUL.

*Councillor Hardy (Vice Chair – Planning), in the Chair.*

148 **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.

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

149 **21/04346/FUL**

**Replace existing building (3no. flats/ 14no bed sits space) with 3no detached houses with 18 bed spaces.  
On The Beach, Harbour Road, Beadnell, NE67 5AN**

D. Love – Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application with a PowerPoint Presentation, and gave the committee the following updates:

- An update to the recommendation on page 31 of the report, to read “approval subject to conditions and a £10,000 contribution towards coastal erosion management”
- There had been an agreed clarification on the description of the planning application, which would now read “Replace existing building (3no. flats/

Ch.'s Initials.....

14no bed sits space) with 3no detached houses with 18 bed spaces, to be used as holiday accommodation.”

- Confirmation that the application site was in the Beadnell Conservation Area but outside the settlement boundary.

C. Williamson spoke on behalf of the Beadnell Parish Council and gave the committee the following information:

- Beadnell Parish Council agreed that the existing building did not present an attractive entrance to the village, and they were generally supportive of the intention to demolish and replace it.
- The application was an overdevelopment of the site, with one building being replaced by three, increasing the floor space considerably.
- The height and uniformity of the buildings did not respond to local character within the Beadnell Conservation Area in which the site was situated.
- The site was bordered by the main road into and out of Beadnell to the north.
- The Parish Council were concerned that there was a reduction in the existing parking provision from 25% to 10% of the site area.
- There was no official car park opposite the site, the land was part of a village green.
- Northumberland County Council had earmarked £687,000 in the 2023/24 budget for coastal defences in Beadnell, £10,000 did not seem proportionate.
- Beadnell Parish Council objected to the application.

N. Allen spoke in support of the application and gave the following information:

- There had been no technical objections.
- The scheme was for three units with six spaces each.
- The previous Built and Heritage Officer did not object to four houses.
- The uniformity of the scheme introduced cohesion to the entrance of Beadnell.
- The original building had one driveway for all vehicles with no turning.

Following questions from members to the planning officer, the following information was provided:

- It was confirmed that the application site was outside of the settlement boundary but inside the Beadnell Conservation Area.
- The £10,000 S106 sum was calculated using a technical formula.
- Highways had been consulted on the application.
- There was no history of collisions near the site in the past 20 years.
- The Local Authority would be responsible to maintain the sea defences if the application was approved.

Councillor Watson proposed to refuse the application on the basis that the application was an overdevelopment of the site, replacing one house with three. This was seconded by Councillor Renner-Thompson stating that he agreed with Councillor Watson and the Parish Council.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR; 6, AGAINST; 3, ABSTAIN;0

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** as it was an overdevelopment of

Ch.'s Initials.....

the site, with the exact reason to be delegated to the planning officer.

*Councillor Swinbank left the meeting.*

150 **21/02775/FUL**

**Erection of 2no holiday lets (Sui Generis) and associated landscaping (as amended)**

**Dunstan House, C74 Dunstan Village Main Road, Dunstan, NE66 3SY**

J. Sharp – Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and gave the committee the following update:

- A late representation had been submitted, which had been circulated to members prior to the meeting.

P. Biggers spoke in objection to the planning application advising of the following information:

- The harm from further holiday accommodation.
- The impact of the position, scale, and design of the units.
- The impact to residential amenity.
- The impact of access changes.
- The applicant had amended their proposal from two dwellings to two holiday lets in the hope of circumventing NLP Policy HOU10 seeking houses to be occupied as principal residences.
- The Craster Neighbourhood Plan, Policy 1 supporting text was clear that new housing should be occupied as permanent residences in recognition of the high percentage of houses used as holiday accommodation.
- 55% of accommodation in Dunstan was for holiday lets, which only had a seasonal benefit to the local economy.
- New houses in the AONB capable of being permanent residences should not be used as holiday lets.
- Placing two large houses in the garden of the site would have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the village.
- The scale and height of the two-storey houses and steeply pitched roofs would be close to that of Dunstan House.
- The impact for neighbours in Windlesham, The Bungalow and Crag View was not a matter of overlooking of windows, it was a result of overlooking into gardens and an overbearing proximity given where the house on plot 1 was sited 1-2 metres from the boundary to Windlesham.
- The residents were concerned over the safety aspects of the approach around the bend from the South.
- The application would require the removal of the edge and a large length of whinstone wall on the street frontage again resulting in the urbanisation of this tranquil street and a loss of character, contrary to Policy QOP1.
- The site was proposed to accommodate only 7 parking spaces.

W. Pattison had registered to speak as the Local Member and submitted a speech to be read out by an officer at the meeting, in accordance with the Public Speaking Protocol. The committee were given the following information:

- The proposal was in direct conflict with Craster Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The planning application stated that the intention was for the new dwellings to become designated holiday lets and not homes for permanent residents/long-term tenants.
- Should the application be granted, it would raise a question over whether future Parishes embarking on a Neighbourhood Plan was a worthwhile endeavour as loopholes could be found.

A. Shanley spoke on behalf of Craster Parish Council and gave members the following information:

- Craster Parish Council strongly objected to the planning application.
- New houses in Dunstan should be for primary occupancy only.
- The Built Heritage and Design officer objected to the application.
- The AONB had objected to the application.
- The views of the Parish Council had been disregarded.
- The application was not a welcome addition to the village.
- The application should be refused.

S. Palmer spoke in support of the application and gave the committee the following information:

- The applicant was not a developer but was an ex-hotelier with experience in tourism.
- The site was to be built as a tourism business and specifically designed as holiday accommodation.
- The site was five times the average plot in Dunstan.
- The application would encourage and increase the tourism market in Dunstan.
- The focus of the project was the existing garden.
- The application would be accessible to people with mobility issues.

Following questions from members to the planning officers, the following information was provided:

- The application was Sui Generis and was looked at under the tourism policy of the Local Plan and was not considered to be a market dwelling.
- There was no policy reason for refusal.
- If granted, the application site could not be used as a market dwelling.
- Highways were satisfied with removing the hedging and boundary wall, subject to the conditions in the report.
- There were seven car parking spaces in total.
- The proposals met the statutory requirement to preserve the setting of the Grade II\* and Grade II listed buildings.
- In the opinion of the Built Heritage and Design Officer, the application would not make a positive contribution to the local character of the village.
- Strong boundary treatments would be put in place to disguise the site from long-range views.
- There was a range of designs within the village.

Councillor Castle proposed to refuse the application stating that the proposed units would not make a positive contribution to the local character and would not integrate with the surrounding build environment, contrary to Local Plan Policy QOP 1 of the Northumberland Local Plan, with the exact wording of the refusal reason to be delegated to the planning officer, this was seconded by Councillor

Ch.'s Initials.....

Renner-Thompson.

Members noted that they understood the different policies within the Northumberland Local Plan, the parish councils may have had different interpretations and there needed to be clearer wording and support.

A vote was taken, and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** as the application was not a positive contribution to the village and that it did not accord with policy QOP1, with the exact wording of the refusal to be delegated to the planning officer.

*Councillor Swinbank returned to the meeting at this point.*

151 **22/04155/FUL**

**Construction of Annex Accommodation to Blue Bell Cottage  
Bluebell Cottage, Dene House Farm Cottages, Longframlington, Morpeth,  
Northumberland, NE65 8EE**

D. Love – Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application with the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation and gave the following update:

- An additional condition to be added stating that prior to any works above damp-proof course level the applicant shall submit details of the external finishing materials for the walls and roof.

G. Nelles spoke on behalf of Longframlington Parish Council, and gave members the following information:

- The Parish Council objected to the application.
- The application would not satisfy the Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan policies for location and design.
- The application sat outside the village boundary and was classified as countryside.
- Whilst the Northumberland Local Plan made provision for rural exception sites that met local need, the Parish Council considered that the application did not fulfil this criteria.
- Highways had stated that the location was not sustainable but had not objected as the stand-alone build was being classed as an annex.
- Housing for older residents would be better suited within the village boundary.
- The application would not satisfy policy LNP7 or policy LNP5.
- The house would not be sustainable in the long term.

C. Ross spoke in support of the application and gave the committee the following information:

- The application was for a family who required an adapted and accessible living arrangement, to allow a family member to live independently.
- There was no highways objection.
- The annex was designed to complement the main building.
- The annex would be tied to the existing property and would be in the garden.
- The track to the property was able to serve bin collection wagons and

Ch.'s Initials.....

- delivery lorries.
- The application would meet a specific identified need and its use would be controlled.

Following questions from members to the planning officers, the following information was provided:

- Any further change to use of the annex would require further planning permission.
- The application was designed in mind for palliative care.

Councillor Hill proposed to accept the recommendation with the additional condition that prior to any works above damp-proof course level the applicant shall submit details of the external finishing materials for the walls and roof with the exact wording to be delegated to the planning officer. Councillor Hill stated that it was a positive application, this was seconded by Councillor Mather.

A vote was taken, and it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** with the conditions set out in the report and the additional condition that prior to any works above damp-proof course level the applicant shall submit details of the external finishing materials for the walls and roof, with exact wording to be delegated to the planning officer.

152 **APPEALS UPDATE**

**RESOLVED** that this was noted.

*Councillor Castle (Chair), in the Chair.*

153 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday, 18 May 2023.

**CHAIR**.....

**DATE**.....

Ch.'s Initials.....