Public Document Pack

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 October 2022 at 2.00 pm.

PRESENT

G Castle (Chair) (in the Chair)

MEMBERS

T Clark G Hill
G Renner-Thompson C Hardy I Hunter
M Mather M Swinbank

OFFICERS

J Blenkinsopp
V Cartmell
J Hudson
R Little
Solicitor
Planning Area Manager
Planning Officer
Assistant Democratic Services Officer

Around 10 members of the press and public were present.

59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Bridgett, Councillor Thorne, Councillor Pattison, and Councillor Watson

60 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 22 September, as circulated, were confirmed as a true record and were signed by the Chair.

Councillor Hardy - Vice Chair, Planning - in the chair.

61 **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.

62 **22/00666/FUL**

New detached house for permanent residence.

Land West of Radcliffe Park, Radcliffe Park, Bamburgh, NE69 7AN

- J. Hudson Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and gave the following updates:
 - A late representation from Bamburgh Parish Council had been submitted and included the following information:
 - i. The proposed site sat behind the corner between the larger detached houses at the entrance to Radcliffe Park, and the houses on Radcliffe Road, which were all large, individual detached houses. The entrance to Radcliffe Park was dominated by West house, a 3storey house much taller than the proposed dwelling.
 - ii. The driveway of the proposed dwelling entered a quiet cul-de-sac along with the driveways of the 2 other detached houses. The Conservation Officer stated, "The dwelling would not integrate into existing highway routes easily." That statement would not hold up to scrutiny.
 - iii. The Parish Council had concerns with the response of Highways. The response seemed to prioritise sustainability, not their stated aims to check that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on highway safety. There was a fundamental presumption in favour of

- the development but based on Highways reading, that being in a location which is reliant on a private car, and which does not provide a genuine choice of transport modes, there was an objection to the development. The basis for objection covered not only the application, but vast swathes of rural Northumberland.
- iv. Highway concerns seemed misplaced; in that they had highlighted sustainability over road safety. The building would be constructed to contemporary standards with high levels of insulation. It would be heated by a ground source heat pump, working in combination with a ground mounted solar panel array.
- Inconsistencies eroding public confidence in the planning system.
 When Highways were consulted regarding a proposal to build 10 houses at the Friars, just up from Radcliffe Road, they made no objections.
- vi. The AONB supported the application on the grounds that it would make a positive contribution to sustainable communities in the Neighbourhood Area.
- vii. Bamburgh Parish Council supported the proposal as the North Northumberland Coastal Communities Plan, which should take great weight in planning matters.
 - A late objection from the ecologist stating that original comments were made on 31/03/22 with no objection to planning conditions, however they had since submitted an objection as they had been recently contacted by a consultant ecologist who had identified evidence of protected species on land. Therefore, considering new information there was a strong possibility that the proposed development may result in the loss of important foraging and habitat for the protected species.
 - To fully consider the impact, a re-assessment was required.
 - Following the late objection from the ecologist, the applicant responded with the following information:
 - The development was designed so that substantial areas of grassland were being retained, providing a fenced area of undisturbed land.
 - ii. The mitigation within the application documents was considered appropriate by the County Ecologist.
 - iii. The proposed mitigation included a requirement for a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for Biodiversity to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the works. The CEMP provided the opportunity for any changes in the protected species to be considered.
 - iv. The site was sufficiently large enough to accommodate any minor changes which may be required such as the relocation of the package treatment plant.
 - Following the rebuttal from the applicant, the Planning Officer contacted the ecologist who had advised that a further assessment of the site was required.
 - A further reason for refusal was announced as follows: "Reason 5 -Insufficient information in regard to an up-to-date ecology survey has been provided. The application cannot be determined until further details have been submitted and adequate mitigation, where

necessary, is provided. Due to the lack of further information the proposal is considered to be unacceptable and not in accordance with policy ENV 2 of the Northumberland Local Plan, policy 3 of the North Northumberland Coast Neighbourhood Plan and paragraph 182 of the NPPF."

Councillor Castle raised a Point of Order explaining that the update provided was very long and that he could not absorb and would not be able to recall all of the information which formed the update from the Planning Officer and felt that he would not be able to make a decision without having the update in front of him and being given time to read and consider the information. Councillor Renner-Thompson agreed and stated that even with the information being circulated beforehand, members could not be able to make a decision without the ecology survey on the protected species being complete.

Councillor Hill proposed to defer the application, so that the information provided as an update could be circulated to all members to have time to consider prior to the next meeting, it was noted that further time may also allow time for a further ecology report to be completed. This was seconded by Councillor Castle.

A vote was taken and was it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the application was **DEFERRED** for the further information provided as an update to be circulated to members prior to the next meeting, it was noted that further time may also allow time for a further ecology report to be completed.

63 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

Land at rear of Neston and The Nook, Pondicherry, Rothbury, Morpeth, NE65 7YS

Tree Preservation Order 2020 (no. 5 of 2020)

- V. Cartmell Planning Area Manager, introduced the application with the following update:
 - A late representation had been submitted in support of the order.

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

- A Tree Officer had completed an assessment on the trees and found that they were worthy of protecting.
- Tree Officers no longer had the capacity to consult on future TPOs.
- The Tree Officer had taken into account the localised decay and had incorporated that into the report.

Councillor Castle proposed to confirm the Tree Preservation Order, this was seconded by Councillor Swinbank.

Councillor Mather raised as a Point of Order, if the North Northumberland Local Area Council could write to the Head of Planning to ask if there could be money allocated to fund a Tree Officer role in planning, this was agreed by Councillor Hill.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR; 8, AGAINST; 0, ABSTAIN; 1

RESOLVED that the Tree Preservation Order be **CONFIRMED** without modification.

64 S106 FELTON: HEALTHCARE EXPENDITURE

To extend the time period for the expenditure of Healthcare contributions for a further three years.

Land North of Benlaw Grove, Main Street, Felton, Northumberland

V. Cartmell – Planning Area Manager, introduced the report to members.

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

- Both parties of the S106 were content with the recommendation.
- The healthcare contributions were to go towards a new surgery for Felton
- At the end of 2025, if not given to healthcare, the money will be reallocated to affordable housing.

Councillor Hunter proposed to accept the variation of the section 106 agreement to allow 3 further years to spend the Healthcare Contribution, which was seconded by Councillor Seymour.

A vote was taken and was it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the S106 variation was **GRANTED**.

65 **APPEALS UPDATE**

RESOLVED that this was noted.

66 **SECTION 106**

RESOLVED that this was noted.

67 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the North Northumberland Local Area Council was scheduled for Thursday, 17 November 2022 at Berwick Leisure Centre, Tweedmouth, Berwick Upon Tweed, TD15 2AS

RESOLVED that this was noted.

68 **URGENT BUSINESS**

Councillor Mather noted that in the report for 22/00666/FUL, Highways objection read "Object to the scheme as the proposed development is located in an unsuitable location reliant on a private car which does not provide a genuine choice of transport modes" – and asked whether a highways officer could attend the next meeting. V. Cartmell explained that the highways officer for the North Northumberland Area was on leave but would be attending the November meeting to discuss sustainable transport.

Resolved that this was noted.

CHAIR	
DATE	