

Public Document Pack

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At the meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held at Meeting Space
- Block 1, Floor 2 - County Hall on Thursday, 20 January 2022 at 1.00 pm.

PRESENT

G Castle (Chair) (in the Chair)

MEMBERS

S Bridgett
G Hill
G Renner-Thompson
J Watson
I Hunter
M Swinbank

T Thorne
W Pattison
C Seymour
C Hardy
M Mather

OFFICERS

V Cartmell

H Lancaster
R Little
C Mead
J Sharp
E Sinnamon

Planning Area Manager - Development
Management
Legal Services Manager
Assistant Democratic Services Officer
Highways Development Manager
Senior Planning Officer
Development Service Manager

82 **PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED AT A PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Councillor Castle explained to the committee members that the meeting had been split into two meetings due to the large agenda, since that decision was made there had been two planning applications withdrawn from the agenda.

RESOLVED that this was noted.

83 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor T. Clark.

Ch.'s Initials.....

84 **DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor Bridgett advised members that he would be speaking on application 21/03103/FUL as the local member, and therefore would not be taking part in the debate or vote.

Councillor Swinbank also advised members that he had a personal but non-prejudicial interest in item 10 and would be leaving the meeting during that item.

85 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 18 November 2021 as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and be signed by the Chair.

86 **DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Councillor Hardy took the chair and explained to members that planning applications 21/02169/REM and 21/00346/OUT had been withdrawn from the agenda.

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 the information be noted.

87 **21/03106/FUL**

**Demolition of the excising convenience store (Class E) and construction of new retail food store (Class E) to be occupied by Co-Operative LTD.
Mace Convenience Store, Town Foot, Rothbury, Morpeth, Northumberland,
NE65 7SL**

J. Sharp introduced the application with the aid of a presentation, and gave the following updates:

- There had been a late submission from the adjacent land owner disputing the timeline of events relating to discussions that took place with the applicant regarding potential use of the land adjacent to the site.
- An update had been circulated, from the agent with their version of events, these had been noted but did not affect the assessment of the planning officer and the recommendation.
- There were several errors on the report, the paragraph numbers from 7.7 onwards and a typo on 7.33 which should state “proposal is

Ch.'s Initials.....

in accordance with this” instead of “proposal is not in accordance with this”

Chris Hoult spoke in opposition to the application and informed members that:

- There were concerns around highway safety on the development site, including road conditions and car parking.
- The argument around no increased traffic was misleading, the Co-Op would sell a wider range of goods and were looking for increased footfall, which meant that there would be additional traffic and demand for parking spaces around Townfoot.
- Residents would rather drive than carry shopping up a hill.
- The application site was situated on a busy road through Rothbury, which was used by lorry traffic in connection with quarrying and forestry operations, as well as farm traffic.
- There were limited parking spaces in Townfoot, in connection with parking with local residents with no on-street parking. Commercial vehicles were regularly double-parked.
- Visibility was an issue when accessing Rothbury from the east and when drivers were exiting residential areas.

Councillor John Devin spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and gave the following information:

- A new purpose-built convenience store was required in the town, but there were concerns over this location site.
- The application was larger than the previous Mace store and would increase vehicle traffic to Townfoot.
- The speed and amount of traffic which would be generated by the proposed new store, which was opposite to a large residential estate and a First School.
- A site visit should be held during busy times of the day, for example the end of the school day.
- The conditions of the approval were inadequate, the issues of parking and road safety were not addressed.

Councillor S. Bridgett spoke as the Local Member and gave the following information:

- A new Co-Operative store was well overdue, but the problem residents had with the application was traffic management.
- There was no mitigation proposed to help with the parking issue in Townfoot, and there was a loss of total parking spaces due to the two EV charging points being installed.
- Without mitigation, someone would be seriously injured or killed on that road.
- Councillor Bridgett suggested stringent conditions and an independent report commissioned over a 12-month period where the applicant would have to provide parking mitigation based on the report.

Ch.'s Initials.....

Ben Harvey then spoke in support of the application and gave the following information:

- The existing Co-Op site had significant problems with the internal layout including accessible access.
- The Co-Op had an agreement with the owners of the Mace Store which was due to complete April/May 2022, the Post Office had been organised to temporarily move to the existing Co-op store.
- The benefits of the application included: more employment during construction activities, 15 jobs when the application was completed, annual salaries for the area, accessibility, and increased product range.
- There was an inherent highways issue with Rothbury, including a lack of parking turnover, the existing Mace store was able to trade without issue.

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

- Highways Development Manager advised that there was not an increased severe risk in regards to highway safety in relation to the application.
- Parking was close to the limit in Rothbury but as it was an existing issue the committee would have to prove that this application would exacerbate the problem.
- A delivery and service management plan would be put in place as part of planning conditions.
- Demolition of the existing Mace store would be necessary due to accessibility and internal layout.
- The new Co-Op would have fewer deliveries and as part of the planning conditions, the store would not be serviced by articulated lorries but by ridged vehicles.
- Additional refuse collections would not be needed as delivery vehicles would remove the Co-Operatives refuse.

Councillor Thorne recommended approval of the officer's recommendation with additional conditions added to monitor the parking impacts and to consider the relocation of the EV chargers from outside the proposed store to a more appropriate area with the wording of these conditions to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee and stated that it was a great opportunity for Rothbury and a modern efficient building would enhance the streetscape.

This was seconded by Councillor Watson, who stated that on balance it was a good proposal as the application was on the outskirts of the town and a new co-op was needed.

Councillor Castle suggested a site visit may be helpful for members to understand the layout of Rothbury and the implications of opening a new store in that area,

Ch.'s Initials.....

this was supported by Councillor Hill, however Councillor Thorne advised he did not wish to withdraw his motion to approve the application.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve the application with the additional conditions regarding the monitoring of car parking and the relocation of the proposed EV charging points with delegated authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to agree the wording as follows: FOR 7; AGAINST 4; ABSTENSION 0.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** with the conditions outlined in the report, with additional conditions in respect of the monitoring of car parking and the relocation of the proposed EV charging points with delegated authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to agree the wording.

88

21/02382/OUT

Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of an existing building and redevelopment with up to 5No residential properties. Christon Bank Farm, Christon Bank, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 3EZ

Jon Sharp introduced the application with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and gave the following updates:

- There had been a late submission from the applicant which had been circulated to members.
- There was an error in the report regarding paragraph numbers, from para. 7.10 onwards.
- This application site was not within the defined settlements of Embleton or Christon Bank and was considered to be open countryside.

Mike Armstrong spoke in support of the application to the committee and explained that he lived opposite the site and found the application site an eyesore, with decay and has been further damaged due to Storm Arwen. The housing that was proposed would be in keeping with the surrounding dwellings in regards to stonework and slates. The applicant would be demolishing the large building and using that space as pasture land.

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

- The planning conditions could not insist on the dwellings being for permanent residents only.
- The building was not included in this application.
- The application was at the committee due to an objection being received from the Parish Council and for consistency as the previous application had been considered by this Committee.

Councillor Hill proposed to move the officer's recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons outlined in the report, which was seconded by

Ch.'s Initials.....

Councillor Bridgett.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 8; AGAINST 3; ABSTENSION 1.

RESOLVED that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons outlined in the report.

Councillor Swinbank left the meeting.

89 **21/03064/FUL**
New dwellinghouse
Land North West of Sturton Grange Mill, Warkworth, Northumberland

V. Cartmell introduced the application with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and explained that there had been a late statement from the applicant which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Craig Ross spoke in support of the application and gave the following information:

- The scheme had the full support of Warkworth Parish Council.
- The applicant was willing to enter into discussions for a coastal mitigation contribution.
- The application would sit in the development limits of a previous large-scale building and would not require a new entry way.
- The application would not be able to be considered functionally or physically isolated due to it being near 26 homes

Rod Galile also spoke in support of the application stating that the application site fell within the Sturton Grange development and was well contained in the existing walled garden and did not spill out in the open countryside nor impact on the nearby listed buildings, neighbours, or landscape.

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

- In July 2021 the NPPF had been re-written and included in the transport section “new locations must offer a genuine choice of transport modes”. However, the location where the application was set, occupants would be dependant on their car due to the roads surrounding the area not providing safe or suitable alternatives, which was why Highways gave their response to consultation as unsustainable.
- The application site was not in any defined settlements and was classed as open countryside.

Councillor Watson proposed that the application should be granted permission as the application site was in an enclosed piece of land, had no objections from neighbours or the Parish Council, in his opinion there was no effect on the listed building. In granting permission it would be subject to a S106 in respect of a coastal service mitigation payment, and subject to conditions which were to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning.

Ch.'s Initials.....

This was seconded by Councillor Mather.

The Planning Manager explained that conversions were acceptable in the open countryside, however new buildings were contrary to planning policy and this proposal was also deemed unsustainable on highways grounds due to needing a car to travel to and from the application site. It was explained that the applicant would need to demonstrate material planning benefits of the scheme that would on balance outweigh the harm to the open countryside. It is officer opinion the applicant had not demonstrated this and that potentially this decision could open a precedent if members were to grant this application without adequate justification as the site was classed as open countryside.

Councillor Watson stated that he did not consider the application to be isolated and in the open countryside as there was a wall surrounding the site and a road already outside the application site and there would be a public benefit in that there would be another home in a growing community and disagreed with the conservation officer, stating he considered there was no harm at all.

Councillors Castle, Renner-Thompson and Mather stated that they agreed with the Local Member and the Parish Council and would be voting in favour of the application as the application was in a local settlement.

Councillor Bridgett spoke in opposition to the proposal and agreed with the officer's recommendation and urged members to think carefully about the precedent that it would set. Councillor Thorne also expressed that he agreed with the officer's recommendation and that there was strong logical arguments on planning grounds.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 4; AGAINST 7; ABSTENSION 0.

The motion failed, Councillor Bridgett proposed to accept the officer's recommendation, to refuse the application which was seconded by Councillor Hill.

A vote was taken as follows: FOR 8; AGAINST 3; ABSTENSION 0.

RESOLVED that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report.

90 **APPEALS UPDATE**

RESOLVED that this was noted.

91 **SECTION 106**

RESOLVED that this was noted.

92 **NEWTON COMMON REPORT**

Councillor Swinbank returned to the meeting.

Ch.'s Initials.....

H. Lancaster introduced the report and explained that the purpose of the report was to update the Local Area Council in relation to the proposed Commons Act Scheme in relation to Newton Common and for Members to make a decision as to whether to approve the proposed Scheme and if so approved, Members must resolve whether to enter into an agreement under s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 for its management with Newton-by-the-Sea Parish Council.

Councillor Pattison proposed to support the recommendations in the report, this was seconded by Councillor Bridget.

Upon being put to a vote, the committee unanimously agreed, and it was **RESOLVED** that:

1. The North Northumberland Local Area Council approved the proposed Commons Scheme at Newton Common (CL26).
2. The North Northumberland Local Area Council would enter into an agreement for its management with Newton-by-the-Sea Parish Council.

93 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was scheduled for Monday, 24 January 2022 at 1:00 p.m.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....

Ch.'s Initials.....