

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

TYNEDALE LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **Tynedale Local Area Council** held at County Hall, Morpeth on Tuesday, 15 February 2022 at 4.00 p.m.

PRESENT

Councillor T Cessford
(Chair, in the Chair for agenda items 82 – 83 and 89 - 91)

(Planning Vice-Chair Councillor A Scott in the chair for items 84 - 88)

MEMBERS

A Dale
SH Fairless-Aitken
C Horncastle (82-87)
I Hutchinson
D Kennedy

N Morphet
JR Riddle
A Sharp
G Stewart
HR Waddell

OFFICERS

N Armstrong
K Blyth

M Bulman
A Craig

J Hitching
P Jones
H Lancaster
N Leadbeattter
N Snowdon

N Turnbull

Principal Planning Officer
Development Management Area
Manager (West)
Solicitor
Programme Officer (Highways
Maintenance)
Senior Sustainable Drainage Officer
Service Director - Local Services
Senior Manager - Legal Services
Housing Enabling Officer
Principal Programme Officer
(Highways Improvement)
Democratic Services Officer

6 members of the public were present.

82. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Oliver.

83. MINUTES

Ch.'s Initials.....

The Chair reported that the minutes from the meeting on 11 January 2022 should be numbered from 73 to 81.

Minute No: 78

Northumberland Fire and Rescue Service: Community Risk Management Plan 2022-26 Consultation

The sixth bullet point should be amended to include the words 'on wet winter days' and read as follows:

'Information was to be checked from the Met Office in the Flooding and Water Rescue section on page 23. It was believed that more information should be included, as whilst there was expected to be fewer rainy days in summer, the amount of rain that fell **on wet winter days** would increase by approximately 14% under a 2oc warming scenario and 28% under a 4oc warming scenario.

Minute No. 79

Local Area Council Work Programme

It be minuted that a request for inclusion of an item in the work programme on the Borderlands development work in Hexham was declined.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the following meetings of Tynedale Local Area Council, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair, subject to the above amendments:

- a) 14 December 2021
- b) 11 January 2022

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Councillor Cessford then vacated the Chair, for Planning Vice-Chair Councillor Scott to chair the development control section of the agenda, as was the arrangement for all Local Area Councils.

84. PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED AT A PLANNING MEETING

The Chair advised members of the procedure which would be followed at the meeting.

85. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The committee was requested 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.

86. 20/03425/FUL

**Development of 9 no. residential dwellings (100% affordable) including associated access, car parking, landscaping and all other ancillary works (amended layout and housing mix)
Land North of Piper Road, Piper Road, Ovingham, Northumberland**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application with the aid of a powerpoint presentation and reported that an additional objection had been received which strongly opposed the development on the grounds of:

- environmental destruction to a well-established old hedgerow, including impact on nesting birds.
- The impact of the noise, disruption and heavy goods relating to these works with such close proximity to local houses was dangerous and effected residents' health and was unacceptable.

Neville Gray spoke on behalf of Ovingham Parish Council and made the following comments:-

- House building in the Green belt was a contentious issue. References to it being a 'rural exception site' which at 9 dwellings was one dwelling less than the maximum allowed. There were already 22 dwelling to the west and other land was available to the east and that possible disaggregation of development to circumvent the NPPF could result in 40 dwellings being built in the Green Belt.
- Conditions 4 to 8 were welcomed but showed that further loss of existing habitat if approval was granted. New hedgerow would take a considerable time to develop and likely 'manicured' and inferior in ecological terms.
- It was recognised that there were fundamental drainage issues on the site and houses fronting Piper Road needed to be raised above the actual site level. The drainage statement from consultants CK21 stated that invert levels had been assumed and that the existing sewer would need to be exposed to confirm the invert level which would determine the finished floor levels. Invert levels had been assumed and the properties fronting Piper Road would be elevated.
- Conditions No. 2 and 28 confirmed that the final elevation of the houses was not currently known. The Parish Council were of the view that the work identified in the CK21 report, and any changes required to drawings and the site plan should have been undertaken in the 17-month period following submission of the application and prior to consideration by committee.
- Detailed technical survey information cast doubt on the JDDK architect's cross sections and showed that the new 2 storey dwellings fronting Piper Road would be significantly elevated and higher than existing houses opposite and to the west. For this reason, they had objected to the site

layout and had requested that only bungalows should front Piper Road on the south side.

- Mobility issues and access to properties raised above street level had not been addressed within the officer's report.
- The height of the 2-storey houses would be out of keeping with the street scene viewed from the road and footpaths.
- They did not agree with the comment in paragraph 7.47 of the report that heights would be satisfactory under policy GD2.
- These matters could only be properly addressed when the actual site and floor levels were known. Making condition no 28 retrospective removed the ability of the committee to properly scrutinise the application and should not be approved.
- Careful thought should be given to the location and access to the site compound as this was a concern to many residents of Piper Road and Cherry Burn Land.

Ms. S. Ferguson represented the applicant and spoke in support of the application. She wished to highlight the following key points to be taken into consideration in the determination of the application:-

- All of the dwellings were to be provided as affordable housing and would form an extension to the neighbouring affordable housing site. That scheme had successfully provided homes to 20 families who might otherwise have been forced to live outside the area in which they had grown up.
- The development addressed the identified affordable housing need within Ovingham and the adjoining parishes of Ovington and Horsley. This had been confirmed through a housing needs survey completed for Ovingham and the surrounding parishes, consultation with local registered providers to establish an evidenced demand and Northumberland Homefinder data. Extensive discussions had been held with the Housing Enabling Officer to ensure the housing mix and tenure met the need of the area and had resulted in amendments to the housing mix.
- The affordable housing would directly contribute to the sustainability of local services and facilities of the village. Supporting small scale developments in rural villages was important to ensure their services and communities were sustained in the long-term.
- Alternative sites had been examined through sequential analysis and a review of the 2019 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). There were no other available or suitable sites to deliver the affordable housing. Also, there were no current alternative sites within Ovingham, Horsley or Ovington with planning permission providing any element of affordable housing to satisfy the identified need. This was confirmed within the officer's report at paragraph 7.29.
- The proposed development allowed for the provision of affordable housing in an acceptable location adjoining an existing affordable housing scheme with no visual harm. There should be assurance that the proposed affordable housing meets the tests and was acceptable within the Green Belt.

- With regard to concerns regarding ground levels and proposed layout, the site had been designed to continue and reflect the form of development of the existing adjoining housing. The layout and scale had been found to be acceptable and the report confirmed that it would not result in significant or harmful impacts on existing residents. It was a good quality design with standards as high or better than private housing would be. An acceptable drainage strategy and ecological mitigation measures were provided and confirmed through consultation by the lead Local Flood Authority and county ecologist, contrary to the objections raised.
- The development complied with local and national planning policy and constituted a rural exception which was appropriate in the Green Belt. The development would bring no harm but deliver substantial benefits for local people in need of housing.

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

- Exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt included limited affordable housing for local community need. This was in line with the development plan policy. As there was an identified need and it was deemed to be acceptable in terms of character, well related, immediately adjoining an existing settlement. It was therefore considered to be an acceptable site.
- As the Tynedale Local Plan Policy referred to alternative provision, the applicant had been asked to consider these. Ovingham was constrained by Green Belt and there were no alternative sites. There were no forthcoming allocations or sites available in the SHLAA. There was also a change in emphasis and assessment of alternative sites was no longer explicitly stated in the NPPF or the emerging policy.
- Current identified housing need was a key aspect in the definition of a rural exception site and advice had been sought from Housing Enabler Officers to confirm that there was an identified need and the adjoining affordable housing development had been taken into account. This would also need to be confirmed any other sites which would be assessed on their own merits.
- The adjacent affordable housing site had been considered in a similar manner against similar policies assessing the provision of limited affordable housing, which did not specify a set number of units.
- Officers had sought to retain as much of the hedge as possible along Piper Road and landscaping conditions sought replacement planting around the boundary of the site in mitigation for the hedging being removed. Officers would liaise with the Council's ecologists regarding the mix of plants and suitability of that proposed.
- Standard wording within Section 106 agreements regarding local connection criteria included a cascading system for local, next parish, Northumberland. This was regardless of whether it was a rural exception site.
- Condition no. 28 was normally included when further information was required on levels or where there was a sloping site. Information on indicative levels had been provided and were dependent on further

drainage works and investigations. Given the layout, relationship with adjoining properties, the separation distance between the properties on the opposite side of the road which were much greater than the minimum distance of 25 metres normally required between the rear elevations of 2-storey properties, officers were satisfied that the levels would be acceptable and would be reviewed by planning officers before being discharged.

- The results of the drainage investigation works and details submitted for any discharge of conditions would be uploaded to the Planning Public Access system following an assessment by officers and available to interested persons to view.
- Phase 1 had been built in 2016 and had coincided with the construction of a flood alleviation scheme which consisted of a large ditch and bund to the north of the development which conveyed water away to the east and the River Tyne. Those measures would remain for phase 2 and conditions were included in relation to that.
- The uncertainty regarding levels related to the proposal for a new foul water sewer which would be located under a water course and the surface water sewer from phase 1. They were therefore confident that a gravity fall system could be constructed from phase 1 to phase 2 in the east and were not concerned regarding raised ground levels at this stage.
- Local need had been identified via a housing needs assessment undertaken by the applicant which considered the general housing need for the area for affordable rented and forms of ownership which identified a need for Ovingham and surrounding parishes. The Housing Enabler Officer had also reviewed applicants on Northumberland Homefinder for Ovingham only and then Ovingham and surrounding parishes which influenced the change in tenure and house types. Other registered providers had also been contacted. Information from Karbon Homes, who operated phase 1, had been similar to the Council's Homefinder data. Housing need could change over time.
- The housing needs assessment had been similar to the exercise undertaken by the Council in Haltwhistle and Rothbury which had been carried out by specialist consultants. This considered house prices and income of residents in the area to assess what people could afford, current stock and tenure types before coming to a conclusion. This was reviewed by officers who also considered current building commitments within the SHLAA. They had concluded that there was a residual need for units in the Ovingham village and surrounding parishes.
- Prudhoe had been excluded from the housing needs survey in Ovingham. Units on the Prudhoe hospital site were to be affordable rented and discounted market value. However, officers had concluded there was a residual housing need for the area as a whole.
- 2 bedroom bungalows had been requested as above a certain age, the Universal Credit (UC) under occupation cap did not apply which would enable residents to receive full housing benefit element for UC. Applicants over the age of 55 were eligible for a bungalow under the Council's housing allocations policy. 2 bedroom bungalows were preferred by registered providers as they found them easier to let and could be rented by individuals who required live in support.

- The grade of agricultural land was unknown and had not been a material consideration for phase 1.
- Detailed plans had not been received regarding the cycle parking and was not understood to be a covered shed or storage area, although there would be sufficient space within the plots.

Councillor Stewart proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions contained in the officer's report and completion of a Section 106 agreement.

This was seconded by Councillor Dale who enquired about the addition of conditions regarding the cascading of local connection criteria and use of established plants of 2.5/3 feet in the replacement hedgerow.

The Solicitor reported that an additional condition regarding the cascading of local connection criteria was not required as it was included as standard wording within Section 106 agreements.

The Development Management Area Manager (West) reminded members that conditions needed to be reasonable and necessary and queried whether a specific condition was required with regard to the size of hedgerow plants to make the application acceptable? It was suggested that Condition No. 4 could be amended to include reference to the size of plants and read "...including a planting schedule setting out species, size, numbers, densities and locations,".

Councillors Dale and Stewart agreed with the suggested amendment to Condition no. 4.

It was noted that there was little climate change mitigation within the development and a suggestion that the applicant be required to install an EV charger at each unit and that the cycle parking be fully secure or covered was debated by Members. The Local Area Council was asked to consider whether the addition of condition requiring an EV charger, and secure or covered cycle parking were reasonable and necessary to make the application acceptable.

In answer to a question, it was confirmed that all applications were considered on their merits and the inclusion of a condition on this application would not set a precedent on other applications.

Both Councillors Stewart and Dale agreed to amend the proposal to include an EV charger for each dwelling.

Other members were of the view that although EC chargers were laudable, as it was not currently a policy requirement, queried whether it could be defended at appeal and should be included.

Alternatively, the Development Management Area Manager (West) suggested that the installation of EV chargers could be included as an informative.

Councillors Stewart and Dale agreed to the latter suggestion and that the inclusion of EV chargers be removed from the motion.

The Solicitor confirmed that as Councillors Faires-Aitken and Kennedy had not been present at the commencement of the item, they would not be able to participate in the vote.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** permission for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report, amendment of condition no 4 as set out below and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure 100% affordable housing provision on the site and a financial contribution to sport and play provision:

“04. Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, a detailed landscaping scheme showing both hard and soft landscaping proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the planting of not less than 80 metres of locally native hedging of local provenance, including a planting schedule setting out species, **size**, numbers, densities and locations, the provision of all new boundary treatments, the creation of areas of hardstanding, pathways, etc., areas to be seeded with grass, and other works or proposals for improving the appearance of the development.

The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings not later than the expiry of the next planting season (November – March inclusive) following commencement of the development, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To maintain and protect the landscape value of the area and to enhance the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with the provisions of Policies GD2, NE37 and H32 of the Tynedale Local Plan, Policy NE1 of the Tynedale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.”

87. 21/03104/FUL

Construction of a first floor rear garden room extension with balcony and external staircase

Saxby House, Station Road, Corbridge, NE45 5AY

The Development Management Area Manager (West) introduced the application with the aid of a powerpoint presentation and advised that there were no updates following publication of the report.

Mrs. M. Williams, the applicant, spoke in support of the application and made the following comments:-

- At the previous meeting Members had agreed that there were very special circumstances in relation to their situation. The house needed to be made more resilient to flooding to provide space upstairs for them to live and ensure that they were not displaced, as had happened in the last 2 floods.

- Officers were still recommending refusal. A request to meet and discuss proposals on site and explain why it could not be accommodated elsewhere had been refused.
- The reference in paragraph 7.14 which stated that an alternative location for the extension would not be considered by the applicant was untrue. The planner's suggestion that it would be better accommodated at the other side of the house, would be less visible from the approach and no problems with overlooking, if there were no windows. Photographs had been sent to show the impact on neighbours. This would have resulted in the access looking directly into the neighbour's kitchen windows and would have been a violation of their privacy. They had spoken to their neighbours who had confirmed that they would have objected. The neighbours had no objections to the current proposal, neither did the parish council.
- Two different designs had been sent to the officers, but they had not liked either. The design which matched the rest of the property's traditional stone exterior and character had been submitted.
- Conditions for one way glass and installation of blinds to reduce light pollution would be accepted.
- They disagreed with the content of the officer's email which suggested that from Members comments at the last meeting, they would not want to see any openings on the end elevation. This email had inferred that they could build along the lines proposed if the design was right i.e. no windows on the field side. Plans had been drawn but had looked ugly and closed in and had not been a good design.
- The committee were reminded of the reason for the extension, namely that the applicants wished to live in it if they flooded. Flooding had a profound effect on mental health, increased anxiety and clinical depression. Themselves and their neighbours had suffered from despair and misery with 30% of the community suffering from PTSD after the second flood in 2015. From experience they would need to live in the extension for a year at a time as it had taken that long to reinstate the house on the previous occasions.
- The back of our house faced east, and they lost the sun at midday. An extension on the north gable with no windows would be very dark, especially in winter when light was limited and would not be helpful to their stress and mental health trying to sort the house. Good daylight in housing had been shown to play a large part in overall attitude, satisfaction and the well-being of occupants.
- They did not understand why they were not allowed windows when the house across the field had an extension with two windows. It was also prominent on the approach to the village.
- Floor plans showed how the internal layout would work and brought their scheme in line with the nearby house which had been raised to protect the occupants against flooding. They were effectively doing the same thing to allow themselves enough room to remain living on the first floor with a temporary kitchen in a former bathroom which had the plumbing provision needed.

- The proposed building would only require small changes to remain living in the house with a small living area (the extension) and some outdoor space and access.
- They had attempted to provide a compromise that would also work for them; however, it was clear that it would not be supported by officers. Members were asked if they could support the application given the circumstances and that they had previously agreed there were very special circumstances.

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

- Officers had not felt it necessary to hold a meeting on site as they had visited the site previously and had sufficient information. They had offered to meet virtually using Teams.
- Officers had suggested that removal of the windows from the most prominent side elevation might help Members make a decision, not that officers would support the application if the windows had been removed. This was due to the impact of the windows both looking out and inwards.
- The Development Management Area Manager (West) was not familiar with the property on the other side of the field and did not have the details with her as it had only been raised at the meeting. The impact of the windows on this application needed to be assessed.
- Officers had recommended that the application be refused due to the forms, scale and massing of the proposed extension, and not specifically the inclusion of windows. Out of the alternative designs put forward by the applicant, officers had suggested that the smaller more traditional windows would be better in this more traditional property. Members had discussed at the previous meeting the impact of large openings and the impact of light in the evening which would make the extension more prominent and intrusive.
- Whilst there had been considerable debate as to whether there were very special circumstances when this application had been considered in December, the application had been deferred and the matter had to be considered afresh. As the property had been significantly extended previously, the proposals could not be classed as a limited extension in the Green Belt and therefore the development would be inappropriate. A second reason for refusal related to the design. Anything could warrant very special circumstances if the information provided was sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Although there had been no vote, from the discussion at the last meeting, Members appeared to support there being very special circumstances if other matters were resolved satisfactorily. A decision on this application that there were very special circumstances would not set a precedent on other applications as each was considered on its own merits. Officers had concluded that the information did not constitute very special circumstances which outweighed the harm to the Green Belt, although Members could arrive at a different conclusion.

Councillor Horncastle proposed that the application be granted, contrary to the officer's recommendation that the application be refused, and that the wording of conditions be delegated authority to the Director of Planning with the agreement of the Chair. This was seconded by Councillor Riddle. The reasons for this were that the very special circumstances put forward by the applicant in terms of the impact to them from earlier flooding and the extension would enable the applicants to live in the property would constitute very special circumstances which outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

Councillor Dale stated that she had not been at the meeting when this application had been discussed previously and did not feel that she could participate in the decision. The Solicitor stated that she had been provided with a copy of the report, had the opportunity to listen to the presentation and ask questions and could vote. However, if she was uncomfortable then she would be able to abstain.

Upon being put to the vote the results were as follows: -

FOR: 7; AGAINST: 4; ABSTENTION: 1.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** permission for the reason and that the wording of conditions to be delegated authority to the Director of Planning with the agreement of the Chair.

Councillor Horncastle left the meeting at 5.50 p.m.

88. PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE

The report provided information on the progress of planning appeals.

In answer to a question, the Development Management Area Manager (West) agreed to obtain an update on the enforcement appeals at Whittonstall.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

On the conclusion of the above items, Councillor Scott vacated the Chair. Councillor Cessford returned to the Chair and continued the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5.50 p.m. until 6.00 p.m.

89. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN PROGRAMME 2022-23

The Local Area Council received a report which set out the draft Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme for 2022-23 for consideration and comment prior to final approval of the programme by the Interim Executive Director of Planning and Local Services in consultation with the Cabinet Members for

Environment and Local Services. (A copy of the report is enclosed with the signed minutes).

The Service Director – Local Services reported that final confirmation from Department for Transport funding was awaited; but a programme totalling nearly £23.5 million had been assumed, based on the allocation received the previous year and an informal indication.

The programme was split across four keys areas and had been devised following a review of the maintenance needs of the highways asset, identified road safety issues, potential improvements to the highway and transport network, and following consultation with Town and Parish Councils along with Local Ward Members, to identify local priorities. Appendices A – D set out the details of the programme. This included:

£1.3 million Walking and Cycling
£2.1 million Safety Improvements
£15.275 million Road Maintenance
£4.7 million Bridges, Structures and Landslips

He highlighted the following:

- The walking and cycling allocation was split between improvements for crossings, footways, bus stop waiting areas and maintenance of footways, cycleways and the rights of way network. An additional £1.5 million was proposed within the capital programme for the development and delivery of cycling and walking schemes within the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans which covered the main towns. Suggestions which were beyond the LTP programme had been captured separately and would be considered in the future if sources of funding became available.
- The Integrated Transport Improvement Funding concentrated on safety at high-risk sites and included traffic management activity, speed reduction schemes and completion of the 20mph school programme. 107 out of 161 of the 20mph schemes had been implemented to date, 10 issued for construction and 44 at the design stage. Other works included replacement of signs and road markings, road maintenance and capital repairs to the infrastructure. An additional £2million had been proposed within the capital programme for investment in U and C roads and footways.
- Strengthening bridges in Tynedale included C279 at Blue Gables, C205 at Middleburn and U8177 at Garden House and 2 landslips schemes at U5034 Blindburn and A686 north of Lightburks. A major scheme of £9.3 million over the next 2 financial years was proposed to resolve the longstanding landslip at Todstead.

The following information was provided in response to questions:

- It was confirmed that the £1.5 million proposed in the capital programme for the delivery of cycling and walking schemes was in addition to the £1.3 million LTP allocation.

- 20 mph flashing signs were advisory where implemented for 1-hour periods for school opening and closures and could not be enforced by the police. Permanent limits were enforceable.

Members made the following comments:

- It was important that cycling and walking infrastructure was improved across the county, not just the main towns.
- There was disappointment that recently renewed road markings, paid for from Members Local Improvement Schemes had worn away quickly; these should be renewed regularly.
- More funding was required to address rural road safety issues than the £175,000 allocation.
- Hexham Town Council were keen to pilot a scheme which implemented a uniform 20mph across the whole town. The Services Director – Local Services explained that there were safety concerns regarding a blanket approach across an entire area as the speed limit needed to be commensurate with the road conditions as it could be ignored unless there were engineering solutions or control measures. The viability of this was being considered.

The Chair thanked officers involved in the preparation and delivery of the LTP programme.

RESOLVED that:

- a) The report be received and noted.
- b) Members' comments be considered in the finalisation of the LTP Programme for 2022-23.

90. LAND AT MICKLEY SQUARE: APPLICATION FOR LAND TO BE REGISTERED AS TOWN OR VILLAGE GREEN

The report informed the Committee of the Inspector's recommendations as to whether the application to register land at Bewick Green, Mickley Square should be granted and confirmed that it was for Members to determine if the application to register the land should be rejected, as was recommended by the Inspector.

The Senior Manager - Legal Services explained the Council's obligations as a Commons Registration Authority which had been required to process an application received from Mr George Hepburn OBE on 7 January 2019 for the registration of land and Bewick Green, Mickley Square Stocksfield as Village Green.

She reported that a single representation from the Highways Authority had been received and withdrawn when the applicant had agreed to exclude the highway from the application land.

A virtual non statutory Public Inquiry had been held on 3 March 2021 to examine the issues. The burden of proof lay with the applicant and the standard was on the balance of probabilities.

The applicant had not demonstrated sufficient quality of user as the main users were:

- Children playing in the immediate vicinity constituted a limited pool and the use had not been heavy as there were other larger spaces available within the village.
- Dog walkers used the land as a stop off area not as a destination.
- An annual barbeque did not add weight to the sufficiency of user.

The Inspector had concluded that the application must fail because the criteria within Section 15 of the Commons Act 2006 had not been met in that a significant number of local inhabitants had not indulged in lawful sports and pastimes on the land during the relevant 20-year period.

Members supported the recommendation of the Inspector and the intensity of use required to assign Village Green status. It was noted that the area was relatively small.

In answer to a question on the length of the report and duplication, the Senior Manager - Legal Services reported that the Inspector had recommended that the Inquiry bundle be attached to the report. The Democratic Services Officer also confirmed that only participants present at the meeting had been provided with the full set of agenda papers.

Councillor Kennedy moved acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation that the application to register land at Bewick Green, Mickley Square, Stocksfield as Town or Village Green, be rejected. This was seconded by Councillor Stewart and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED that the recommendations of the Inspector, Mr James Marwick, be accepted; namely that the application to register land at Bewick Green, Mickley Square, Stocksfield as Town or Village Green, be rejected.

91. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on Tuesday 11 January 2022 at 4.00 p.m.

CHAIR _____

DATE _____