

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [DC Consultation](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application Consultation 21NP0016 Land south of Gallow Law, Gallow Law, Alwinton, Northumberland, NE65 7BQ  
**Date:** 29 April 2021 16:11:24

---

Dear Colin,

I have had a look at this application and the response from Natural England. I have the following comments:

### **Survey and report**

This was carried out in December, which is not ideal but due to the nature of the site in an improved area of field I think most of the issues will have been identified. There is one issue relating to whether it is ever been a hay field or improved for species diversity as it is mentioned that seed has been added in the past. Since the survey was carried out in December it was not evident. Perhaps this could be clarified? If so we may need details of replacement grassland habitat. I think this would be a good idea to add to the biodiversity net gain proposals anyway.

### **Designated sites**

I think it is unlikely that the development would have a significant impact on River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI even though it is the closest site and immediately south of the proposed boundary. After construction of the buildings water on site will however run off more quickly to the area below as there will be increased hard surfaces. I think some compensation should be made for this and more thought put into the water control over the site and into the marshy grassland below.

Harbottle Moors SAC/SSSI is too distant for there to be a likely significant effect from this development since there are already houses in the village, so it can be screened out and no Habitats Regulations Assessment is needed. I also think it is unlikely that there would be any effect on the Barrow Meadow SSSI.

### **Protected species**

There are no protected species that are likely to be significantly affected if the precautions in the report relating to bats, reptiles, mammals and birds are conditioned and adhered to. My only concern is around potential pollution and disturbance to the water course and marshy grassland just south of the development site (which is within the SSSI boundary). Water voles have not been ruled out adjacent to the site and although they are unlikely on the actual footprint of the scheme as there is no suitable habitat in the field, I think a working methodology should be submitted and approved that assumes they are present, unless they carry out and submit a survey at the correct time of year when signs would be more evident.

### **Water supply and sewerage connection**

I note that they have confirmed connection to the mains water and sewer. I was concerned about this initially with the proximity to the River Coquet SSSI, but am satisfied this is no longer an issue.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain**

The construction of these four houses will result in the loss of pasture/meadow. The mitigation suggested in the ecology report includes integrated features for bats and birds

in the new houses, bat safe roofing membrane and native planting. None of these things are referenced in the Design and Access statement and the only submission was an example of an external sparrow terrace box. I don't think just bird boxes on the outside of the buildings is acceptable mitigation as they could be taken down and won't last long. I think integrated measures for birds and bats in all the new buildings should be conditioned if this is given approval as they are more likely to provide permanent habitat. Examples include bat slates, bricks, cavities, lofts, access to the eaves, and for birds integrated nesting holes in the walls, artificial house martin nests, overhangs for swallows with nesting platforms etc. The ecology report does link to some of these examples but they are not shown on any of the plans or noted in any of the other documents as far as I can see. I suggest at least two measures for bats and two for birds in each house and the inclusion of bat safe membrane.

On the surrounding land more native hedges or improvement of the current ones should be included and native seeding on grassland should be considered. Areas of native tree planting and perhaps a pond or two to the south could also be included as that is also shown as under the same ownership. This could help counteract some of the hard standings and roofs etc. as well as gain. Opportunities for green roofs have not been explored, on for example the garages; this is another measure that could help reduce run-off to surrounding areas.

In summary, although I do not object to the principle of four houses I think the applicant needs to include more features in the application to result in biodiversity net gain and ensure there is no impact on the neighbouring habitats. Until I see this information in the new houses and surrounding land I will object to the plans, but I am happy to discuss details with the applicant. A pollution prevention scheme/methodology should also be submitted taking into account the potential presence of water voles, which should also be protected from disturbance .

If you have any queries please get back in touch

Yours sincerely,  
Gill Thompson

---

**From:** DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>

**Sent:** 18 March 2021 14:42

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Planning Application Consultation 21NP0016 Land south of Gallow Law, Gallow Law, Alwinton, Northumberland, NE65 7BQ

Please see the attached consultation regarding a planning application which has been received by Northumberland National Park Authority. Full details can be viewed at <http://nnpa.planning-register.co.uk/plaPlanningAppDisplay.aspx?AppNo=21NP0016>

---

## DC Consultation | [Development Control Consultation](#)

### **Northumberland National Park Authority**

Tel: Mob:

Officers are expressly required not to make defamatory statements and not to infringe or authorize any infringement of copyright or any other legal right by email communications. Any such communication is contrary to ICT policies and outside the scope of the employment of the individual concerned. Northumberland National Park Authority will not accept any liability in respect of such communication, and the employee responsible will be personally liable for any damages or other liability arising.

---

[Redacted]

Officers are expressly required not to make defamatory statements and not to infringe or authorize any infringement of copyright or any other legal right by email communications. Any such communication is contrary to ICT policies and outside the scope of the employment of the individual concerned. Northumberland National Park Authority will not accept any liability in respect of such communication, and the employee responsible will be personally liable for any damages or other liability arising.