



30 June 2021

*Scanned to
Walter Godfrey 9
Planning*

Re Planning Application 21NP0045

Writing as Clerk to Alwinton Parish Council ('Alwinton PC' or 'the PC') I write to report that the PC met on 28 June 2021 and as part of the usual business, the councillors discussed the above application.

The Parish Council would like to state at the outset that it does not object in principle to a development of this type by the Applicant and have treated the current application (21NP0045) as a 'fresh'/'new' application and make no apology for any duplication of comments after considering historical responses in connection with the Applicant's previous application (18NP0007).

After considering the information on the planning portal, the Parish Council unanimously concluded that it opposes the application (21NP0045). The planning authority will note that the PC opposed the Applicant's previous application (18NP0007). The PC asks that the planning authority notes the PC's prior comments in relation to that application and carries them forward to be included as part of the PC's consultation response on the current application, together with the following additional comments.

The PC notes that some of the key material planning considerations are:

- The principle of the development;
- Design, appearance and impact upon visual amenity;
- Impact upon residential amenity;
- Proposals in the Development Plan
- Highway safety, parking and access;
- Foul drainage and utilities;
- Energy efficiency and renewable energy provision; and
- Any other matters

The application site is located to the eastern side of and at the entrance point to Alwinton village. The planning authority has previously concluded that the previous proposed scheme did not constitute "local needs development". as this relates to new tourism development; the proposed tourist accommodation does not lie within Alwinton, as it is situated on a green field site outside of the village periphery. Any development here impacts visitor's initial visual impression, amenity and character of the village. On that basis, the PC's view is that the proposed location of the development remains unsuitable and set a precedent.

The planning authority has previously stated that a sequential approach to the identification of development sites within settlements is required in order to meet their development needs and optimise the re-use of previously developed land and buildings. Under the authority's policies, policy sites are prioritised in the following order ('types 1-4'):

1. Previously developed land and buildings within the identified settlement;
2. Other suitable sites within the identified settlement;
3. Previously developed land and buildings adjacent to the built-up area of the identified settlement;
4. Other suitable sites adjacent to the built-up area of the identified settlement.

The planning authority have previously concluded that this is a sensible approach and should carry some significant weight when considering the application.

The PC note that the Applicant has previously developed land available for use which lies to the rear (south) of the Rose and Thistle pub (see planning application and permission granted re 19NP0107). The PC comments that the Applicant has not fully considered in its current application or properly explored and discounted development of other locations within types 1-4 and therefore the current application based on the proposed location should be rejected on that basis as an unsuitable location.

The PC notes the altered/new design of the proposed development. This modern 'bungalow' design contrasts with the old building(s) at this end of the village. The PC notes that there is a mix of designs within the village itself at the west end. The proposed development presents as a 3-bedroom bungalow, not a modest, inobtrusive bunkhouse. The design changes as set out offers less visitor accommodation in contrast to the previous application (19NP0107), which is inconsistent with the proposal that it is intended to be used in conjunction with and would be ancillary to the Rose and Thistle in respect of the provision of meals and day-to-day running. This inconsistency is highlighted by virtue of the changed design (external and internal) and the facilities proposed to be provided within the building. It is unclear whether the proposed development is simply to provide sleeping accommodation and parking facilities only, with other functions provided by the existing pub/inn, or to allow visitor self-catering on-site. The latter aspect appears to be supported by the inclusion of an enlarged kitchen area which is more in keeping within a self-catering establishment or permanent residence, than the proposed simple/modest bunkhouse. The PC concludes that the proposal does not represent and is not characteristic of or in common with the intended modest/basic bunkhouse accommodation of the type currently existing within the locality. The PC noted some residents' concern at that current ratio of holiday lets to permanent residences (see appendix).

In addition, the PC notes that the overall size of the proposed site has increased by 27.5% from 737m² to 940m² with proposed vehicle parking for 5 or 6 cars. As a large number of mountain bikers/cyclists arrive by van it is surprising that provision for SWB/MWB and LWB vans does not appear to have been considered with regard to safe access/egress/pedestrians and parking issues. There appears to be further inconsistency regarding the intended use of the development as the application cites both 'domestic' and 'commercial' uses. This needs clarification.

Design, appearance and impact upon visual amenity are important factors to consider. As the proposed development would not now be of such a small scale, it has greater impact on visual amenity of the site and its setting near to the entrance of the village. There are no dimensions on the submitted drawings to show actual ground height of the proposed building in relation to the kerbside level and these should be included. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site would be located adjacent to the village, the proposed development would be highly visible from within the nearby area and on approach. It would be unduly prominent and visually intrusive on approach to or from within the village by virtue of its height/size and location. The removal by the Applicant of several trees from the field hedge increases visual impact on approach to the village. Accordingly, a new ecological site assessment should be carried out and submitted as part of an updated application as there has been loss of tree vegetation and habitat since 2017/2018 and to take into account surface flooding, soakaway location and any ecological impact / risk connected with mains sewer works connection and surface water run-off/flood risk impact on site burn/ditch and consequential run-off to Coquet SSI flows. The last assessment shows as dated in 2018 and is not current.

The PC noted additional inconsistencies in the application which and feel that the following points should be corrected or clarified;

a) building use shown as domestic/commercial – which is it?

b) waste disposal activities within 250m of proposed site have been omitted/inadvertently overlooked (the PC has been made aware that there has been regular burning of waste towards the bottom of the field behind the Rose and Thistle).

Should the planning authority conclude that the development is permitted to go ahead, the Parish Council would insist that the planning conditions relevant to the previous application (18NP0007) by the Applicant still apply and must be retained, inclusive of all and any conditions preventing permanent residential use, environmental/sewage conditions required by the assessor, noise restrictions and mandatory requirement for pre-works by the Applicant or his agent of any method statements/risk assessments deemed necessary by the planning authority.

Clerk



Submitted for and on behalf of Alwinton Parish Council.

Appendix – Holiday Accommodation within the Parish

Bunkhouses: Milkhope
 Deer House
 Clennell (17 beds)
 Barrowmill (Bunk barn)

Self-Catering Beds Available - (96 at present)

 Kidlandlee (22 plus 4 pending planning approval)
 Stonecrop (4)
 Bridge End (4)
 Red Lion (11)
 Hosedon House (9)
 Barrowmill (12)
 Bygate (6)
 Low Alwinton (28)

B&B Rose & Thistle - 3 Rooms
 Clennell Hall – 10 Rooms

Caravan Site & Camp Sites at Clennell Hall

NB: There are just 71 residents on electoral roll.