<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>13/00229/FUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>Proposed residential development comprising 3no. dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Land South West Of 21 Front Street East, Bedlington, Northumberland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Applicant:              | Green Sky Ventures Ltd  
1 Plas Meirion, Trefriw, Conway, Wales  
LL27 0RZ |
| Agent:                  | Mr Walter Ross  
Ross Architectural Consultants, 15 New Road Studio, Leet Street, Coldstream, Berwickshire  
TD12 4BJ |
| Valid Date:             | 14 March 2013 |
| Expiry Date:            | 9 May 2013 |
| Case Officer Details:   | Name: Mrs Judith Murphy  
Job Title: Senior Planning Officer  
Tel No: 01670 622640  
Email: judith.murphy@northumberland.gov.uk |
1. Introduction

1.1 This application is before the South East Area Planning Committee as it is recommended for approval contrary to more than five letters of objection from neighbouring residents, and a letter of objection from West Bedlington Parish Council. It therefore falls outside the scope of the Council’s Officer Scheme of Delegation.

1.2 The application was deferred at the South East Area Planning Committee on 17th September 2013 to allow a Members site visit to take place. The reason for the site visit was to allow Members to look at the car parking proposals on the site and assess any highway implications arising from the development. The site visit took place on Thursday 10th October ahead of the next committee meeting scheduled for 15th October 2013.

1.3 The application was again deferred at Committee on 15th October 2013. A second application for the demolition of an outbuilding in relation to the same site was also presented to Members at that meeting. However, a late representation advised that an application had been made to English Heritage to have the outbuilding listed. It was therefore requested by Members that both applications be deferred until the next meeting of the South East Area Planning Committee to allow the outcome from English Heritage be known and have the two applications considered together thereafter. It was agreed to defer both applications.

1.4 Since this time, other issues have arisen surrounding emergency vehicle access which needed to be resolved before the application could be re-listed on the South East Area Planning Committee agenda. This has taken some time, however these issues have been resolved and both applications can now be considered for determination.

2. Description

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two two-storey dwellings and one bungalow with detached garage on land south west of 21 Front Street, Bedlington, and is approximately 0.29 acres in area.

2.2 It is proposed to create a modest private development of three dwellings which would involve the demolition of an existing stone building. The demolition of this building, by virtue of being located within the Bedlington Conservation Area, requires conservation area consent and this is being considered separately under application ref: 13/00373/CON.

2.3 The design concept has sought to embrace the traditional character of the area in terms of scale, mass and use of materials. The applicant proposes that materials would be sourced locally, where possible, and the build specification would be to a high standard.

2.4 Access to the site would be from the existing right of access driveway over land belonging to 21 Front Street East which would be utilised and extended through the application site. Plots 1 and 2 for the two storey dwellings would each benefit from in-curtilage parking in the form of a driveway and attached/integral garage whilst Plot 3 (bungalow) would benefit from a detached garage. Three visitor parking bays would also be located within the courtyard area of the site.
3. Planning History

Reference Number: 13/00373/Con
Description: Conservation area consent for demolition of existing buildings
Status: Pending Consideration (Considered this agenda)

4. Consultee Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Bedlington Parish Council</th>
<th>Objects on grounds of access for emergency vehicles, provision of services to the new dwellings, impact on the surrounding area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Archaeologist</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Ecologist</td>
<td>No objection subject to conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree And Woodland Officer</td>
<td>No objections subject to conditions for replacement trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Conservation</td>
<td>Original concerns addressed in further submission. No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Authority</td>
<td>No objections subject to conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbrian Water Ltd</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>No response received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>No objections subject to conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Public Responses

Neighbour Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Neighbours Notified</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Objections</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Support</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of General Comments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notices

Site Notice - Affecting Conservation Area, 18th March 2013
Press Notice - News Post Leader, 28th March 2013

Summary of Responses:

Thirty-two letters of objection have been received, several of which have been submitted by the same objectors, raising the following concerns:

- The proposed development is dependent upon an access route over private land and increased use of the access would significantly intrude on the environment of 21 Front Street East;
- There is no vehicle or pedestrian access for refuse facilities;
Winter access from Front Street is already problematic;
There is a risk of compromise to health and safety regarding the entry and egress of both vehicles and pedestrians across the right of way and the rest of the private property;
Additional traffic over the proposed access route will increase noise and disturbance levels to the resident of 21 Front Street East;
Additional traffic will cause major congestion to the area at a point which is already an issue with parking of residents’ vehicles and visitors to the neighbouring bar and restaurant;
Gradient is currently too high at the access point and further traffic should not be encouraged; and
If development went ahead, there would be significant unwanted disturbance and intrusion of privacy to all neighbours;
Emergency access routes.

6. Planning Policy

6.1 National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

6.2 Development Plan Policy

Wansbeck District Local Plan 2007

GP1 - Location of development
GP4 - Accessibility
GP6 - Trees and hedgerows
GP18 - Conservation areas
GP29 - Land contamination
GP30 - Visual impact
GP31 - Urban design
H3 - Windfall housing
H5 - The design and density of new housing developments
T3 - Provision for cyclists
T6 - Traffic implications of new development
T7 - Parking provision in new development
REC7 - Provision by developers
REC8 - Children’s play

6.3 Other Documents/Strategies

Wansbeck’s Supplementary Planning Document - Sport and Play 2009
Wansbeck’s Residential Development Design Guidance 2007

7. Appraisal

7.1 The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to:
Principle of the development
Impact on the surrounding environment and Conservation Area
Highway safety, car parking and emergency access
Impact on neighbouring residents
Sports and play provision

Principle of the development

7.2 It is considered that the relevant policies of the Wansbeck District Local Plan and associated Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) generally align with the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and as such can be afforded appropriate weight in the determination of this application. In respect of applications for new housing development the NPPF advises that proposals should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development encouraging the effective use of brownfield sites. One of the key objectives of the NPPF is to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. These objectives mirror those of the housing policies in the Local Plan and relevant SPDs.

7.3 Local Plan Policy GP1 states that provided proposals are in accordance with other policies in the plan, development on previously developed sites within settlement limits, as defined on the Local Plan proposals map, will be permitted. The application site currently hosts a single storey workshop constructed in 600mm wide stone walls. The demolition of this is the subject of a separate planning application for conservation area consent (ref: 13/00373/CON). As a previously developed site within the defined settlement limit for Bedlington the construction of residential development on this site would accord in principle with Local Plan Policy GP1.

7.4 Policy GP4 of the Local Plan goes on to state that new development should be located to reduce the need to travel and to minimise journey lengths. It should be accessible to all users by a choice of means of transport including buses, walking and cycling. The NPPF fully supports the development of 'deliverable' sites and advises that sustainable development should be approved without delay. The application site is located to the rear of 21 Front Street East, which is the main street running through Bedlington. It therefore benefits from easy access to all local services including shops, community facilities, recreational facilities and public transport, all of within are within a short walking distance. In this respect, the site is considered to be highly sustainable, future occupiers of which would not need to depend on a car to access local services and facilities.

Impact on the surrounding environment and conservation area

7.5 The NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment stating that new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. This is echoed by Policy GP18 of the Local Plan which aims to protect the former Wansbeck District's conservation areas and ensure that all development within a conservation area is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. The policy clearly states that development likely to have an adverse impact on the character of an area will not be permitted.

7.6 The application proposal demonstrates that the design of the three dwellings would take account of their setting within the Bedlington Conservation Area and consideration has been given to the appropriate use of materials and the context of the surrounding environment. The initial comments of the Council's Conservation Officer were taken on board by the applicant and the scheme amended to reflect and
overcome the concerns raised. The amended scheme is therefore considered to be acceptable within the context of the Bedlington Conservation Area.

7.7 The NPPF also requires good design and states that securing high quality and inclusive design is important and proposals should function well to the overall quality of an area for the lifetime of the development. Policy GP30 of the Local Plan advises that all proposed development should add to the character and quality of the surrounding area, whilst Local Plan Policy GP31 supports this by stating that proposed developments should promote character, encourage accessibility and establish local identity. It is considered that the amended scheme achieves all of the objectives of the NPPF and Local Plan in this respect and is acceptable both as an independent scheme and as a scheme demonstrating connections to the conservation area that it would form a part of. The proposal therefore complies with the design objectives of the NPPF and Local Plan Policies GP30 and GP31.

Highway safety and car parking

7.8 The application site is located on land to the rear of 21 Front Street East in Bedlington. The access to the site is directly off Front Street East and runs alongside No. 21 into the site. Although the access is owned by the owner of 21 Front Street, the applicant owns the application site and has a right of access over this access route. There is some concern over the proposal from the owner of 21 Front Street which will be addressed later in the report. Policy T6 of the Local Plan states that when planning applications are being determined, the volume and character of traffic likely to be generated by, and attracted to, the proposed development will be considered. It advises that proposals will only be permitted if the existing highway network is adequate to cope with any additional traffic resulting from the development; the proposed arrangements for access and egress will allow for the safe and efficient movement of vehicles; internal circulation arrangements will be able to absorb vehicular traffic entering the site without queues forming on existing roads; and adequate provision is made for servicing and deliveries. Similarly, Local Plan Policy T7 requests developers to make appropriate provision within their developments for parking whilst taking account of road safety and environmental problems.

7.9 In relation to this proposal, the Highways Authority raised some initial concerns over vehicle manoeuvrability within the site. However, the applicant has revised the scheme in light of the Highways Authority’s comments and no subsequent objection has been raised. The Highways Authority has advised that the scheme would not now present a potentially detrimental impact on highway safety in the area, has sufficient parking and manoeuvring space within the site, and adequate geometry to accommodate the amount of trips that would potentially be generated by the scheme. The Highways Authority has added conditions to be included to any permission given, and provided these are complied with, there are no concerns with the access route into the development site. It is therefore considered that the revised scheme complies with Policies T6 and T7 of the Local Plan.

Emergency vehicles

7.10 The emergency access is proposed to lead off Towers Close, specifically no. 30. No. 30 is owned by the applicant and the intention is to widen the existing driveway to 3.7m and lengthen it to 20m. The extension of a driveway can be carried out under householder permitted development rights therefore planning
permission would not be required for this part of the proposal. Leading off from the vehicular route, a 1.2m wide footpath would be constructed which would link the driveway to the three new dwellings. A condition has been attached regarding the need to keep the footpath free from bushes, fences, hedges or any other obstacles.

7.11 A Northumberland County Council Fire Officer has reviewed and discussed the proposal with the agent. The Fire Officer has since submitted his confirmation that he is satisfied that the fire engine can access the driveway to No. 30 Towers Close in a forward direction and all equipment can reach within 45 m of all parts within the proposed dwellinghouses in the event of a fire.

7.12 The objections raised by neighbouring residents surrounding the emergency access have been fully considered. As mentioned, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has no control or influence over works that constitute permitted development in accordance with Class F of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008. It is accepted that vehicles may be parked on the driveway to no.30 on the rare occasion that a fire engine may need to gain access. This has been discussed with the Fire Officer who advised that such events arise on regular occasions and Fire Officers are trained to deal with such circumstances. He confirmed that he would not object to the proposal on the basis that vehicles may park on the driveway. It is therefore considered, on balance, that the provision for emergency access vehicles is acceptable.

Impact on neighbouring residents

7.13 A number of objections have been received to the proposal from nearby residents. Policy H5 of the Local Plan identifies the need for new housing developments to be well designed, ensuring that residents will enjoy reasonable standards of privacy, outlook and daylight and that the new development will relate well to its surroundings. Whilst this is directed towards standards within a new development, it is equally important in considering a new proposal that existing residents would not lose a significant degree of privacy, outlook or daylight as a direct result of a new development.

7.14 As mentioned above, there is an outstanding issue regarding the access route into the site. This is owned by the resident and owner of 21 Front Street, however the applicant as owner of the land to the rear has a right of access which is also intended to be utilised by the prospective residents of the new development. Unfortunately, this is not a material planning consideration and is a civil matter that would need to be resolved between the land owners involved. Whilst the Highways Authority is satisfied with the proposal from a highway safety, access and manoeuvrability perspective (subject to conditions), and whilst planning permission could be granted for the development, this would not override the right of access issues. If these cannot be resolved between the respective parties, potentially the development could not go ahead or an alternative means of access to the site would need to be found.

7.15 With regard to refuse collection, bins would need to be brought down to the double gates at the access to the site for collection. This has been confirmed by a member of the Council’s Waste Management team and the bins would be emptied routinely as part of its refuse service.
With regards to the comments raised about problematic access to the site in winter, it is understood that many existing residents use the access lane located directly in front of the dwellings at Millfield Court and need to negotiate the relatively steep gradient from Front Street East. However, this is a historic issue that is common to all of the residents along this stretch of housing and would not be created as a consequence of, or exacerbated by, the introduction of the three proposed new dwellings. Furthermore, the Highways Authority has not raised this as an issue in their assessment of the scheme.

In relation to the objections surrounding potential increased noise and congestion from the additional traffic generated by the development, this needs to be considered in the context of existing traffic and noise levels in the area. Front Street East is the main road running through Bedlington and is therefore continuously busy with cars, lorries, vans and pedestrians. It is recognised that the area currently experiences high volumes of parked cars along the access road which are both residents’ vehicles and visitors to the neighbouring restaurant and bar. However, the three dwellings being proposed would have adequate parking provision and visitor parking within the confines of the site and therefore residents and visitors would have no need to park along the access road. The only increase existing residents may notice would be additional vehicles accessing the new development. However, the impact of this would be negligible when taken in context with the existing traffic movements on a daily basis around this area and it is anticipated that any additional vehicle movements would go largely unnoticed.

In terms of the privacy issues raised, this refers back to the points raised in paragraph 7.13 above. However, the proposed dwellings would be orientated in such a way as to reduce any impact on adjacent residents in terms of privacy and overlooking and all separation distances between the new and existing dwellings would be met. It is therefore considered that these concerns are unfounded.

Since this proposal was last before Members, a further concern has been submitted by an objector regarding site boundary issues. These were also mentioned during discussions at the Members’ site visit.

The issues raised have been investigated by the case officer with the agent who has confirmed that all formal documentation in relation to site boundaries has been checked and the agent has verified these to be accurate and correct to the best of his knowledge. This has been relayed to the objector and further advice has been offered surrounding boundary issues. Similarly, it has been raised in the objections that there is a covenant in place within Towers Close to prevent through traffic. Again, this is outwith planning control and is a civil matter.

When a planning application is received the Local Planning Authority has to trust that all of the information is accurate and correct unless it can be clearly demonstrated with evidence that discrepancies exist. In this case all documentation has been re-checked regarding the site boundary issues and no further concerns have arisen. On this basis the LPA can continue to determine the application. However, if the applicant has proposed to develop land that is outwith their ownership, they cannot develop without the owner’s permission. The fact that planning permission may be in place does not preclude that. Whilst the boundary issues may remain, the matter would need to be addressed on a personal/civil level between the respective parties involved.
Sports and play provision

7.22 In line with Policies REC7 and REC8 of the Local Plan, and the former Wansbeck District Council’s SPD on sports and play facilities, the applicant has been requested to enter into a financial obligation with the Council in relation to off-site sports and play provision. This contribution would help secure the updating, upgrading and future maintenance of sports and play facilities within the local area where such provision cannot be accommodated on the site. The Section 106 planning obligation necessary to secure the requisite financial contribution is currently being finalised between the Council and the applicants.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The NPPF fully advocates new housing development and particularly so in sustainable locations. As detailed within this report, the site is considered to be highly sustainable and constitutes previously developed land on which the NPPF encourages the construction of new dwellings. In this respect, the principle of the development fully complies with the objectives of the NPPF and relevant policies of the Wansbeck District Local Plan.

8.2 The proposal would bring a redundant brownfield site back into use and all initial concerns with the proposal have been addressed. The scheme is considered to be acceptable from a highways perspective, in terms of its design in the context of the Bedlington Conservation Area, and in terms of its potential impact on neighbouring residents. The application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions and the successful completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure an appropriate financial contribution towards off-site sports and play facilities.

9. Recommendation

That Members be minded to GRANT PERMISSION subject to the completion of a Section 106 planning obligation to secure an appropriate financial contribution towards the provision and maintenance of off-site sports and play facilities and subject to the conditions listed below.

Conditions

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

02. Notwithstanding the details contained within the planning application, prior to the commencement of development a full schedule of materials including brick/stone, tiles/slates, windows, quoins and rainwater goods and, where appropriate, samples of materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be constructed in the approved materials.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the character of the conservation area.
03. No work shall commence on the development site until the access route from Front Street to the site has been resurfaced in accordance with details and specification that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall be fully implemented as approved thereafter.

Reason: In order to achieve a satisfactory form of development having regard to highway safety.

04. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until the driveway to no. 30 Towers Close has been extended, as shown on Drawing no.1 Revision I, to provide emergency access to the proposed new dwellings.

Reason: In order to achieve a satisfactory form of development having regard to highway safety.

05. The area allocated for parking and manoeuvring on the submitted plan shall be properly consolidated, surfaced and drained before the use commences and shall not be used other than for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate space within the site for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles clear of the highway.

06. No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall provide for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; wheel washing and/or road cleaning facilities. The approved statement shall be implemented and complied with during and for the life of the works associated with the development.

Reason: In order to achieve a satisfactory form of development having regard to highway safety.

07. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until a scheme showing the footpath linking the vehicular emergency access and the new dwellings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be kept clear of bushes, fences and any other forms of obstruction at all times and the submitted scheme shall also include an annual monitoring schedule to ensure the footpath is kept clear of such obstruction at all times. The scheme shall be implemented as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the emergency access route is kept free from obstruction at all times.

08. Details of cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall be installed in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for cyclists visiting the site.

09. No construction works or deliveries to the site in connection with the development hereby approved, and no noisy activity audible at the site boundary,
shall be carried out other than between the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday, 8.00 am to 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

10. No development shall take place unless in accordance with the mitigation detailed within the protected species report ('21, Front Street, Bedlington - Proposed Development Bat & Barn Owl Report - Summer 2012' Ruth Hadden, September 2012) and as shown on the architect's plans ('Plot 3 Garage Proposals' Ross Architectural Consultants, Drawing No.5, Revision A, December 2012) including adherence to timing restrictions (demolition works to avoid bat hibernation period - November to March inclusive); adherence to precautionary working methods and Method Statement; provision of eaves level bat crevice (as specified) on the south side of the detached garage; adherence to external lighting recommendations; use of 'bat friendly' timber treatments (as specified); any internal roof space water tanks to be covered. In the event that development does not start before 3rd September 2014 then an updating bat survey must be undertaken with any resulting amended mitigation or avoidance measures to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before development begins.

Reason: To maintain the favourable conservation status of protected species.

11. No demolition shall be undertaken between 1 March and 31 August unless an ecologist has first confirmed that no bird's nests that are being built or are in use, eggs or dependent young will be damaged or destroyed.

Reason: To protect nesting birds, all species of which are protected by law.

12. No development shall commence until a plan detailing suitable tree species to be planted as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be included as part of the landscaping scheme referred to in condition 13 below.

Reason: To mitigate the loss of trees as a result of the development.

13. Notwithstanding the details contained within the planning application, no development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; hard surfacing materials, design and colour; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the character of the conservation area.

14. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, designs, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary
treatment shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

15. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a scheme to deal with any contamination of land or pollution of controlled waters has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and until the measures approved in that scheme have been implemented. The scheme shall include all of the following measures unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirement in writing:

a) A desk-top study carried out to identify and evaluate all potential sources of contamination and the impacts on land and/or controlled waters, relevant to the site. The desk-top study shall establish a 'conceptual site model' and identify all plausible pollutant linkages. Furthermore, the assessment shall set objectives for intrusive site investigation works/Quantitative Risk Assessment (or state if none required). Two full copies of the desk-top study and a non-technical summary shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority without delay upon completion.

b) If identified as being required following the completion of the desk-top, a site investigation shall be carried out to fully and effectively characterise the nature and extent of any land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters. It shall specifically include a risk assessment that adopts the Source-Pathway-Receptor principle, in order that any potential risks are adequately assessed taking into account the site's existing status and proposed new use. Two full copies of the site investigation and findings shall be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority without delay upon completion.

c) Thereafter, a written method statement detailing the remediation requirements for the land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters affecting the site shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and all requirements shall be implemented and completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority. If during redevelopment contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing the scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

d) Two full copies of a full closure report shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall provide verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the closure report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met.

Reason: To ensure that any contaminants within the site are dealt with in an appropriate manner to afford protection to the public, the buildings and the environment and in accordance with Policy GP29 of Wansbeck District Local Plan.

16. No development shall commence until details of protective measures, including the use of a heavy-duty membrane to prevent the ingress of land gases have been
submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The dwellings shall not be occupied unless the approved measures have been incorporated into the construction of the building.

Reason: In order to prevent any accumulation of oxygen deficient air which may potentially be prejudicial to the amenity of the occupants of the respective properties.

17. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans. The approved plans for this development are:-

1. Site Layout Plan Drawing No. 1 REV I Dated May 2012
2. Site Location Plan Received 6 November 2013
3. Design Proposals Plot 1 Drawing No. 2 REV C Dated May 2012
4. Design Proposals Plot 2 Drawing No. 3 REV C Dated May 2012
5. Plot 3 (Bungalow type) Drawing No. 4 REV D Dated December 2012
6. Plot 3 Garage Proposals Drawing No. 5 REV A Dated December 2012

Reason: To ensure that the approved development is carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans.

Background Papers: Planning application file(s) 13/00229/FUL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.T. Bryce</td>
<td>28 Towers Close Bedlington Northumberland NE22 5ER</td>
<td>See attached copy of correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien Mather</td>
<td>248 Prince Rupert Drive Aylesbury HP19 9DJ</td>
<td>We object to the proposed development on a number of ‘planning issues’ as suggested in guidance issued by Northumberland County Council.  &lt;br&gt; Government Planning Policies  &lt;br&gt; o We feel that Planning Office Professionals are best able to make this comparison if given accurate and detailed information. Please see our list of possible inaccuracies within the submitted application by the developers in our ‘Other Information’ section at the end of this objection.  &lt;br&gt; o The points raised in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Bedlington CAMS SPD (2011) regarding the demolition of the stable as detailed in a separate submitted objection. Ref 13/00373/CON  &lt;br&gt; Other Planning Policies  &lt;br&gt; o No objection at this time  &lt;br&gt; Existing use of a building/land and previous planning decisions related to it  &lt;br&gt; o With regards a previous planning application for a single dwelling in 1978 (withdrawn 1979), correspondence from the Chief Engineer to the Chief Planning Officer is available stating that satisfactory access will require to be provided. The CPO wrote to the then applicant (ref WHG/EG/78/F/421) stating that they could not recommend planning permission where vehicular access would be onto Front Street and shared with the owner of 21 Front Street East (see attachments 1A &amp; 1B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existing use of the proposed development site is referred to in the planning application as commercial use. The existing use is an untended garden belonging to the owners of 30 Towers Close.

The layout and siting of the development is dependent upon an access route over private land. There is a Court defined Right of Way (shown on PDF attachment and photograph attachment 3, showing the actual area roped as an approximate outline) but there are no ownership, development, modification, improvement or enhancement rights by the applicants. The issues that arise from the access concerns are listed below:

1. There is a Court determined width of access route over the land belonging to the owner of 21 Front Street East.
2. There is no right to extend or modify the access route or any aspect of it, including gates from Front Street which belong to the owner of 21 Front Street East. Full ownership rights are reserved.
3. The increase use of the access for the proposed development will intrude significantly on the environment of 21 Front Street East.
4. Access could impact on emergency and service vehicular access.
5. Current access is through gates that are owned by 21 Front Street East and increased use for the proposed new development may have a diverse affect on security.
6. There is no vehicle or pedestrian access for refuge facilities.
7. Winter access from Front Street is problematic during inclement weather and there are times when weather prevents all vehicular access.
8. There is a risk of compromise to Health and Safety and incidents regarding the entry and egress of both vehicles and pedestrians across both the Right of Way and the rest of the private property and also on the crossing of the public footpath outside.
The impact of a building on adjacent properties

- The use of the access route for an increased number of vehicles will impact on the safety of residents and visitors to 21 Front Street East as there may be children and/or animals on the property and safety is paramount.
- Open gates will affect the safety of the premises, owner, family and visitors.
- Above issues affect the privacy at 21 Front Street East.
- Additional traffic over the proposed access route will increase noise and disturbance levels at 21 Front Street East.
- Proposed access for development will impact on increased congestion to minor road towards The Millfield slip road onto Front Street and ‘Residents Access’ only road past Vicarage Terrace. (see attachment 2)

Impact on development of existing amenities
- As identified above

Impact on protected features
- No objection at this time

Other Information which may be helpful to Planning Officers

Planning Application Form
- A number of inaccuracies and assumptions appear to have been submitted

- Section 4 has contradictory and potentially confusing address entry, with inaccuracies as to the description of the site. The site is not unused and has been the extended garden use for 30 Towers Close for over 30 years.
- Section 6 suggests that a new or altered vehicular access is proposed to or from the public highway. Access is only permitted over an area specifically detailed and outlined by a court agreed Right of Way.
o Section 7 waste storage and collection. There is no designated collection point on the plans and pick up from the entrance for potentially 4 properties (including 21 Front Street East) will obstruct the access route as well as the highway/pavement access.

o Section 9 the access road is owned by 21 Front Street East and remains within control of the landowner with regard to the surface dressing.

o Section 10 lists parking for 6 vehicles. The use of the access route by these additional vehicles is excessive for the nature of the current access.

o Section 11 the developer is suggesting connection to the existing private drainage system, however there is no reference as required to any details of the existing system or references for plans or drawings.

o Section 14 the existing use of the proposed site is garden and has been so for 30+ years during the ownership of the developers’ family.

o Section 30 the owner of 21 Front Street East should be included in notification of site visits that require a duration of stay on the access route, as it is then not being used solely for the purpose of accessing the proposed development site it serves.

With reference to the Design and Access Statement, we note that:

o Section 2 the postcode entered is incorrect.

o Section 5 see section 6 of the Planning Application Form points above.

o Section 6 the proposed connection of drains is via the private drains belonging to 21 Front Street East to the existing public sewer.

o Section 10 the reference to the footpath serving Millfield Court is misleading. The proposed development has no right of access to the footpath.

o Section 11 the extent of the proposed development raises concerns of impact on water table levels.
Section 12 Any activity of Blacksmith or Joinery ceased prior to circa 1960. The Court documents attached to the deeds of the owners of both the plot of land seeking consent, and 21 Front Street East and lodged with Land Registry stipulate the Right of Way and access over 21 Front Street East’s land.

Further Comments
- Photographic evidence is available to prove the use of the proposed site as a garden.
- All Court-related correspondence for the Right of Way and access route to the site is available.
- Of paramount concern is the welfare of the current resident of 21 Front Street East which will be severely compromised by the proposed development.
- We would like to draw the attention of the Planning Officers that the owners of the proposed development site are also the owners of the neighbouring property of 30 Towers Close who used the site as a garden over 30+ years. They are both also directors of the development company Green Sky Ventures Ltd involved in the application. One of the directors is the signatory on the final Court Order determining the Right of Way. All history and status of the site is known about to the development company but this has not been clearly entered into the Planning Application detail.

Persons submitting this objection,
Vivien Mather, 248 Prince Rupert Drive, Aylesbury HP19 9DJ (daughter of H G Mather)
Rhona Wilson 5 Deanery Street, Bedlington NE22 6JY (daughter of H G Mather) who should be contacted in the first instance at their addresses or by email at RhonaLWilson@hotmail.com
Mrs Hilda G Mather (current owner of the adjacent land over which access is required)
21 Front Street East, Bedlington, Northumberland NE22 5DS (please contact only via appointment made with daughters)
We object to the proposed development on a number of ‘planning issues’ as suggested in guidance issued by Northumberland County Council.

Government Planning Policies
- We feel that Planning Office Professionals are best able to make this comparison if given accurate and detailed information. Please see our list of possible inaccuracies within the submitted application by the developers in our ‘Other Information’ section at the end of this objection.
- The points raised in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Bedlington CAMS SPD (2011) regarding the demolition of the stable as detailed in a separate submitted objection. Ref 13/00373/CON

Other Planning Policies
- No objection at this time

Existing use of a building/land and previous planning decisions related to it
- With regards a previous planning application for a single dwelling in 1978 (withdrawn 1979), correspondence from the Chief Engineer to the Chief Planning Officer is available stating that satisfactory access will require to be provided. The CPO wrote to the then applicant (ref WHG/EG/78/F/421) stating that they could not recommend planning permission where vehicular access would be onto Front Street and shared with the owner of 21 Front Street East. (see attachments 1A & 1B)
- The existing use of the proposed development site is referred to in the planning application as commercial use. The existing use is an untended garden belonging to the owners of 30 Towers Close.

The layout and siting of the development
- The proposed development applied for
is dependent upon an access route over private land. There is a Court defined Right of Way (shown on PDF attachment and photograph attachment 3, showing the actual area roped as an approximate outline) but there are no ownership, development, modification, improvement or enhancement rights by the applicants. The issues that arise from the access concerns are listed below:
1. There is a Court determined width of access route over the land belonging to the owner of 21 Front Street East.
2. There is no right to extend or modify the access route or any aspect of it, including gates from Front Street which belong to the owner of 21 Front Street East. Full ownership rights are reserved.
3. The increase use of the access for the proposed development will intrude significantly on the environment of 21 Front Street East
4. Access could impact on emergency and service vehicular access.
5. Current access is through gates that are owned by 21 Front Street East and increased use for the proposed new development may have a diverse affect on security.
6. There is no vehicle or pedestrian access for refuge facilities.
7. Winter access from Front Street is problematic during inclement weather and there are times when weather prevents all vehicular access.
8. There is a risk of compromise to Health and Safety and incidents regarding the entry and egress of both vehicles and pedestrians across both the Right of Way and the rest of the private property and also on the crossing of the public footpath outside.

The impact of a building on adjacent properties

The use of the access route for an increased number of vehicles will impact on the safety of residents and visitors to 21 Front Street East as there may be children and or
animals on the property and safety is paramount.

- Open gates will affect the safety of the premises, owner, family and visitors.
- Above issues affect the privacy at 21 Front Street East.
- Additional traffic over the proposed access route will increase noise and disturbance levels at 21 Front Street East.
- Proposed access for development will impact on increased congestion to minor road towards The Millfield slip road onto Front Street and ‘Residents Access’ only road past Vicarage Terrace. (see attachment 2)

Impact on development of existing amenities

- As identified above

Impact on protected features

- No objection at this time

Other Information which may be helpful to Planning Officers

Planning Application Form

A number of inaccuracies and assumptions appear to have been submitted

- Section 4 has contradictory and potentially confusing address entry, with inaccuracies as to the description of the site. The site is not unused and has been the extended garden use for 30 Towers Close for over 30 years.
- Section 6 suggests that a new or altered vehicular access is proposed to or from the public highway. Access is only permitted over an area specifically detailed and outlined by a court agreed Right of Way.
- Section 7 waste storage and collection. There is no designated collection point on the plans and pick up from the entrance for potentially 4 properties (including 21 Front Street East) will obstruct the access route as well as the highway/pavement access.
- Section 9 the access road is owned by 21 Front Street East and remains within
control of the landowner with regard to the surface dressing.

- Section 10 lists parking for 6 vehicles. The use of the access route by these additional vehicles is excessive for the nature of the current access.
- Section 11 the developer is suggesting connection to the existing private drainage system, however there is no reference as required to any details of the existing system or references for plans or drawings.
- Section 14 the existing use of the proposed site is garden and has been so for 30+ years during the ownership of the developers' family.
- Section 30 the owner of 21 Front Street east should be included in notification of site visits that require a duration of stay on the access route, as it is then not being used solely for the purpose of accessing the proposed development site it serves.

With reference to the Design and Access Statement, we note that:

- Section 2 the postcode entered is incorrect.
- Section 5 see section 6 of the Planning Application Form points above.
- Section 6 the proposed connection of drains is via the private drains belonging to 21 Front Street east to the existing public sewer.
- Section 10 the reference to the footpath serving Millfield Court is misleading. The proposed development has no right of access to the footpath.
- Section 11 the extent of the proposed development raises concerns of impact on water table levels.
- Section 12 Any activity of Blacksmith or Joinery ceased prior to circa 1960. The Court documents attached to the deeds of the owners of both the plot of land seeking consent, and 21 Front Street East and lodged with Land Registry stipulate the Right of Way and access over 21 Front Street East’s land.
Further Comments
  o Photographic evidence is available to prove the use of the proposed site as a garden
  o All Court related correspondence for the Right of Way and access route to the site is available.
  o Of paramount concern is the welfare of the current resident of 21 Front Street East which will be severely compromised by the proposed development
  o We would like to draw the attention of the Planning Officers that the owners of the proposed development site are also the owners of the neighbouring property of 30 Towers Close who used the site as a garden over 30+ years. They are both also directors of the development company Green Sky Ventures Ltd involved in the application. One of the directors is the signatory on the final Court Order determining the Right of Way. All history and status of the site is known about to the development company but this has not been clearly entered into the Planning Application detail.

| Hilda G Mather | 21 Front Street East
| Northumberland NE22 5DS |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| We object to the proposed development on a number of ‘planning issues’ as suggested in guidance issued by Northumberland County Council. |

Government Planning Policies
  o We feel that Planning Office Professionals are best able to make this comparison if given accurate and detailed information. Please see our list of possible inaccuracies within the submitted application by the developers in our ‘Other Information’ section at the end of this objection.
  o The points raised in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Bedlington CAMS SPD (2011) regarding the demolition of the stable as detailed in a separate submitted objection. Ref 13/00373/CON
Other Planning Policies
- No objection at this time

Existing use of a building/land and previous planning decisions related to it
- With regards a previous planning application for a single dwelling in 1978 (withdrawn 1979), correspondence from the Chief Engineer to the Chief Planning Officer is available stating that satisfactory access will require to be provided. The CPO wrote to the then applicant (ref WHG/EG/78/F/421) stating that they could not recommend planning permission where vehicular access would be onto Front Street and shared with the owner of 21 Front Street East. (see attachments 1A & 1B)

- The existing use of the proposed development site is referred to in the planning application as commercial use. The existing use is an untended garden belonging to the owners of 30 Towers Close.

The layout and siting of the development
- The proposed development applied for is dependent upon an access route over private land. There is a Court defined Right of Way (shown on PDF attachment and photograph attachment 3, showing the actual area roped as an approximate outline) but there are no ownership, development, modification, improvement or enhancement rights by the applicants. The issues that arise from the access concerns are listed below:
  1. There is a Court determined width of access route over the land belonging to the owner of 21 Front Street East.
  2. There is no right to extend or modify the access route or any aspect of it, including gates from Front Street which belong to the owner of 21 Front Street East. Full ownership rights are reserved.
  3. The increase use of the access for the proposed development will intrude significantly on the environment of 21 Front Street East.
  4. Access could impact on emergency and
service vehicular access.
5. Current access is through gates that are owned by 21 Front Street East and increased use for the proposed new development may have a diverse affect on security.
6. There is no vehicle or pedestrian access for refuge facilities.
7. Winter access from Front Street is problematic during inclement weather and there are times when weather prevents all vehicular access.
8. There is a risk of compromise to Health and Safety and incidents regarding the entry and egress of both vehicles and pedestrians across both the Right of Way and the rest of the private property and also on the crossing of the public footpath outside.

The impact of a building on adjacent properties

- The use of the access route for an increased number of vehicles will impact on the safety of residents and visitors to 21 Front Street East as there may be children and or animals on the property and safety is paramount.
- Open gates will affect the safety of the premises, owner, family and visitors.
- Above issues affect the privacy at 21 Front Street East.
- Additional traffic over the proposed access route will increase noise and disturbance levels at 21 Front Street East.
- Proposed access for development will impact on increased congestion to minor road towards The Millfield slip road onto Front Street and ‘Residents Access’ only road past Vicarage Terrace. (see attachment 2)

Impact on development of existing amenities
- As identified above

Impact on protected features
- No objection at this time
Other Information which may be helpful to Planning Officers
Planning Application Form
A number of inaccuracies and assumptions appear to have been submitted

- Section 4 has contradictory and potentially confusing address entry, with inaccuracies as to the description of the site. The site is not unused and has been the extended garden use for 30 Towers Close for over 30 years.
- Section 6 suggests that a new or altered vehicular access is proposed to or from the public highway. Access is only permitted over an area specifically detailed and outlined by a court agreed Right of Way.
- Section 7 waste storage and collection. There is no designated collection point on the plans and pick up from the entrance for potentially 4 properties (including 21 Front Street East) will obstruct the access route as well as the highway/pavement access.
- Section 9 the access road is owned by 21 Front Street East and remains within control of the landowner with regard to the surface dressing.
- Section 10 lists parking for 6 vehicles. The use of the access route by these additional vehicles is excessive for the nature of the current access.
- Section 11 the developer is suggesting connection to the existing private drainage system, however there is no reference as required to any details of the existing system or references for plans or drawings.
- Section 14 the existing use of the proposed site is garden and has been so for 30+ years during the ownership of the developers’ family.
- Section 30 the owner of 21 Front Street east should be included in notification of site visits that require a duration of stay on the access route, as it is then not being used solely for the purpose of accessing the proposed development site it serves.
With reference to the Design and Access Statement, we note that:
- Section 2 the postcode entered is incorrect
- Section 5 see section 6 of the Planning Application Form points above
- Section 6 the proposed connection of drains is via the private drains belonging to 21 Front Street east to the existing public sewer
- Section 10 the reference to the footpath serving Millfield Court is misleading. The proposed development has no right of access to the footpath.
- Section 11 the extent of the proposed development raises concerns of impact on water table levels
- Section 12 Any activity of Blacksmith or Joinery ceased prior to circa 1960. The Court documents attached to the deeds of the owners of both the plot of land seeking consent, and 21 Front Street East and lodged with Land Registry stipulate the Right of Way and access over 21 Front Street East's land.

Further Comments
- Photographic evidence is available to prove the use of the proposed site as a garden
- All Court related correspondence for the Right of Way and access route to the site is available.
- Of paramount concern is the welfare of the current resident of 21 Front Street East which will be severely compromised by the proposed development
- We would like to draw the attention of the Planning Officers that the owners of the proposed development site are also the owners of the neighbouring property of 30 Towers Close who used the site as a garden over 30+ years. They are both also directors of the development company Green Sky Ventures Ltd involved in the application. One of the directors is the signatory on the final Court Order determining the Right of Way. All history and status of the site is known about to
the development company but this has not been clearly entered into the Planning Application detail.

Mr Gordon Potts  
25 Millfield Court  
Bedlington  
Northumberland  
NE22 5EW

I wish to object to the planning application - 13/00229/FUL, for the following reasons  
1) Access to this proposed development is totally unsuitable for vehicles of any kind. From the main highway, Front Street East, the gradient is noticeably high, with vehicles already scraping their front bumpers on the road when driving around the area which will become the main access point if this development progresses. 
2) Congestion at the proposed access point is already an issue with parking of cars belonging to householders, and visitors to 2 x nearby pubs and restaurants, especially in the evenings and weekends when additional vehicles park, causing further access problems. 
3) The plans indicate removal of several established trees, which are all of good standing, even though conveniently worded reports by the developer implies that this is not the case. 
4) Access to the proposed development relies on crossing over land that I have been led to be believe was for pedestrian access only, and this was to allow the maintenance of the property/land. 
5) The owner of the proposed development has contested ownership of the adjoining wall and fence, at the rear of 22-26 Millfield Court Bedlington. The two foot high wall is a retaining wall of land which is higher on the proposed development side to that on the side belonging to the Millfield Court properties. Additional weight of lorries etc. involved with the proposed development work, without doubt, cause this wall to collapse. Therefore, I object to any proposed development work which may cause damage to this wall, and fence. 
Due to the ownership of the fence by the developer also being contested, additional
expense has been made to neighbours of this proposed development. Access to both sides of this fence is required by residents of 22 - 26 Millfield Court to allow maintenance and repair.
6) If this development was to go ahead there would be significant, unwanted disturbance, and intrusion of privacy to all neighbours.