

**PRESENT:** Cllrs Morrison, Parks, Foxley, Dargue, Weir, Lewis

**APOLOGIES:**

T Hinton

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:**

Cllr Weir declared an interest in planning application 19/04919/REM

**2. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

There were 9 members of the public present.

**19/04919/REM – Percy Drive**

Mrs M Weir of 76 Priory Park requested information on the type of houses expected. ATC said that in the planning application there were 173 3 bedrooms properties, 71 x 4 bedroom properties, 26 x 5 bedroom properties, 2 x 6 bedroom properties and within that 26 were classed affordable housing. It was queried who decides what is affordable housing. ATC explained there is a formula from central government. The planning application does not make it clear which houses are to be on which plot. In the original application, there was said to be bungalows, however, there are no bungalows in the current scheme. If any variations to the full planning permission were requested, these would have to be sought via NCC. ATC are generally not made aware of any variation requests.

Mr J Loxton, 72 Priory Park – Mr Loxton has submitted his objection to NCC and queried what would happen to his objection. It was explained that his objection would be added to the public planning portal. If and when the planning application goes to planning committee all objection are read out and it will be decided whether the objections are valid in terms of planning grounds. The public may register their intention to speak at the meeting but there is a strict allocation of 5 minutes in total.

Mrs P Loxton – 72 Priory Park – Mrs Loxton has contacted NCC to discuss the planning application however the application had not yet been assigned a planning case officer. There was frustration at this.

Mrs A Burke suggested that the vegetation zone should be retained and encouraged into a wildlife corridor. This was agreed and would be added into ATC comments.

Mrs M Weir queried when they would start to build. ATC were unsure but thought it would be a phased development.

Brief discussion was held regarding S106 monies and how the allocation process has changed. ATC to write to NCC to request details of the change.

**19/05018/REM – Gloster Hill**

Mr M Horn expressed concern over the inadequate drainage and the plans to hold surface water in a tank and suds pond for release at 6litres per minute, resulting in 22 tonnes of water per hour, into the burn, behind Gloster Park and into the culvert. ATC agreed to take this information back to the developers. The lack of S106 funds available to improve the footpath at the back of Amble was also a concern.

There is a concern that the developers and Northumbria Water think that there will be no additional water from this development.

Mrs A Burke expressed deep concern regarding the intention to build properties on this field. The field is riverbed and salt marsh. There is no drainage from this field whatsoever. Previous ground tests have resulted in machinery sinking. The land is very unstable with underground springs and running sand. The plans submitted are not to scale and therefore not accurate. The guilders burn is currently filling fast due to other developments nearby already. The field floods when the tide is high and even surrounding areas flood, there is no where for the water to go and this was agreed by Northumbrian Water during a site visit.

**3. COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS:**

**To consider the following planning applications:**

**4.1 19/04919/REM. Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 272 dwellings (on approved planning application 17/01677/OUT)**

The following comments were agreed to be sent to NCC:

No objection but concerns over inaccuracy and some details and omissions.

The Design and Access Statement and the Planning Statement state ‘a mix of small/large...’ and ‘3 to 5 bedroom’- both inaccurate as the smallest are 3 bedroomed and there are 2 x 6 bedroomed properties in this application. Hardly the mix which the community was lead to expect or needs- that being some smaller properties suitable for single occupancy or older persons as well as some bungalows. Additionally, there is no indication on the plans which type of house would go where.

The Design Development map on page 6 of the Design and Access Statement is inaccurate- there has never been a Right of Way where indicated- it was a Permissive Way, permission for which was not renewed by the owner prior to negotiating the sale of this land. To say that landownership and existing vegetation prevents a pedestrian link here to Charles Road is completely inaccurate. A layout change at plots 159 or 185 would enable easy access to the original point of the permissive way on to land owned by NCC. They had no previous objections to this usage and to do this would ensure the occupants of this estate would more easily access the coast in a safer manner than along the busy Percy Drive entrance to the town.

The Masterplan shows lots of landscape areas with undulating mounds for play as well as 2 play provision spaces but there is no detail of how these will be maintained. Open spaces only remain attractive if managed- it is therefore important that an estate management plan is put in place with occupiers contributing to it to ensure a feeling of responsibility for safekeeping. Condition 27 in the approved plans 17/01677/OUT indicated a future maintenance plan would need to be detailed to NCC. There is concern that these play areas are too close to the suds.

There appears to be a vegetation zone between this development and that of Priory Park- is this so? If so, who would be the owner, who would be responsible for its maintenance and what plans are in place for this? Could this area be encouraged as a wildlife corridor.

There is no clear indication either of what the boundary between this estate and Priory Park will consist of- is it a 6' close boarded fence?

Whilst the majority of the internal highway layout is well constructed and is in relatively short sections there is a concern that the circular route with no traffic calming measures or 'blockages' around plots 72 to 114 will lead to anti-social behaviour and a less safe traverse for cyclist within that area.

Whilst there are several highways requirements, in the original approved planning application it stated

'12 Notwithstanding the details provided, no dwelling shall be occupied unless schemes to provide:

c. Improvements/relocation/alteration of bus stops on Percy Drive in the vicinity of the site frontage, including the provision of shelters; level access kerbing; pedestrian dropped kerb road crossing; .....

yet this application makes no mention of bus shelters. There is no requirement for timetable facilities as Arriva no longer supply these; however there is a need for shelters at the end of Percy Drive nearest the roundabout- stops likely to be used more frequently by occupants of this estate and likely to assist less vehicular activity. We urge the provision of two shelters in consultation with the parish council as these are now part of local council's remit and not NCC.

In line with NCC future plans for energy usage, we urge the inclusion of solar panels wherever possible.

**4.2 Ref No: 19/05018/REM. Reserved Matters application for approval of appearance, scale, layout and landscaping for 185 dwellings on approved planning application 18/01529/OUT. Land South East Of New Hall Farm Amble Northumberland.**

It was agreed that the following comments be submitted to NCC:

No objection.

There is concern regarding the drainage and the calculations of releasing 6 litres of water per minute / 22 tonnes per hour into the culvert which already struggles with managing the existing water.

Welcome the good mix of size and types of properties.

Pleased to note there will be a management fee to cover the grounds maintenance throughout the site.

A welcome addition is the pedestrian route to the S.E. which will give an alternative to the busy crossroads and also link to the Right of Way. However, there is a concern that the self- binding gravel could make this unsuitable for cyclists.

Disappointing that there is no defined cycle route through the development. Also note that emerging thinking states shared pathways are not recommended. Hope the road network is wide

enough and has enough traffic calming measures to ensure safe cycling towards the S.E. and N. to the Right of Way.

The Council would urge that some consideration be given to the realignment of the smaller properties so that these are closer to the bus routes.

Urge consideration of solar panels on buildings.

## **5. Any other applications received up to the date of the meeting**

### **5.1 19/04268/FUL – Gloster Hill, 6 Houses**

No plans had been received by ATC.

No objections provided the original approved application details are adhered to, in particular:

Original permission 13/03459/ out granted **01/09/2016**. It stated:

2. Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of **three years** from the date of this permission.

Has this happened as there is nothing to indicate anything between these two application dates on the planning portal? If not, does this invalidate this application?

4. The development hereby approved shall take place in accordance with the mitigation detailed within the protected species report ('Gloster Hill, Amble, Proposed Development Extended Phase 1 Survey Report', Ruth Hadden, June 2014) including temporary fencing (as specified) of a 10m buffer zone to the Guilder's Burn to be kept clear of all machinery and materials for the duration of the construction works with a permanent fence and all works to be in accordance with the guidance set out in 'Pollution Prevention Guidance: Works or Maintenance in or Near Water PPG5', Environment Agency, 2007.'

16 *Prior* to the commencement of development details the protective fence referred to in condition 4 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details

The recommendations in the updated ecological appraisal and bat activity survey including this fence must be strictly adhered to.

21 *Prior* to the occupation of the dwelling houses hereby approved, a scheme for emergency evacuation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented before the occupation of the dwelling houses hereby approved and shall be subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme.

22 *Prior* to the construction of the dwelling houses hereby approved, detailed geotechnical engineering drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be fully implemented within the final build and thereafter retained.

Imperative that intensive ground stability checks are undertaken and structural engineering measures to combat any instability of the slope behind the development are put in place, as soon as possible to ensure the safety of the established residential developments on Gloster Hill and the contractors who will be working on this site.

17-20. All *prior* to construction- We concur with Northumbrian Water's requirements for more detail regarding drainage etc.

Will the adjacent land- wet marshy grassland- require maintenance? If so, who will be responsible for this?

Will the land be stable enough to hold the properties? Should the houses be built on the same level as the road ( which was lifted by 2 metres due to flooding)

Urge consideration of solar panels on buildings.

### **5.2 19/04974/FUL GV Engineering, x 3 new workshops**

No objections but would urge consideration of solar panels on buildings.

**6. DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING:** The next Meeting will be held when required.