

# Comments for Planning Application 20/03090/OUT

## Application Summary

Application Number: 20/03090/OUT

Address: Car Park East Of Blue Bell Mount Pleasant West Mickley Northumberland

Proposal: Outline application for construction of 3no. detached 4 bedroomed dwellings and re-configuring of existing carpark

Case Officer: Mr Callum Harvey

## Customer Details

Name: Dr Michael Smith

Address: 1 Mount Pleasant, West Mickley, Stocksfield, Northumberland NE43 7LP

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Outline application for construction of 3no. detached 4 bedroomed dwellings and re-configuring of existing carpark | Car Park East of Blue Bell Mount Pleasant West Mickley Northumberland

I suggest that the application is invalid and further information should be requested from the applicant in accordance with the Northumberland County Council Planning Application Validation Checklist. The Blue Bell car park is not a sustainable, or suitable location for growth. The Reg 19 draft Northumberland Local Plan identifies modest growth in Prudhoe parish of 30 dwellings per annum. There is no indication of the need for privately owned three- and four-bedroom houses.

Considerations for this proposal:

### Highway Safety

Mount Pleasant is accessed from the North via a steep incline which is Stonybank Road. Despite claims to the contrary in the proposal, Mount Pleasant and West Mickley are hamlets without the access to services and frequent public transport links to support sustainable housing growth. No one person, and longevity is a characteristic of the community, recalls a public transport service stopping at the Blue Bell. The use of a car is therefore essential.

The houses have to use the road to park outside their houses leaving only one lane passable. Regularly lorries, and tractors have to queue to pass along Stonybank Road. This proposal will extend the reliance on private vehicles. This development will also be heavily reliant upon the private car and there is nothing in the application to suggest that the new houses would contribute to sustainability with regard to energy, through the use of lower and zero carbon technologies to compensate.

### Parking

Parking is very limited on Mount Pleasant and if pub car parking is limited, then overflow will go up

sides of road, possibly causing obstruction to farm traffic and other heavy vehicles. Safety on the road is a daily consideration as drivers often drive at a speed which is both inconsiderate and dangerous.

Admittedly, layout and access details are reserved matters as this is an outline application however there is no evidence that this site can accommodate 3 x 4-bedroom dwellings with acceptable internal and external space standards (Nationally Described Space Standards), residential parking, parking for the existing pub and turning facilities. It may be the case that the whole new site access road would be within the minimum drag distance for a refuse vehicle, which tends to be 25m however access for emergency service vehicles should be given further consideration when access and layout is considered.

The Design & Access statement indicates that each house will be served by a double garage with spaces in front. Appendix D of the Local Plan sets out that three spaces are required for a 4-bedroom house. Paragraph D.7 set out that as garages tend to be used for storage, and are often discounted from providing parking spaces, a minimum space standard for a double garage of 6m x 6m. Although the application is outline, the proposed site plan makes it clear that the garages proposed would not meet this standard and therefore there would likely be a shortfall in the parking standard as the parking spaces in front of the garages would not be sufficient to provide 3 space for each house.

The applicant notes that the new road surface on the car park would be capable of accommodating a fire engine or bin lorry, although there is no indication of a turning head to allow these vehicles to leave the site in a forward gear with acceptable visibility at the access junction with Stonybank Way. An inaccuracy in the proposal drawing is the provision of a public pathway to the left of the pub car park entrance/exit. No such pathway exists, which will be a public safety issue with additional traffic throughout the day and visibility at the point of exit.

Parking for the pub needs to be more than 18 spaces for special events and busy times. If people find it difficult to park this would damage the pub business.

Layout and density of building

The site is not large enough for three-or four-bedroom houses.

The proposed plan shows insufficient space for vehicles parking and manoeuvring and insufficient garden space.

This development will be heavily reliant upon the private car and there is nothing in the application to suggest that the new houses would contribute to sustainability with regard to energy, through the use of lower and zero carbon technologies.

Nature conservation:

The site is landfill and is likely to contain contamination which when disturbed by the construction process may cause pollution to the burn that runs under the site and cause damage to the local ecology. There is a surprising lack of information in the application.

Although the application is an outline, given the presence of trees, scrubs and vegetation with the proposed developable area, with the potential for foundation digs within the root protection areas of trees, it would be expected that the application would be supported by reports to inform an assessment of the proposal's impact on ecology and arboriculture.

There is a surprising lack of information in the application. Although the application is an outline,

given the presence of trees, scrubs and vegetation with the proposed developable area, with the potential for foundation digs within the root protection areas of trees, it would be expected that the application would be supported by reports to inform an assessment of the proposal's impact on ecology and arboriculture.

I consider that the close boarded fence to separate the access road for the houses from the pub car park will look out of keeping in an open setting. A natural screen of trees or hedges would be a better outlook and provide some biodiversity gain which this application currently lacks.

Government Policy.

Mount Pleasant is "washed over" green belt and therefore previously undeveloped land and should not be built upon. If housing were allowed on this site, it would change the character of the hamlet as there is no other building on this side of the road and the development would close a gap of open land and diminish outlook between Mount Pleasant and Hallyards.

Additional inaccuracies in the application. The application states that there is no water course within twenty metres of the proposal, whereas the Bellasis Burn rises to the south of the site and runs into a culvert under the site.

The application states there is no suspected contamination on the site, which is inaccurate. The site is a landfill and contamination is very likely. The application has no information on site history and contamination. Even a desk-based assessment (as required by Note 17 of the local validation checklist) would enable further details of a risk assessment, remediation strategy and verification report to be controlled via planning condition, however as it stands there is no information to understand the likely contaminants. Contamination is a key issue to consider in determining the principle of the proposed residential development and goes to the heart (the Whitley principle) of whether permission should be granted or refused.

Even though the Design and Access Statement contends that the application would support the business of the Blue Bell, reducing the parking facility and removing a large external space will limit the ability to host special events which will be a very important part of the profitability, the sustained employment, and future viability of the pub.

The application, it appears assumes that a car park is an indication of development. This is no reason to allow the site to be built upon. A covenant was enacted when the site was acquired by the previous owners of the Blue Bell. It is clearly evident that the intention was that the site should only be used as a car park. The covenant placed the restriction that it should only be used as a car park to prevent such a development as that proposed - a clear intention that this development should not go ahead.

I respectfully suggest that the application is invalid and further information should be requested from the applicant in accordance with the Northumberland County Council Planning Application Validation Checklist.