BPC Planning Meeting on 17/05/17

Planning Application [17/01401/FUL] Hellens/Arch Development for 52 houses on land west of The Wynding, Beadnell

Objection Comments:

* There is no need within Beadnell for any more housing, even if affordable and/or for permanent occupation. With the recent approval for Northumberland Estates to build 45 permanent residences on Beadnell Green, the cumulative effect of too much development within this area has been highlighted by the fact that Hellens have had to request a separate Environmental Impact Assessment [17/01481/SCREEN].
* The original Pre-Planning Proposal was for 98 houses. These would have been built within the upper field, where the proposed 52 would be, as well as the two lower fields now designated as required for, and I quote from Page 6 of the Design and Access Statement, " **To the west open land which will be retained to retain the open aspect of the site**." There is, however, a convenient gap between two of the houses to the west of the site for an access road to facilitate further development. I suggest a clause should be added to the compulsory "Beadnell" S106 Agreement for permanent occupancy which would ensure that the two "open aspect" fields do remain open.
* Hellens Residential is a registered provider of affordable homes. As such, they are supported by Government Grants to offset the costs entailed by offering quality accommodation without recourse to open market profit. In this application Hellens is proposing to build only the minimum stipulated requirement of 15% affordables in a major development within the AONB. What guarantee do we have that Hellens will not abuse their special status and be subsidised by taxpayers to build non-affordable homes at full market rate? In addition, the link with Arch, the wholly owned development arm of NCC, smacks of a set-up. In the light of the recent power shift in County Hall, however, the support given by Arch may be withdrawn.
* Statement of Community Involvement conducted on 23/01/17- The Consultation Process was flawed. The feedback was definitely not positive as stated on page 17 of the Design and Access Statement. I personally put lines through the contentious leading questions to support my position of no more houses being built.

The questionnaire presumed the scenario that the development had been approved.

I give two examples from Figure 8.2 on page 2

"What size of housing would you like to see on this site?"

"What type of housing is more important to you?"

 It was akin to asking Brexiteers what part the UK should now play within the EU or asking turkeys for their preferred method of cooking.

* The lack of adequate services and utilities within the village have been well documented in past planning applications. Once again, Northumbrian Water Ltd have placed a condition in their Consultee Document that no development shall commence until the completion of their integrated hydraulic study for the Seahouses WWTW catchment.
* Hellens, Arch and GVA, the Developers, have failed to carry out their pre-application surveys with due diligence. Of the four Consultee Responses received thus far two have objected to the paltry evidence supplied - The Lead Local Flood Authority concerning the serious risk of flooding and The Public Health Protection on the grounds of noise pollution.
* Problems of sustainability in the local area - 45 houses approved on Beadnell Green, 52 houses proposed in this application and 88 proposed next to Kings Field in Seahouses. The doctors' surgery in Seahouses has just lost the Alnwick section of the Practice.
* This application would flout various clauses of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular with reference to the Northumberland Coast AONB, namely Paragraphs 14, 55, 64, 114, 115 and 116. It is also contrary to Policy F2 of the Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Council Plan and the AONB/EMS Management Plan Policies LP2 and LP5.

In conclusion, this planning application does not provide the required "conservation and enhancement" within the AONB and should be refused.