

# PONTELAND TOWN COUNCIL

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2022

Present: Councillors Mrs S Johnson (in the Chair), Mrs K Woodrow, Mr A Hall, Mr S Ahmed, Mrs K Overbury and Mr A Varley.

### 1. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A list of planning applications received since the previous Committee meeting had been circulated

**The Committee made no comments about the 1 application considered.**

### 2. DECISIONS: APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS; WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

**2.1 DECISION: 22/01203/VARYCO, 21 The Rise, Darras Hall, Ponteland, NE20 9LH. Proposed variation of condition 1 (approved plans 20-0844 D08 Rev 0) on application 21/01332/FUL in order to change the orientation of the roof ridge.**

Permission **granted** under delegated powers on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2022. The Committee had made no comment about this application.

**2.2 DECISION: 22/01939/VARYCO, Land South of East of Field House, Prestwick. Proposed variation of condition 2 (approved plans) on approved planning application 20/01602/FUL on order to amend the elevations and alter the internal layout.**

Permission **granted** under delegated powers on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2022. The Committee had made no comment about this application.

**2.3 DECISION: 22/01856/FUL, Dove Cottage, Berwick Hill, Ponteland, NE20 0JY. Proposed demolition of existing covered yard, outbuilding and garage. Proposed garden room and attached garage extension.**

Permission **granted** under delegated powers on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2022. The Committee had made no comment about this application.

### 3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

**3.1 22/01909/CCMEIA: Proposed extraction of 4 million tonnes of dolerite, importation of inert infill material and associated highway and landscape works. Land At Northside Harle, Kirkwhelpington.**

The following objection had been submitted to Northumberland County Council.

OBJECTION: Ponteland Town Council (PTC) has reviewed the submitted application documents and considered their contents. PTC object to the proposed development.

Planning law requires that decisions on planning applications must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The primacy of the development plan is reaffirmed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The policies within the statutory development plan that are relevant to the consideration of this application are contained within the Northumberland Local Plan (NLP). The NPPF is a material planning consideration.

PTC acknowledge that the application site lies within an area allocated by NLP policy MIN9 for the extraction of crushed rock. Whilst this allocation may result in the principle of the development being acceptable, it does not mean that planning permission should be granted where the detailed considerations of the proposal conflict with other development plan policies. The fundamental concerns of PTC relate to the significant increase in HGV movements through the parish along the A696 and the impact of this on: the amenity of residents, operation of local businesses, as well as highway capacity and safety.

NLP policy MIN1 defines the environmental criteria for the assessment of mineral extraction development proposals. It requires applicants to demonstrate that any adverse effects on local communities and the environment are acceptable. These requirements are reflected in the NPPF which states that local planning authorities, when determining planning applications for mineral developments, to ensure there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural environment and human health (paragraph 211).

PTC is concerned that there has been very limited consideration of impacts resulting from the proposed development on anything other than the area within close proximity to the application site.

Criterion 2a of NLP policy MIN1 explains that consideration should be given to the impact of minerals developments on local amenity. It highlights that applicants will be required to demonstrate that development prevents unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution. The submitted documents only focus on issues of noise and air pollution close to the application site. No consideration has been given to the impact of the increase in noise and air pollution resulting from the increase in HGVs on the A696 through Ponteland.

Criterion 2g requires an assessment of the capacity and suitability of the transport network, including numbers of movements, site access arrangements and impacts on non-motorised users. Again, the focus of the application documents comprises the road and rights of way network and its users, close to the application site, this includes traffic flows and accident data.

The submitted documents explain that the anticipated operation hours for road haulage would be 61 hours per week (7am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 1pm Saturday). Details for export and import HGV movements are provided for an 11-hour weekday (export: 29 vehicles per day (laden)/ 58 vehicles per day (2-way) and import: 17 vehicles per day (laden)/ 34 vehicles per day (2-way). It is stated that the routing of the vehicles north and south on the A696 would vary depending on the market demand for aggregates and the availability of inert fill. It is estimated that the majority (75%) would be to/ from the south – resulting in: weekday 34 vehicles per day (laden)/ 68 vehicles per day (2-way) travelling south on the A696.

PTC has significant concerns that the assessment of impacts is only based on traffic movements on the A696 within a short distance south of the quarry. Also, that the conclusion is that approximately 6HGVs per hour on an A-road through a busy commuter village near Newcastle would not result in any significant impacts on the community, congestion, accidents and safety, indeed it states the impacts would be 'negligible'. It appears that no detailed assessment has been undertaken into the current highway issues in Ponteland, particularly as a result of the volume of HGVs already using the A696.

No consideration has been given to the impact of the additional HGVs on pedestrians, cyclists and amenity of residents or businesses operating in Ponteland. The application documents conclude that the A696 is not a route that would be attractive to walkers, cyclists or equestrians. This clearly fails to acknowledge that the A696 passes through Ponteland, again stating that any impacts would be negligible.

PTC submit that the information provided does not meet the provisions of policy MIN1 and further information is required to fully understand the impact of the proposed development on highway safety as well as Ponteland residents and businesses.

PTC are therefore opposed to the proposed development because of its clear conflict with the development plan and other material considerations. The application should therefore be refused.

If you would like to discuss any matters raised in this response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 16<sup>th</sup> August 2022**