

# Tillside Parish Council

*Chr:* Jim Railton  
Nursery House  
Chatton  
Alnwick  
Northumberland NE66 5 PY  
*T* 01668 215323  
*M* 0777 424 1111  
*E* jim@jimrailton.com

*Secretary:* Isabel Hunter  
Morven  
11 Springhill Lane  
Berwick upon Tweed  
TD15 2QH  
*T* 01289 306365  
*M* 07836 345489  
*E* isabel.hunter31@btinternet.com

24.11.16

Dear Sir/Madam

## Application 16/03865/FU, Plot 16 Mill Hill, Chatton

The Parish Council are very much minded that to oppose an application, it must be on legitimate material planning grounds. However with this plan for an extra house on the Mill Hill estate, the background to the whole site must be considered.

The development in the village has been underway for over 15 years, and there have been an astonishing 26 applications for amendments to the original plans. These vary from changes in design, location and size to the most recent application to lift one of the main conditions of the construction works, that all building traffic had to come through a separate service road for the period of development.

The recent application for variance caused much consternation in the village, and was strongly opposed in committee by our local County Councillor Anthony Murray, on safety and amenity grounds. The Parish Council were split, but ultimately voted not to oppose the application, primarily motivated by a wish to see the whole estate tidied up and finished with as swiftly as possible. It has been scar in the village for over 10 years, and it was considered better to get the whole messy development "done with", and put up with extra traffic coming past peoples homes.

The arrival of this new application by Northumberland Estates has been met in the Parish Council by some feeling that we had been duped, an observation of 'very underhand practice', and by others of outright astonishment. There have been similar feelings expressed throughout the village. The application is therefore unanimously opposed on the following grounds:

1. It is overdevelopment of the site. The layout was designed and approved with open space, particularly on this route of a footpath through the village. The plan suggests squeezing an extra property onto this site, directly in front of a pleasant footpath to the estate planted with trees. Basically this house blocks the open path, so that the route will be right up against the wall of the prospective property.

2. A further building site on the estate will prolong the development with extra building & service traffic coming past peoples homes, which are now occupied by young families as well as elderly people. The construction traffic will be a hazard to residents.

3. To push an extra house into this small space goes against the previous planning policy for the site, which incorporated open space. The layout, as accepted by previous planning decisions, ensured minimal loss of privacy and overlooking, as well as overshadowing. The density, appearance and use of materials were critical in the overall design of the development, and this suggested "add on", will always be that - an afterthought.

4. The Parish Council reluctantly conceded to the recent variation of planning conditions, allowing building access through the residential estate, in the absence of this prospective property being shown on the site. Similarly the County Council's Planning Committee examined this application for variance, without the knowledge of this site, which must have been 'in the pipeline'. It indicates a lack of integrity of the applicant, and the concession might well have not been made had Planners & Councillors been informed of their intentions.

5. The turning circle at the end of the housing estate was designed as that, a means by which traffic could visit the site and leave, without the need to reverse up people driveways and execute five-point turns in the road. To put a private access to the highway onto the turning circle constitutes a danger & traffic hazard. Inevitably it will lead to parking on the turning circle when the property's drive is full, causing yet further congestion.

We urge the planning case officer and planning committee members to reject this application on the above grounds. We ask for the matter to be considered by the full planning committee, and wish to have representation at that meeting.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Cook", written in a cursive style.