

Walltown Lodge

Greenhead

Northumberland

CA8 7 JD

22nd August 2022

Your Reference: 22NP0056

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing in response to your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> August 2022 regarding the Outline application for the construction of two self build principal residence houses at land to the east of Walltown Lodge and as residents of the adjacent property, Walltown Lodge wish to make the following comments;

- The application incorrectly states that the land is not currently in use. The septic tank for Walltown Lodge currently occupies part of the site upon which the proposed buildings would be built and has done so for over 34 years. The site plan shows that a proposed building would be directly on top of the septic tank. The legal right for the tank to be situated on this land, including our right of access to maintain the tank is protected in a legal conveyance dated 6<sup>th</sup> May 1988 which we have in our possession, and which has been scrutinised by our solicitors and is robust. The applicants are aware that the septic tank is there and despite this having been mentioned to them previously, they have failed to make any enquiries with us regarding this and have omitted to mention this in their application. There is nowhere else on our land where we could relocate the septic tank and we believe that due to the very high archaeologically sensitive nature of our location, any plans to move it would be problematic in any event. The land all along the boundary between the site and our property is soakaway for the septic tank and contrary to the information contained within the application, the proposed sewage treatment site would be within 50 metres of the tank. Approval of these plans and this development would not only contravene our legal rights, but the removal of our septic tank would render our home uninhabitable thereby negating any argument for the need for additional housing.
- The application also states that the site is in a sustainable location and that water is available from a spring. This is incorrect. There is no spring water available in the area, the previous supply having ran out many years ago, long before we moved into the property in 2015. All local properties in the area (Walltown Lodge, Carvoran/Roman Army Museum and Walltown Visitors Centre) extract their water via borehole. To our knowledge, the closest properties that are spring fed are located approximately 1 mile away around the area of Walltown Farmhouse where the applicants also have a holiday cottage. The applicants are aware of sustainability issues with the supply in that area as it is documented in an article in the "Hexham Courant" newspaper that the supply to their holiday cottage dried up on at least one occasion resulting in the holiday makers making a complaint. Neighbours have stated that this is a regular problem in the summer months. For these reasons, we disagree that the site is in a sustainable location.

- In addition to the reasons already stated, another concern regarding the unsustainability of the site is our belief that there are insufficient natural resources to support the addition of an additional borehole in the immediate vicinity without this impacting upon the existing supply to our property. We encountered significant issues with our supply several years ago which coincided following the addition of a new borehole at Walltown Quarry. This was extremely costly for us to rectify and it was considered by the specialists who were called in to investigate, that the extraction of water from the new borehole in the vicinity was most likely to have been the reason for the problem we encountered.
- Contrary to the information contained within the application, as stated there is a borehole on our property. This supplies our drinking water. The proposed location for the sewage treatment area would be within 50 metres of this.
- Regarding the ecological appraisal, the site is home to a very healthy population of hedgehogs which are designate a species of “principal importance” under the NERC Act. These hedgehogs are nightly visitors to the feeding stations at our property. We have also seen common lizards and barn owls both on the site and on the walls and fences bordering it and our property, as well as deer and a very large bat population. We understand that bats and common lizards are protected species.
- Consent for applications in the area for conversion of existing buildings to holiday lets are given conditionally on the basis that the properties are to be used for visitor accommodation only. Application number 17NP0036 on 24 March 2017 for the removal of such a restriction to allow for the building to be used as accommodation for permanent residential use at a nearby property was refused on the grounds that it failed to meet the relevant criteria. We fail to see how the construction of two brand new properties can be acceptable when change of use of existing buildings is not permitted. Having viewed the National Park’s policy on development we fail to see how this proposal meets the appropriate criteria in numerous respects and we feel that any such approval would set a precedent for future applications for change of use of existing visitor accommodation.

In addition to the above comments we would like to be transparent in informing you that when we first moved to our property we did make some enquiries with the then land owner, Alex Newall regarding purchasing this land. Our intentions for the land were for additional utility land to our home as we believed (and for the reasons already mentioned continue to believe) that this is its only real value. Our intention was to use the land as additional garden space/paddock to our property. The land was valued at approximately £12,000 by land agent GF White and we made what we believed to be a reasonable offer of £20,000. A counteroffer was made by Mr Newall of £50,000 which we declined. We are informing you of this as we believe it to be relevant as evidence of our long held belief that the land has no value as development land. Had we believed that the land was suitable for such lucrative development we would have accepted this counter offer at the time.

Yours sincerely,

James Milburn

Alison Milburn

Response to comment from M Maughan added 5/9/2022

Mr Maughan does not appear to live in the area, his only stated connection being that he has completed building work nearby within the last 4 years. As such work has been very limited, we would therefore question whether this building work was carried out on behalf of the applicants who converted farm outbuildings into a holiday cottage within this timescale and would therefore question his motivation in commenting on an application that otherwise would not appear to be of any relevance to him.

The fact that he has also said that he believes the land was used as allotments is incorrect but is also mentioned in the application. The land has never, to our knowledge been used as allotments, its previous use being to house pheasant pens.

Mr Maughan states that he does not believe that this development would have an impact upon neighbours. We can only assume that he has not read our published representations regarding why approval of this application would have a very serious impact upon us and the sustainability of our home. to the degree that it would make our home uninhabitable.

Concerns regarding sustainability of the location have also been made by our neighbour Patricia Burley.

Website Comment

There are many people that visit this area to take in the beauty & historical sites. I object to the Application due to the locality, limited access, the dangers to walkers incl children & poor parking. Surely there are more appropriate sites for new-builds?

Mrs A Gill

41 Lawson Rd,Hartlepool

Website Comment

There is no need for this housing and seems out of place in this location. It will be highly visible on the only approach to Walltown Crag for visitors to Hadrian's Wall which is a real negative. The single track road which provides the access is unsuitable due to high numbers of walkers (including children) and the lack of visitor parking. It's an accident waiting to happen.

Existing housing in this area also takes longer than the national average to sell and there is a lack of amenities for families with young children, who you would expect to live in such houses.

Andrea Henry

25 Portchester Close ,Ingleby Barwick ,Stockton

Website Comment

I was seriously concerned to see this application in our national park. This area does not require more properties as it takes a considerable amount of time to sell houses in the area. In addition the proposed site it is not near any local amenities and residents would require transport to shop get children to school thus harming the environment further. The light pollution from a further two houses will also increase light pollution in what is classed as a dark sky area.

Anna Stabler

Mooshed 3Laker Hall ,Newton

I feel this proposal to build two houses in this area is totally out of keeping. The site has restricted access and the building will spoil what is a beautiful area.

Adrian Tubman

10 The Hawthorns, bussage, stroud, glos.

Website Comment

Housing is needed in certain communities within the NP but not here. It will be highly visible on the only approach to Walltown Crags for visitors to Hadrians Wall and the single track road which provides the access is unsuitable due to high numbers of walkers (including children) and the lack of visitor parking.

Nothing to suggest extra housing of this type is needed in the area. Existing housing already takes longer than the national average to sell.

Allison Wardman

9 Springwell Avenue Langley Park DH7 9XT



Website Comment

I object to this application. We need houses for young/first time buyers in the area.

Where these houses are planned are to squeeze hoses on and possibly rent out to holiday makers or holiday homes. OBJECT!!!!

Dave Berry

2 Hall Terrace , Gilsland.

What a ridiculous idea. I regularly visit the area and feel houses on this site would significantly impact on the beauty of the surrounding area, not to mention the di gel track road access.

Whilst there is a need for new housing, this has to be weighed against the environment and aesthetic impact.

Daniela Fisher

50 Portland Rd

I have visited this beautiful area over the years.

I feel that the type of housing that is being proposed would be out of place here. It would also spoil the amazing views from Walton Crag. Also I think the single track road is unsuitable due to the amount of walkers that use this.

The proposal for these two properties seems completely unnecessary.

Fiona Molyneux

16,Churchfield Rd,Rothwell ,Leeds

Website Comment

The construction of new property so close to Hadrian's Wall and within the National park would detract from the beauty of the area. There is no requirement for housing in that specific area. Affordable housing is of greater need near to services and amenities.

Jane Buckingham

19 Otter Burn Way ,Prudhoe ,Northumberland

Website Comment

I am disappointed that consideration is even being considered to these new builds. They certainly would not be in keeping with the landscape of the area and would negatively impact on the natural beauty of the quarry and historic beauty of the wall. I am against this request.

Lynne Hewerdine

71 The Avenue, middlesbrough

As a regular visitor to the area, walking and running both alone and with friends and family I feel that the addition of new homes in this area would have a significant negative impact

In an area with such heritage and history there are already many visitors and the work that would need to be carried out would undoubtedly impact on the existing residents and businesses such as bed and breakfast accommodation in the area

Also the addition of new homes would likely impact on light pollution and overall impact on the area due to increased transport and impact on habitats

Louise Newton

20 Shepherd Drive, Fairfields Manor, Ryton

Website comment

Plans submitted would be a conflict to the buildings in the surrounding area

Lisa Shield

52 Busty bank,

Website Comment

The proposed development would be harmful to the local environment, the local wildlife, the flora and fauna, and those who are already established in the immediate area. This is a special area which needs to be protected from builds purely for financial gain.

Laura Wood

33 Beaumont Close



Website Comment

I think on health and safety grounds the planning permission should be refused as a sewage treatment plant is planned to be located very near to the borehole used for drinking water by the neighbours.

Maria O'Malley

127 Alwyn St,Liverpool

Website Comment

I don't believe that the area requires this type of development. It would block trail paths and would be a negative aspect to the natural beauty of the place and would not be in keeping with the area.

Natalie Gallagher

9 Stileston Close, Hartlepool, TS26 0PT

Website Comment

After visiting Walltown Lodge on a number of occasions I have very much enjoyed it's secluded and semi remote location.

It's open vistas of the surrounding countryside and dark skies at night are truly stunning.

I feel it would be extremely detrimental to the area surrounding Walltown Lodge if this development was allowed to proceed.

Neil Leighton

105 Michael Street ,Birtley ,Chester-le-Street ,County Durham,

While I recognise the need for housing, I'm a frequent visitor to friends in the area. Such a building site would be blight on the landscape and could easily contaminate current occupants' water supply.

Phil Woodhead

74 Maddren Way, Middlesbrough

Website Comment

I am a very frequent visitor to this area and I strongly object to the building of these dwellings in such an area of outstanding natural beauty. They would be unsightly and visible from Walltown Crag.

It also only has a single track road which is a very busy route for walkers.

Ronnie Sawdon

21 Clarence Drive, Darlington

Website Comment

The building of these 2 dwellings is totally unnecessary in this area of outstanding natural beauty, which shadows Hadrian's Wall. It is also a dark skies area and more houses would result in more light pollution. It would spoil the magnificent views and the take away from the beauty of the area, which tourists flock to see from all over the world currently.

Sophie Milburn

Spring Cottage,,50 Painshawfield Road,,Stocksfield. ,Northumberland.

Website Comment

Totally inappropriate to the lie of the land. Waltown Crags & Hadrian's Wall.

Sarah Nolan

2 Thirlwall View ,Greenhead ,Brampton ,

I have heard about this application and I fail to see what difference 2 houses is going to make to anybody, it will be a construction site on the route to Hadrians Wall that my family and I, including children, use a canny few times a year and this would make it really dangerous. We often stay all Walton Lodge and this would totally disrupt the peace and tranquility of the area , to not much eventual gain of 2 houses, I really don't see the point

Vicki Lester

15 Lodore Grove ,Acklam,Middlesbrough ,Cleveland



Website Comment

There is no need for additional housing in this area. It would completely spoil the landscape. The housing would be best in a community where there is a greater need.

Nicky Davison

55 Christchurch drive ,Stockton

Website Comment

I object to this application on the basis that it undermines and is in opposition to several of the core policies in the Local Plan Adopted 2020. Namely policy ST1 encouraging sustainable development, point B reduction in need to travel. This development will encourage further cars onto the road for basic services. In addition this development contravenes policy DM9 which highlights the need to minimise journeys. Additional dwellings outside the service area will only add to more journeys. Policy ST2 indicates that opportunities are taken to enhance local wildlife and biodiversity however this development is proposed to be build on an area that has no current building upon it thus taking away habitat of wildlife around it. Policy ST4 encourages the reuse of buildings but this is a new build planned for open countryside, I don't believe this planning application meets the criteria set out in policy SP4 for development in open countryside. I also don't feel this development meets the criteria listed in policy SP5 to allow for new housing, part b points 1-7 have not been met sufficiently. This development would also have a huge impact on the surrounding landscape, under policy DM2 I feel that this development would have significant impact on the approach to the world famous Walltown Craggs and nearby Country park. An area marked by only ancient stone buildings and an area of such historic importance would certainly be visually impacted by new build accommodation close by. I object sternly to the principle that any new build accommodation be permitted in such a rural area.

Rachel Robertson

61 Bailey Lane, Wilton

Website Comment

This is a rural area enjoyed by the public including small children , the dangers to walkers will spoil a trip to this wonderful area.

Liz Hodgson

Watergate Cottage

Website Comment

I do not feel that this application would be in keeping with the area. Any new builds would be highly visible to visitors to the area and out of keeping with the existing buildings. I do not feel that it is a sustainable proposal as there would be a limited bus service which does not operate until late afternoon. The parking would be problematic as the proposed road for the building is a single track. I am against this proposal.

Maree Bennett

71 The Avenue, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough,

Website Comment

As a regular walker in that area, I feel this is just not needed, it will only mean one man will be benefitting from this, & he is not hadrian,,, I'm imagining the thumb screws are getting turned on locals to push this through.. just not right or needed,, leave this area neebuild free,, please...

James Shield

52 busty bank ,Burnopfield ,Newcastle upon Tyne

Website comments

The proposed development will be detrimental to the area as the houses will be highly visible on the only approach to Walltown Crag for visitors to Hadrians Wall and the single track road which provides the access is unsuitable due to high numbers of walkers (including children) and the lack of visitor parking. There is nothing to suggest extra housing of this type is needed in the area to warrant the damage the development will cause.

Lucy Blades

2 The Green ,Norton

Website comments

We have spent a lot of time within the local area walking and visiting friends. There are enough buildings already, it would ruin the look of the area for visitors

Catharine Lowerson

36 The Hawthornes ,West Kyo,Durham,

Website comment

As a fairly regular visitor to this area I felt I must object to this, there is far too much intrusion on green spaces elsewhere before starting in areas such as these, these are the areas that people, such as myself, go to to get away from built up towns and villages, to enjoy the landscapes, views, isolation. I feel if this were to be allowed it would open the door for future builds.

Lisa Smith

9 Barwick View ,Ingleby Barwick ,Stockton on Tees



Website Comments

The local landscape should not be compromised to build on, totally out of character to the picturesque scenes of Walltown.

Michael Nolan

2 Thirlwall View ,Greenhead

Website comments

These two houses should not be built in the beautiful area. The water supply of a neighbouring house will be compromised due to the houses needing a septic tank. The guest house is in a peaceful location and it should not be spoilt with building two houses.

Patricia Curry-Riley

8 Strome Close ,Ingleby Barwick ,Stockton on Tees ,

My main concerns regarding the outline application are as follows:

The application states that there is a spring fed water supply available for the development. Water problems in this area from such sources are well known with properties having to import water by tanker leading to both Carvoran and Walltown Lodge having to make substantial bore hole investments to ensure adequate water provision.

Past experience would indicate that it is unlikely that two substantial family dwellings could extract without periodic disruption from any existing spring fed supply.

The majority of visitors to the Roman Army Museum arrive by car or bus, using the main link road from the B6318 but many then use the single track road leading past the proposed development by foot to access a defined walking route to Hadrian's Wall further to the east. This includes groups of school children. Existing Carvoran & Roman Army Museum properties do not have any vehicle impact on this route but the proposed new build development would lead to 4 vehicles (?) using this narrow road for access to the housing.

Potential impact on the archaeological heritage is always a consideration in this World Heritage Site area.

Yours sincerely,

Patricia Birley