

Kerren Rodgers - Clerk to Kirknewton PC

**Support the application**

Reasons:

Kirknewton Parish Council supports this application as it will restore a derelict property and make it available for use as a residence again. We would make note that our support is subject to the stonework being reinstated as per the original building.....

**Object to the application**

Reasons:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**No objections**

Comments:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Consultee Name : **Kerren Rodgers - Clerk to Kirknewton PC**

Date :

Ref No. : **23NP0087**



Highways Development Management  
ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT

From:	Shaun James, Highways DM Technician	Ref:	23NP0087
To:	Susannah Buylla, National Park	Date:	12/09/23

**Application Description:** Replacement of existing cottage due to collapse of existing residential unit with the addition of rear and west gable extensions and new garage/store adjacent. Change of use of agricultural grounds immediately surrounding building to form landscaping areas and vehicle access.

**Application Location:** Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton, Wooler, Northumberland, NE71 6XF

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Imposition and implementation of condition (s):** Required to ensure acceptability.

**Planning Documents Reviewed:**

Date Published	Description	Reference
21/08/23	Application Form	N/A
21/08/23	Location Plan	23/1330 04
21/08/23	Design, Access & Heritage Statement	None
21/08/23	Proposed Site Plan	23/01330 05
21/08/23	Photos following demolition	None
21/08/23	Photos showing cottage	None
21/08/23	Proposed Elevation and Floor Plans	23/01330 02
22/08/23	Proposed Site Plan as built	WGW/T255/002

**Assessment of proposal:**

- When assessing this application, the Highway Authority checks that the proposal will not result in an adverse impact on the safety of all users of the highway, the highway network or highway assets.
- The information submitted has been checked against the context outlined above, it is considered that this development will not have a severe impact on highway safety, and there are no objections in principle to the proposals.
- The proposal is for 'Replacement of existing cottage due to collapse of existing residential unit with the addition of rear and west gable extensions and new garage/store adjacent. Change of use of agricultural grounds immediately surrounding building to form landscaping areas and vehicle access'.
- It is noted that the proposal is located quite a distance from the public highways as such that there are no highway safety issues identified.
- Subject to conditions and informatives, HDM have no objection to the proposal.

### **Assessment of Proposal Checklist**

- **Transport Statement or Assessment**

Not required.

- **Pedestrian routes, Public Transport and Cycles**

Access by sustainable modes is in keeping with the rural nature of the surrounding area.

- **Road Safety**

The proposed development will be located along a private road which is very lightly trafficked. The existing access point has suitable visibility splays and constructed to a suitable standard despite it being located on a private road. A pre-commencement construction method statement would be required due to the sensitive location of the development and nearby public right of way/byways. The construction method statement should provide all mitigation measures in respect of the protection of all ProW /Byway users from the construction elements.

- **Travel Plan**

Not required.

- **Car Parking**

A parking area has been shown the submitted location plan. This area also has associated turning facilities to aid safety. The proposed triple length garage is considered acceptable in terms of internal dimensions and can be classed as two spaces. It is noted that the garage door opens inwards which would not comply with Appendix E dimensions. However, the parking provision will still be acceptable for the number of bedrooms proposed.

- **Cycle Parking**

There is space within the garage to store bicycles.

- **Highway Works**

No proposed works to the adopted network.

- **Highway Land and Property issues**

The development site is located approximately 750m South West of the adopted highway network.

- **Refuse Storage and Servicing**

Refuse storage to be located in the garage.

- **Lighting**

N/A

### **Planning Obligations and Conditions:**

Necessary planning obligations and conditions required for planning approval

<b>S106 Heads of Terms</b>
N/A
<b>S278/S38/S59/S184 Requirements</b>
N/A
<b>Standard Conditions</b>
<b>Pre-Commencement Condition</b>  <b>Construction Method Statement</b> Development shall not commence until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Planning Authority. The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Construction Method Statement shall, where applicable, provide for:

- i. vehicle cleaning facilities;
- ii. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iii. the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iv. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- v. mitigation measures to protect users of Kirknewton Public Right of Way 42 and Restricted Byway 58.

Reason: To prevent nuisance in the interests of residential amenity and highway safety, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework

### **General Condition**

#### **HWD 2 Implementation of car parking area**

The development shall not be brought into use until the car parking area indicated on the approved plans, including any disabled car parking spaces contained therein, has been hard surfaced, sealed and marked out in parking bays. Thereafter, the car parking area shall be retained in accordance with the approved plans and shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles associated with the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework

### **Informatives**

#### **INFO 33 Reminder to not store building material or equipment on the highway**

Building materials or equipment shall not be stored on the highway unless otherwise agreed. You are advised to contact the StreetWorks team on 0345 600 6400 for Skips and Containers licences.

#### **INFO 40 Reminder to not deposit mud/ debris/rubbish on the highway**

In accordance with the Highways Act 1980 mud, debris or rubbish shall not be deposited on the highway.



# Northumberland County Council

## Environmental Protection Planning Consultation Response

**To:** DC.consultation@nnpa.org.uk - Northumberland  
National Park Authority

**From:** Tracy Spark, Environmental Health Officer  
Environmental Protection Team

**Planning Reference:** 23NP0087

**Subject:** Replacement of existing cottage due to collapse of  
existing residential unit with the addition of rear and  
west gable extensions and new garage/store adjacent.  
Change of use of agricultural grounds immediately  
surrounding building to form landscaping areas and  
vehicle access

**Location:** Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton,  
Wooler, Northumberland, NE71 6XF

**SRU Reference:** SRU168513

**Date:** 18/09/2023

---

I refer to your consultation and attachments of 23/08/2023.

### **Opinion**

The Environmental Protection Team have no objection to this application and would recommend the attached conditions are imposed in order to protect public health and prevent loss of amenity.

### **Commentary**

The Environmental Protection (EP) Team have undertaken a technical review of the submitted information and have assessed the environmental impacts which are relevant to the development and would comment as follows:

#### **1. Contaminated Land**

A YALPAG screening assessment has been submitted. However, as the proposal includes the incorporation of a former barn into the new dwelling and the use of agricultural land as external amenity land, there is the potential for contaminated land to be present from the use storage or spillage of agri-chemicals and fuel oils. This may pre-date the 35 years of the applicant occupancy stated in the YALPAG

A phase 1 preliminary risk assessment (desk top study) is required, along with any further investigation and remediation if appropriate. Conditions are suggested below.

## **2. Private Water Supply**

The applicant states the dwelling will be connected to a new private water supply - See Informative below.

### **Recommended Conditions**

The EP Team recommend the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a scheme to deal with contamination of land or controlled waters has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be undertaken by a competent and qualified consultant. The scheme shall include all of the following measures, unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing:
  2. a) A Phase 1 preliminary risk assessment carried out to identify and evaluate all potential sources of contamination and the impacts on land and/or controlled waters, relevant to the site. The Phase 1 preliminary risk assessment shall include a desk study, site walkover and establish a 'conceptual site model' identifying all plausible pollutant linkages. Furthermore, the assessment shall set objectives for Phase 2 intrusive site investigation works/ quantitative risk assessment (or state if none required). The Phase 1 preliminary risk assessment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority without delay upon completion.
  - b) A Phase 2 intrusive site investigation shall be carried out to fully and effectively characterise the nature and extent of any land contamination and/ or pollution of controlled waters. It shall specifically include a risk assessment that adopts the Source-Pathway-Receptor principle, in order that any potential risks are adequately assessed taking into account the sites existing status and proposed new use. The site investigation and findings shall be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority without delay upon completion.
  - c) A written remediation strategy detailing the remediation requirements for the land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters affecting the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and all requirements shall be implemented and completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination are minimised.

3. Prior to the development being brought into use or continuing in use the applicant shall submit a verification report to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval. The report shall provide verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved remediation strategy. Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the closure report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met.

[Should no contamination be found during development then the applicant shall submit a signed statement indicating this to discharge this condition].

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination are minimised.

4. If during development contamination not previously considered is identified, then an additional written remediation strategy regarding this material (prepared by a competent person) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

No building shall be occupied until a remediation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and measures proposed to deal with the contamination have been carried out. [Should no contamination be found during development then the applicant shall submit a signed statement indicating this to discharge this condition].

\* “Competent Person” has the same definition as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) ISBN 978-1-5286-1033-9.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination are minimised.

[**NOTE:** All recommended conditions above should be subject to confirmation by Development Services Legal Team, to ensure they are enforceable].

### **Informatives**

1. **All** private water supplies are required to be registered with the Environmental Protection Team. This can be done by calling 0345 600 6400 or emailing [public.protection@northumberland.gov.uk](mailto:public.protection@northumberland.gov.uk)

The Private Water Supplies (England) Regulations 2016 require all new and existing private water supplies to be risk assessed and monitored (with the exception of supplies serving a single domestic owner-occupied dwelling). New



supplies should not be brought into use until the local authority has completed a Regulation 6 risk assessment (inspection) and determined monitoring requirements (sampling) in accordance with Regulation 8, 9 or 10 as appropriate.

The sampling frequency is determined by the classification of the supply. Supplies with a commercial activity require sampling at a minimum frequency of once per year. Domestic supplies are subject to a risk assessment and water sampling once every five years.

The applicant must ensure that appropriate legally binding agreements have been signed by all relevant persons (as defined in section 80 of the Water Industry Act 1991). These documents should lay out the responsibilities of each relevant person in respect of maintenance and management of the supply, access rights, apportionment of costs and charges (including those for sampling and risk assessment), emergency plans including alternative supplies etc

The applicant is advised to contact the Environmental Protection Team to discuss the requirements of the Regulations. Further information can be found at:  
<https://www.dwi.gov.uk/private-water-supplies/>

<b>Officer</b>	TSP
<b>EP Checked</b>	N/A

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [DC Consultation](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application Consultation 23NP0087 Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton, Wooler, Northumberland, NE71 6XF  
**Date:** 30 August 2023 13:39:00

---

Dear Susannah

Thank you for consulting me on the proposed development at Longback Cottage and I refer to my previous comments for application 18NP0111.

In terms of public access, Kirknewton restricted byway 58 and public footpath 42 run along the main access track to the property from Kirknewton village. This is a well-used route, linking in with many access opportunities in the area - specifically the Hillfort trails at West Hill and Yeavinger Bell and the long-distance route of Saint Cuthbert's Way.

Whilst any construction works are ongoing, care should be taken to not obstruct access to these rights of way or in any way prevent or deter public use of the paths without the necessary legal diversion or closure order having been made.

I have some concerns over the impact of the proposal on the public footpath in the immediate vicinity and specifically the plan to formally divert this route in the future. As discussed previously with the applicant, this footpath was the subject of a historical claim submitted to the County Council to add this route to the definitive map and was confirmed in 2008 (restricted byway 58 is a very recent addition to the definitive map at the eastern end of the access track). A future legal diversion proposal past the cottage could impact upon the user's appreciation of this historic route-way and could attract objections from the user groups. As such I would like to see consideration of this in the application.

Kind regards  
Lorna

---

**From:** DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 August 2023 14:39  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning Application Consultation 23NP0087 Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton, Wooler, Northumberland, NE71 6XF

Please see the attached consultation regarding a planning application which has been received by Northumberland National Park Authority. Full details can be viewed at <http://nnpa.planning-register.co.uk/plaPlanningAppDisplay.aspx?AppNo=23NP0087>

[DC Consultation](#)  
Development Control Consultation

[Lorna Lazzari](#)

23NP0087 Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton, Wooler, Northumberland NE71 6XF.

**Proposal:** Replacement of existing cottage due to collapse of existing residential unit with the addition of rear and west gable extensions and new garage/store adjacent. Change of use of agricultural grounds immediately surrounding building to form landscaping areas and vehicle access

#### Heritage considerations

The proposal refers to a previous application prior to the demolition of the cottage for renovation of and extensions to an existing dwelling of local heritage significance,

The Delegated Decision Report for 20NP0088 set out the heritage consideration of the building and the proposed alterations and extensions to bring it back into a habitable condition in line with the lawful certificate obtained (15NP0037).

The report states that:

*“While Longback cottage is not covered by a statutory heritage designation, the cottage was recorded in the 1987 Historic Building Survey of the Northumberland National Park and is considered to be of local interest. The pre-amble to policy DM14 of the Local Plan notes that ‘locally valued (non designated) assets (also) have historic interest and play a key role in defining place and in building local pride..... (as) a heritage asset of local significance, a condition requiring the submission of an historic building survey (to Level 1 as set out in Understanding Historic Buildings, a Guide to Good Recording Practice) should be attached.”*

A non-designated heritage asset is a building, monument, site, place area or landscape identified by plan making bodies as having a degree of heritage significant meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets. A substantial number of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage significance to merit identification as non-designated heritage assets.

The emphasis for a non-designated heritage asset is not process or presence on a list, but the significance of the heritage asset.

The Historic Building Survey 1987 described the building thus:

Cottage c. ¼ mile south-west of Kirknewton House

*“An 18th century cottage, built of igneous rubble with sandstone dressings and pantiled roof. A single-storey, three-bay cottage with an outbuilding attached to the left under the same roof. The door to the right is a stable-type door and the windows are small casements. The roof is steeply-pitched with reverse-stepped gables, a characteristic 18th century feature. Two small brick chimneys on the ridge. Attached to the right is a lean-to pigsty. (Grundy Grade III).”*

Whilst not capable of formal designation, the building was considered of some historic significance due to its:

- Age and period – as an 18<sup>th</sup> century vernacular dwelling.
- Rarity – few examples of buildings of this type and period survive in Northumberland National Park.
- Fragility – the identification of a new use for the building, sympathetic to its character and appearance, is desirable in order to avoid the total loss arising from dereliction and decay.

- A good representative example of 18<sup>th</sup> century vernacular buildings
- Historical value as contributing to the story of 18<sup>th</sup> century Kirknewton, prior to significant changes with the arrival of the railway in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The condition for an historic building survey as part of several conditions was deemed to be a reasonable and proportionate response to 20NP0088 and consent granted. This took account of the building's significance. This also accorded with NPPF guidance regarding bringing a heritage asset back into habitable condition, safeguarding the asset and enhancing the historic character of the area.

This building has, unfortunately, been demolished.

The demolition of the building, however, has resulted in the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset, the core of which was to be retained as part of the 2020 consented application. The 2023 proposal is for a dwelling constructed from materials salvaged from the demolition of the existing structure, but without the significance of that former structure. The developer did not take adequate measures to protect the building through the use of shoring and scaffolding in order to carefully dismantle unsafe elements and retain the core of the structure as was a condition of planning consent.

The fact of the demolition and removal of heritage significance also removes the justification for the development on the basis that it is bringing a non-designated heritage asset into habitable condition in a way which is consistent with its conservation. This assumed that the proposals would not have an unacceptable effect on the significance of the heritage asset. It is considered that had the application included demolition and rebuilding it would result in an objection on heritage grounds on the basis that it would cause substantial harm (total loss) of a non-designated heritage asset which forms part of the cultural heritage of Northumberland National Park.

The above should be considered when determining this application in line with a balanced judgement in line with legislation, policy and established best practice.

Chris Jones  
Historic Environment Officer  
21.09.23

## Susannah Buylla

---

**From:** Gill Thompson  
**Sent:** 16 October 2023 16:23  
**To:** DC Consultation  
**Cc:** Susannah Buylla  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application Consultation 23NP0087 Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton, Wooler, Northumberland, NE71 6XF

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Susannah,

Thanks for consulting me on this application, which I note replaces 20NP0088 after the full demolition of the property. In this previous application it was noted that there were two small roosts of common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle in the original building in the west gable end, which was due to be demolished. A licence was therefore required and I reasoned that this would be likely to be granted. Since then a resurvey in September 2022 was undertaken and two roosts (one the same location as previous and one new) were recorded. Three roost locations were therefore recorded in total in the two surveys in the original building. I note that a licence was applied for and granted on 20/07/2023. This would require removal of some features by hand and exclusion valves prior to demolition. I don't know whether this was done but it was included in our original condition number 3. In addition under this condition (and in the new report) 5 bat boxes were to be erected before work commenced to provide replacement roosts. Has this been done and have they provided evidence? They would probably have to for the licence so perhaps we should see tis for completeness.

When 20NP0088 was granted there was also condition number 4 which stated that no destructive work was to take place in the hibernation period, but I note that the demolition occurred recently so this is not an issue.

If the bat boxes have been erected I do not have any objections as I see a resurvey was carried out and the licence granted. The original plans did not show any permanent features for bats and I do think that with biodiversity net gain some permanent bat and bird features in the new building would be appropriate, particularly as no original stonework now exists they could easily be incorporated into the new stonework/roof.

If you have any queries, please get back to me.

Yours sincerely,  
Gill Thompson

---

**From:** DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 August 2023 14:39  
**To:** Gill Thompson <gill.thompson@nnpa.org.uk>  
**Subject:** Planning Application Consultation 23NP0087 Longback Cottage, West Kirknewton Farm, Kirknewton, Wooler, Northumberland, NE71 6XF

Please see the attached consultation regarding a planning application which has been received by Northumberland National Park Authority. Full details can be viewed at <http://nnpa.planning-register.co.uk/plaPlanningAppDisplay.aspx?AppNo=23NP0087>

## Susannah Buylla

---

**From:** Susannah Buylla  
**Sent:** 27 October 2023 08:25  
**To:** DC Consultation  
**Cc:** Margaret Telfer  
**Subject:** FW: 23NP0087 Longback: Landscape advice please  
**Attachments:** IMG\_0823.JPG; Longback cottage tree planting.jpg

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Comments to be uploaded for Longback application.  
Thanks

---

**From:** Robert Mayhew [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 October 2023 00:39  
**To:** Susannah Buylla [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: 23NP0087 Longback: Landscape advice please

Hi Susannah,

Having read your landscape comments paras 5.27 to 5.35; and reviewed the application documents, photographs and other material associated with this application I would point out the following with respect to the Tree, Landscape and Dark Sky Park implications of this application.

1. Trees - From the photographs in figure 2 and figure 9 of your report taken in 2018 and 2019 respectively, the photographs contained in the [delegated officers report](#) associated with Planning Application 15NP0037 and a review of the aerial image in [google maps](#), it is clear to me that the Ash trees that used to stand immediately behind (to the south of) the former Longback Cottage and identified in the topographical survey as suffering from ash dieback; have been felled to make way for the proposed development and subsequent retaining wall and bank to the rear of the property. However, I could not find an associated felling licence application for this work on the Forestry Commission's [felling licence register](#). Whilst the need for a felling licence is not a planning matter and indeed the volume of timber may not have necessitated one, current Forestry Commission guidance on [managing ash dieback in England](#) identifies that replacing trees felled due to ash dieback is important. I would also draw your attention to Northumberland National Park Local Plan policy DM12 Trees, Woodland and Forests; specifically, paragraph 4 in which it states that:- "Where a development would result in the unavoidable loss of an existing tree, orchard or hedgerow but the wider sustainability benefits of the development significantly outweigh the loss, proposals will be expected to minimise harm and provide a net biodiversity and amenity gain, with appropriate replacement of lost trees or hedgerows." I have not been able to establish from the documents or plans provided as part of this application that the expected replacement tree planting has been incorporated as part of these development proposals?

Secondly, in relation to trees, I note from the red line drawing identified in figure 13 of your report that the Scots pine shelterbelt located to the south of the proposed development lies within the development area. As such and, due to the fact that the conifers appear to be reaching economic maturity, have been planted close together forcing them to become tall and spindly and are top heavy thus prone to windthrow and now do not serve their original function as a shelter belt since the wind can pass directly beneath the canopy, I would like to learn more about the long term vision for this shelterbelt. Whilst not set directly against it but beneath it, the shelterbelt plays an important part of the backdrop to the proposed development when viewed from the B6351 and other receptor sites to the north and should the trees have to be removed for whatever reason, the proposed development may become more visually prominent if the backdrop of West Hill were to become more uniform in appearance. Having sight of a [FC style 10 year management plan](#)

would give reassurance as to how this woodland site is to be managed into the future as part of the red line boundary development site.

2. Landscape – The principle publicly [accessible receptor sites](#) for this development are Kirknewton Footpath 42 that passes immediately to the north of the former cottage, Kirknewton Restricted Byway 58 200m. to the east and the B6351 that passes approximately 600m. to the north. It should also be noted that the lane immediately to the south of the Scots pine shelterbelt to the south of the proposed development is also designated as ‘Access Land’ under the CROW Act 2000. The property will be overlooked by members of the public accessing the archaeological settlement located on top of West Hill 400m. to the south, all be it screened by the Scots pine shelterbelt for the time being; (see note on windthrow risk above).

In terms of scale, mass, from the original and proposed building elevation drawings provided, the new build would sit approximately 1.5 meters taller than the original cottage and the increase in floorspace will arise from the rear extension that will be largely hidden by the taller more prominent rebuild of the main living area to the north. Visually, in terms of fitting with the local vernacular of the area, the reuse of the existing stone will ensure that the new build will be largely in keeping with existing traditional residential buildings found in the area, particularly sandstone walls and a red pantile roof. The noticeable differences would include aluminium framed windows, Velux windows in the pantile roof, a glazed corridor connecting the main building to the new rear extension and a glazed gable centrally within the north elevation. For users of both public rights of way, the residential element of this new build would in my view be seen as a contemporary version of a traditional stone building. However, I would point out the triple garage located immediately to the east of the residential building which itself will be topped by a solar array; see figure 8 of your report. This appears to be less in keeping with the traditional building style and hence likely to be less appealing to the eye.

Views from the B6351 some 600 metres to the north will largely be transient from a moving vehicle and as such, given the backdrop of West Hill, and subject to my earlier comment about the long-term vision for the conifer shelterbelt on the hillside behind, I do not believe the proposed development would be visually prominent within the landscape. I would agree with your assessment in paragraph 5.31 in that the development would have a minimal effect on the visual amenity and landscape character of this part of the National Park. However, drawing on the replacement tree expectation mentioned above, opportunities do exist to break-up/screen the linear appearance of the development if two or three parkland style trees (oak) in tree cages similar to the one pictured in the bottom right of [this view](#), were planted in the newly created paddock on the north side of the building between the realigned footpath and the building itself. Additional biodiversity net gain and landscape structure could be achieved if the proposed fence to the north of the realigned Kirknewton Footpath 42 were to incorporate a native mixed species hedge, stretching from the field gate to the west of the development site, east along the northern side of the right of way until it reconnects with the original alignment of this public right of way. (see images attached or the upper fence line in figure 12 of your committee report). Failing that, the fence should be replaced with a stone wall to tie-in with/match the existing found on site.

3. From a dark sky perspective, whilst there is a significant degree of glazing in the new build for solar gain purposes this could at the same time result in light pollution escaping from the building at night. I understand that this is expected to be minimised by the inclusion of blackout blinds that whilst not 100% effective since they require the occupant to use them, should help mitigate against this potential risk. I would however advocate use of the standard NNPA dark Sky condition when it comes to the possible future inclusion of any exterior lighting, weather fixed to the residential building of triple garage.

I hope this helps but I will be happy to sit in the DC meeting to answer any questions Members may have if you think it would be useful.

Thanks

Robert  
[Robert Mayhew](#)  
Head of Conservation & Environment

# Development Management Committee

## 8th November 2023



**DMC2023-24**

**16 of 16**

**23NP0087**

**Longback Cottage**