

CD J.2.2



**Northumberland**  
County Council

**SUMMARY**

**Gordon Halliday MA MPhil MRTPI**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**APPEAL BY DEVONPORT ESTATES**

**CONSTRUCTION OF A PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE LANDMARK AND  
ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT**

**ON**

**LAND AT COLD LAW, STIDDLEHILL COMMON, NEAR RIDSDALE,  
RAY ESTATE, NORTHUMBERLAND**

**PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF: APP/P2935/W/20/3244389**

**LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REF: 19/00247/FUL**

1. I deal with planning considerations in my proof of evidence. David Stokoe, a landscape architect from Wood PLC, deals with landscape considerations in his proof of evidence. In respect of landscape considerations, I only deal with application of landscape planning policy and its implications for the planning balance

2. I am Gordon Halliday, an independent planning consultant. I have been a Chartered Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute since 1981. The evidence I have prepared and provide for this appeal, on behalf of Northumberland County Council, is in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinion.

3. The Council refused the application due to the inappropriate location for the proposed development. The reason for refusal was as follows.

*'The proposal results in development in the open countryside which fails to recognise the intrinsic character and nature of the countryside in this location and is therefore contrary to paragraph 170 of the NPPF and Policy NE1 of the Tynedale Local Development Framework Core Strategy'.*

4. A second application was withdrawn before it could be determined. Some of the supporting material for the second application is relevant to the current appeal.

5. The Development Plan in respect of the appeal site comprises the Tynedale Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2007) and the Tynedale District Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) Other material considerations include the emerging Northumberland Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Northumberland Landscape Character assessment (2010).

6. I consider the relevance of the policies and provisions in these national and local planning policy documents and the weight that they should be given.

7. I address the following three topics - effect on landscape character and appearance, benefits and sustainable development / the planning balance.

8. I do not repeat or summarise David Stokoe's detailed evidence on landscape character and visual impact. Based upon Mr Stokoe's assessment and conclusions, with which I agree, I consider that the appeal proposal is in clear breach of NPPF paragraph 170(b) and TLDFCS Policy NE1 referred to in the Council's reason for refusal.

9. Whilst policies in the emerging NLP can only be given limited weight, the plan is at a significantly more advanced stage than when the application was refused planning permission and my consideration of relevant emerging policies does not affect my overall conclusion that the proposed development conflicts with the Development Plan and the NPPF.

10. I consider whether or how these conclusions might be influenced by design and tourism policy considerations or by the economic, environmental and economic benefits claimed by the appellant. I conclude that none of these policy and other considerations outweigh the harm, that the proposal does not represent sustainable development and that the planning balance weighs strongly in favour of dismissing the appeal.