

**BATES AND EAST
SLEEKBURN LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT ORDERS**

Consultation Feedback Report

INTRODCUTION

This Report details the outcomes of public consultation on two planning documents:

- The Northumberland Local Development Order: Bates Site, Blyth; and
- The Northumberland Local Development Order: East Sleekburn Sites.

The Local Development Orders are a means of simplifying the planning system. They seek to grant planning consent for certain the development, as specified in the Order on three sites around the Blyth Estuary.

Specifically the Northumberland Local Development Orders were prepared to help create the conditions for economic recovery and growth.

The Local Development Order preparation process

In summary, to date, the Local Development Order preparation process has involved the following:

- Evidence was collated.
- Informal consultation was initiated with the likes of statutory consultees (e.g. Natural England and the Environment Agency) and major landowners.
- The Local Development Orders and Statements of Reasons were drafted alongside undertaking various assessments (e.g. A Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment).
- Draft Local Development Orders and associated documents were subject to formal consultation.
- Responses received were assessed and resulting amendments were been made to the Local Development Orders.

Next steps

The next stage in the preparation process is to submit the revised draft Orders and associated information to the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government. The Secretary of State may determine that no intervention is necessary in which case the Orders may be adopted by Northumberland County Council. Alternatively the Secretary of State may make a direction determining that the Order(s) cannot be adopted or must be subject to amendments and further consultation.

THE CONSULTATION

Planning regulations require that draft Local Development Orders are subject to consultation with a range of organisations and individuals. Consultation on the two Local Development Orders exceeded these requirements. In brief the consultation took place between the 27th September and 12th November 2012 (a period of just over 6 weeks). It included:

- Around 900 letters to owners and occupiers in the vicinity of the sites;
- Around 600 letters and emails to various consultees considered to have a potential interest in the proposals t or area;

- A press notice;
- Site notices close to the sites;
- Publicity via the Council's web site;
- Presentations to various committees including the three closest Parish Councils;
- Consultation drop in events at Keel Row Shopping Centre, Blyth and Cambois Miners Welfare.

Consultation Responses

- Comments were received verbally, by email, by post and via the on-line consultation portal.
- Responses were received from a range of individuals, businesses and organisations.
- There were 20 written responses to the Bates Site Local Development Order and 25 written responses to the East Sleekburn sites Local Development Order. (The responses are detailed in the Appendix)
- The majority of representations provided general comments rather than express support or object to any element of the Orders.
- Consultation drop in events were attended by around 50 individuals.
- Many of those who provided comments verbally at meetings or the drop in events considered that development in the area would be positive if it could attract new business and jobs. However, there was concern about the potential impacts of development upon amenity, and the loss of greenfield land.

Amendments to Local Development Orders

Northumberland County Council has taken into account all of the responses received during consultation. This has resulted in a number of non-material amendments to the Local Development Order documents. In summary the changes include:

- References to the documents being consultation drafts have been removed and replaced with a brief description of the Local Development Order preparation process.
- The documents have been slightly re-ordered for ease of use, including a new section clarifying the process for progressing development under the provisions of the Orders.
- Details of monitoring that were in the associated Local Development Order Guide have been moved to a new Appendix.
- Details of other consents, outwith planning that were in the associated Local Development Order Guide have been moved to a new Appendix.
- Descriptions of site locations have been moved and a plan showing the sites in context has been added to the Statement of Reasons.
- The description of development the East Sleekburn Order permits has been revised. Namely the scale of retail floorspace permitted has been reduced by 50sqm
- Additional prior information requirements have been added. The Orders now require developers to submit plans/drawings and a statement demonstrating how the development achieves high quality and inclusive design. The requirement to demonstrate development does not represent displacement has also been moved to 'prior information requirements' for clarity.
- The wording of a number of development conditions has been amended. This includes changes to the wording to allow for development to occur in phases.

- Further evidence has been assembled including a preliminary archaeology survey and a documented account of how sequential test considerations have been taken into account.

Consultee Name	Consultee Company / Organisation	Response in reference to:	Comments	Council's response
Mr Harry Siepmann	Civil Aviation Authority	East Sleekburn and Bates LDOs	<p>Northumberland County Council and its associated Planning Authorities have statutory obligations concerning the safeguarding of Newcastle Airport. The safeguarded area is a circle centred on the airport which extends to a radius of 13 km in the case of development that might affect the birdstrike environment, 15 km in the case of development which might affect the obstacle environment and 30 km in the case of any development involving a wind turbine. Maps of these areas showing the detail of required consultation have been issued to all relevant Planning Authorities. The statutory requirement to carry out consultation with the airport operator has the objective of identifying those developments which might impose an operational penalty on the airport, thereby restricting the amenity of an established use of land. The policy is described in more detail in the attached ODPM Circular. Whenever there is an intention to abbreviate Planning procedures attention must be paid to preserving some means of allowing the airport operator to consider proposed development and if necessary to object to those which might impose an operational penalty and reduce amenity. It should be noted that the Statutory Direction annexed to the attached Circular prevents a Planning Authority from granting Planning Permission to any proposal to which the airport operator has objected, until the CAA has been given an opportunity to consider the case and if necessary refer it to the Secretary of State. The CAA's advice, therefore, is that any abbreviation of Planning procedures within a 30 km radius of Newcastle Airport should take into account the need to continue consultation with the airport operator in accordance with the principles expressed in the attached Circular. The airport operator should also be given the opportunity of commenting upon any proposed abbreviation of Planning procedures before they are implemented.</p>	<p>The LDO sites are located just over 16km from Newcastle International Airport therefore outwith the 13km radius for development that might affect the birdstrike environment and the 15km radius for development that might affect the obstacle environment. The sites fall within a 30km radius, however the LDOs do not permit wind turbine development. Notwithstanding the respective distances, Newcastle International Airport were initially informally advised of the proposals and subsequently formally consulted as part of the LDO consultation exercise. Comments from the Airport have been taken into account accordingly. Specifically an amendment has been made to a development condition relating to external lighting.</p>

Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	Bates LDO - Introduction	Paragraph 1.4 informs that only part of the site has Enterprise Zone status. It would be helpful if the plan in Appendix 1 made clear which parts were EZ and which weren't.	The Enterprise Zone site allocations may be subject to change over time. For example, a 40 hectare extension of the North Eastern Enterprise Zone has been recently announced. However the additional allowance has not yet been allocated to a specific site or sites. As the LDO will be in place for a relatively long time it is considered that the EZ boundaries can be more effectively represented elsewhere. Notably through Arch and their marketing material.
Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	Bates LDO - introduction	Paragraph 1.7 advises that the LDO does not remove the need to obtain any additional (heritage-related) consents that may be required. This not only includes any need to obtain Listed Building Consent, but other consents such as Scheduled Monument Consent and Conservation Area Consent. Whilst the Bates site contains no heritage designations that might otherwise require additional consents, it is important to recognise that Circular 01/2006 also requires the setting of heritage assets to be safeguarded too.	The LDOs make it clear that other consents may be required. The list of other consent examples has been moved from the Guide to the appendix of the main document as it's is recognised this will be an important development consideration. As stated it is not intended to be an exhaustive list. A requirement has been added to Table 1 which requires developers to submit information in respect of demonstrating high quality and inclusive design. This is to include specific consideration of how the development contributes and responds to local character, heritage and the listed Coal Staithes.
Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	Bates LDO	Paragraph 2.6 - we are informed that Site 1 is primarily brownfield. That part of the document dealing with Development Considerations remains silent with regard to any matters concerning the historic environment, and in particular any archaeological interest or potential the site may possess. If no archaeological assessment has been made, one should be; if one has been made, its findings should be reported, together with a statement explaining the extent to which anything of heritage value has helped inform the process. Such an assessment should include all aspects of the historic environment, including non-designated and marine heritage assets, and the setting of those assets	Under the heading of development considerations only key issues are identified. In response to English Heritage's comments the Council have undertaken a preliminary assessment of archaeological/heritage issues, which will be available to developers. Reference has also been added to the LDO Guide.

<p>Mr Alan Hunter</p>	<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>Bates LDO - Statement of Reasons</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.10 - we are advised that the LDO is designed to encourage inward investment into Northumberland. As a consequence, there is a presumption that existing firms in the county will not be able to relocate unless there is a sound business case for doing so. Given that the North Eastern Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) operates throughout Northumberland, Tyne & Wear, and County Durham, and that the 'Enterprise Zone' is a LEP-wide one (albeit dispersed throughout a number of disparate locations), it seems surprising that, for example, a company in Berwick-upon-Tweed should not find it easy to relocate, yet one only 8 or 9 miles away in North Tyneside could without issue.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.12-3.14 - It is not the government's intention that a LDO should be a means of circumventing the requirement for sustainability. This being the case, the LDO should have regard to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which advises that there are three aspects to sustainable development - economic, social, and environmental - and that the latter includes for protecting and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes clear that gains in each of these aspects should be sought jointly and simultaneously. Development that does not do this is not sustainable.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.22 advises that development which has started will be allowed to complete within a 'reasonable' timescale. Developers would be assisted were this timescale to be less vague.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.34 - we are advised that the submission of a notice of intention to start work on site must be submitted to the local authority 14 days prior to commencement. Presumably this is at least 14 days.</p>	<p>The LDOs are clear in their objective to attract investment in Northumberland and avoid displacement. This approach is consistent with other Local Authority approaches within the NELEP area. Para's 3.12 - 3.14 are not intended to explain all of the provisions of the NPPF which have been taken into account in developing the LDOs. The section identifies just a few of the key relevant issues from the policy frameworks identified. The preceding sentence has been amended to reflect this. The Council does not see the LDOs as a means of circumventing the requirement for sustainability. On the contrary, the Council has been committed to embedding sustainability into the LDOs and has demonstrated this through undertaking a Sustainability Appraisal. The reference to completing development within a 'reasonable timescale' is considered fit for purpose. There is no prescribed timescale in respect of development permitted as a result of a planning application or General Permitted Development rights. Para 3.34 has been amended to clarify that a notice of intention to start work on site must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority at least 14 days prior to commencement. The document has also been reordered to make the submission and notification process more clear.</p>
------------------------------	-------------------------	---	---	---

Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	Bates LDO	<p>Table 2 sets out the conditions with which development must comply. In respect of Development Design we are advised that it should be of a 'high quality'. There is a suggestion that the key ingredients of good design set out in paragraphs 56-68 of the NPPF provide the necessary guidance and benchmarking, but greater clarity on this matter would assist. Conditions should cover all aspects of the historic environment, and not just archaeology. This should include non-designated assets and the settings of heritage assets. Marine heritage may also be present. Where heritage assets are discovered as a result of investigation it might be more appropriate to avoid their loss rather than mitigate for it.</p>	<p>Development design has been given careful consideration in developing the LDOs and there is reference in the LDO Guide to achieving high quality design. However, in response to consultation, various amendments have been made to further emphasise the importance of design. Notably, a development requirement has also been added to Table 1 requiring developers to submit a statement demonstrating how the development has had regard to achieving high quality and inclusive design. Potential impacts on heritage assets and their settings, both designated and non-designated has similarly been assessed as part of the LDO drafting process. It is not considered necessary to include a specific development condition but advisory notes have been provided in the LDO Guide.</p>
Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	East Sleekburn LDO - Introduction	<p>Paragraph 1.7 advises that the LDO does not remove the need to obtain any additional (heritage-related) consents that may be required. This not only includes any need to obtain Listed Building Consent, but other consents such as Scheduled Monument Consent and Conservation Area Consent. Whilst the East Sleekburn sites contain no heritage designations that might otherwise require additional consents, it is important to recognise that Circular 01/2006 also requires the setting of heritage assets to be safeguarded too.</p>	<p>The LDO makes it clear that other consents may be required. The list of other consent examples has been moved from the Guide to the appendix of the main document as its is recognised this will be an important development consideration. As stated it is not intended to be an exhaustive list. A requirement has been added to Table 1 which requires developers to submit information in respect of demonstrating high quality and inclusive design. This is to include specific consideration of how the development contributes and responds to local character, heritage and the listed Coal Staithes.</p>

Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	East Sleekburn LDO	<p>Paragraph 2.1 helpfully explains that Site 1(west) does not have Enterprise Zone status. This fact was not apparent to us until now.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5 - we are informed that Site 1 is primarily greenfield. Paragraph 2.34 dealing with Development Considerations remains silent with regard to any archaeological interest or potential the site may possess. If no archaeological assessment has been made, one should be; if one has been made, its findings should be reported, together with a statement explaining the extent to which anything of heritage value has helped inform the process. The same could also be said of Site 2 (quay), where artifacts of previous occupation may possess heritage value. Paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8 make reference to the former presence of the Blyth Power Station and associated infrastructure. Paragraph 2.34 also remains silent on whether any such remains, including the Ash Barge Dock, are of heritage value. Paragraphs 135 and 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework are of relevance. Paragraph 2.34 deals with Built Heritage. We are advised that the Coal Staithes at Blyth Power Station are listed grade II*. We are also advised that they must be protected both during construction and operation. It is important to protect their setting where this is an integral part of their heritage significance.</p>	<p>The development considerations identified are not intended to be an exhaustive list but instead identify key issues. In response to English Heritage's comments the Council have undertaken a preliminary assessment of archaeological/heritage issues, which will be available to developers. The archaeological condition has been amended accordingly. Full recording of the former Power Station has previously been undertaken. A requirement has been added to Table 1 requiring developers to submit a statement in regard to demonstrating how high quality and inclusive design has been achieved. Specifically they will need to address how development responds to the setting of the listed Coal Staithes.</p>
----------------	------------------	--------------------	--	--

Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	East Sleekburn - Statement of reasons	<p>Paragraph 3.10 - we are advised that the LDO is designed to encourage inward investment into Northumberland. As a consequence, there is a presumption that existing firms in the county will not be able to relocate unless there is a sound business case for doing so. Given that the North Eastern Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) operates throughout Northumberland, Tyne & Wear, and County Durham, and that the 'Enterprise Zone' is a LEP-wide one (albeit dispersed throughout a number of disparate locations), it seems surprising that, for example, a company in Berwick-upon-Tweed should not find it easy to relocate, yet one only 8 or 9 miles away in North Tyneside could without issue.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.12-3.14 - It is not the government's intention that a LDO should be a means of circumventing the requirement for sustainability. This being the case, the LDO should have regard to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which advises that there are three aspects to sustainable development - economic, social, and environmental - and that the latter includes for protecting and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes clear that gains in each of these aspects should be sought jointly and simultaneously. Development that does not do this is not sustainable.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.22 advises that development which has started will be allowed to complete within a 'reasonable' timescale. Developers would be assisted were this timescale to be less vague. Paragraph 3.34 - we are advised that the submission of a notice of intention to start work on site must be submitted to the local authority 14 days prior to commencement. Presumably this is at least 14 days.</p>	<p>The LDOs are clear in their objective to attract investment in Northumberland and avoid displacement. This approach is consistent with other Local Authority approaches within the NELEP area. Para's 3.12 - 3.14 are not intended to explain all of the provisions of the NPPF which have been taken into account in developing the LDOs. The section identifies just a few of the key relevant issues from the policy frameworks identified. The preceding sentence has been amended to reflect this. The Council does not see the LDOs as a means of circumventing the requirement for sustainability. On the contrary, the Council has been committed to embedding sustainability into the LDOs and has demonstrated this through undertaking a Sustainability Appraisal alongside drafting the LDOs.</p> <p>The reference to completing development within a 'reasonable timescale' is considered fit for purpose. There is no prescribed timescale in respect of development permitted as a result of a planning application or General Permitted Development rights. Para 3.34 has been amended to clarify that a notice of intention to start work on site must be submitted to the local planning authority at least 14 days prior to commencement.</p>
----------------	------------------	---------------------------------------	--	---

Mr Alan Hunter	English Heritage	East Sleekburn LDO	<p>Table 2 sets out the conditions with which development must comply. In respect of Development Design we are advised that it should be of a high quality'. There is a suggestion that the key ingredients of good design set out in paragraphs 56-68 of the NPPF provide the necessary guidance and benchmarking, but greater clarity on this matter would assist.</p> <p>Conditions should cover all aspects of the historic environment, and not just listed buildings and archaeology. This should include non-designated assets and the settings of heritage assets. Marine heritage may also be present especially at Site 2 (quay). Where heritage assets are discovered as a result of investigation it might be more appropriate to avoid their loss rather than mitigate for it.</p>	<p>Development design has been given careful consideration in developing the LDOs. In response to consultation a requirement has been added to Table 1, requiring developers to submit a statement demonstrating how development has had regard to achieving high quality and inclusive design. Potential impacts on heritage assets and their settings, both designated and non-designated have been assessed as part of the LDO drafting process. An amendment in respect of the setting of the listed coal staites has been added to the conditions in Table 2.</p>
-----------------------	------------------	--------------------	---	--

Mr Brian Oliver	Bedlington Forum	Bates LDO - About this consultation document	<p>The Bates site might offer huge hope to a very deprived town, but the marketing of this site is always going to be hampered by one very negative factor. There is no adequate transport infrastructure for this location. For many years the A193 Cowpen Road corridor route in and out of Blyth has been recognised as unsatisfactory. Until an alternative route into Blyth is found there cannot be any attraction or draw for a potential new company to develop this site, as year on year the traffic situation only worsens and this is only compounded each time a new housing development is completed in this part of South East Northumberland. The rail link that used to once run right into Bates Pit has long since been ripped up, the cost of refurbishing such a long section of line with all its bridges, crossings and with around 25 miles of railway lines, would all prove massively cost prohibitive. The river (at this location) is not particularly deep and would require further work, or a suitable new road link would need to be constructed to access the existing deep water port which is located further down river. The only way of making this site viable would be to build a road bridge across to the Cambois side of the river to access the transport network which already exists over there, however the cost of such a construction would be astronomical, but it would open up huge possibilities for the developments on both sides of the river, any additional expansions destined for the Cambois would benefit greatly from this too. While this project is very laudable, realistically there is little chance of any decent numbers of jobs ever coming from this ambitious development particularly when the prospective company's hands will already be tied by the complete absence of a suitable transport infrastructure other than by sea.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Highway issues are acknowledged in the LDO and associated Guide to be a key development consideration for the Bates site. Specifically Cowpen Road is acknowledged to be at close to capacity at certain times of day. Planning for sustainable travel and minimising road based traffic is emphasised. Planning for infrastructure to aid economic development is being fully appraised. However, as recognised in your comments viability is a key challenge. Until development proposals come forward it is difficult to determine the impact that new development at the Bates site could have on Cowpen Road and other key routes. However, the Council is considering what information / data may be available to help such analysis and potential solutions / mitigation.</p>
Mr Justin Hancock	Banks Group	Bates LDO - Introduction	<p>Banks Property Ltd supports the principle of redevelopment of the Bates Staithes at Blyth provided that the new development is fully compatible with neighbouring developments, existing and approved. Banks Property Ltd has a 50% stake in Bates Regeneration Ltd which is the owner and developer of land immediately south and south west of the LDO area.</p>	<p>In developing the LDO and defining the parameters of development to be permitted and conditions of development, full consideration has been given to the compatibility of development with neighbouring uses and development proposals including for the site immediately south and south west of the LDO area.</p>

	Natural England	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs – Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment	Natural England agrees with the conclusions of the Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment (including Habitats Regulations Screening report). Therefore, taking into account Regulation 78 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 ("The Habitats Regulations"), Natural England does not consider that the developments included in the LDOs will have a likely significant effect on a European site.	Comment noted.
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Gateshead Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs - Definitions	Whilst the Draft LDO prevents displacement of office, research and development, light industry, general industry and storage/distribution from elsewhere within Northumberland; we suggest that the wording is tightened to prevent displacement of employment within the wider LEP boundary to ensure the EZ derives net additional benefits for the LEP area. We welcome the provisions in the Draft LDOs that mean that planning permission would still be required for new development not linked with the EZ sectors or change of use within the same use class not linked with key EZ sectors set out in the LDO. However, it will be important these provisions are rigorously monitored and enforced and further details should be set out in the monitoring section.	The LDOs are clear in their objective to attract investment in Northumberland and avoid displacement. This approach is consistent with other Local Authority approaches within the NELEP area. Nevertheless the LDO is not intended to actively encourage development from elsewhere within the NELEP. As set out in the document, following expiry of the LDO no new uses will be allowed or changes or use without planning consent, unless it is a permitted change of use. Monitoring and enforcement was detailed in the LDO Guide and has been moved to the Appendix. Normal planning enforcement procedures will apply. Other procedures will also be place for determining eligibility for the Enterprise Zone incentives.

Ms Sophie Evans	Environment Agency	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs - conditions	<p>We generally agree with the proposed LDO and the conditions assigned to any new development permitted by the LDO, which reflect our earlier discussions in relation to this document Permitted Development In relation to the development permitted by the LDO, the document currently states- B2 General Industry (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or any operation processing or storage) or activity involving hazardous or inert waste; This seems to read that activity involving hazardous or inert waste is permitted. If this is not the case we would recommend that the brackets are amended. If this is the case, and activity involving hazardous or inert waste is to be permitted as part of the LDO, it needs to be made clear that this also requires and Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010. Under these regulations, permitted sites should not cause harm to human health or pollution of the environment. The operator is required to have appropriate measures in place at the site to prevent pollution to the environment, harm to human health, the quality of the environment, detriment to the surrounding amenity, offence to a human sense or damage to material property. If this is not included with the application then it is likely that we would reject any application received for an Environmental Permit. Surface water drainage We have previously advised that drainage from hardstanding areas that have the potential to be contaminated by fuels, chemicals or other polluting material must be connected to the foul sewer. The Environmental Permitting Regulations make it an offence to cause or knowingly permit any discharge that will result in the input of pollutants to ground or surface waters. We would recommend that this is included within the LDO if possible to make developers aware of the requirements.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The error was a typographical error and the brackets have been adjusted . As identified in the document it is not anticipated that development will involve hazardous substances but if it did this would require and Environmental Permit. The potential need for an Environment Permit is also identified under the issue of 'other consents' and a Table of other consents has been moved from the LDO Guide to the Appendix of the main document. A specific condition has been added to Table 2 in respect of surface water drainage from hard standing areas.</p>
Ms Sophie Evans	Environment Agency	LDO Guide – Other Consents re East Sleekburn	<p>We welcome the inclusion of a list of additional consents and Permits which may be required separate to the LDO/planning process.</p> <p>Consent for the culverting of any watercourse on and adjacent to the East Sleekburn sites will be required. As these are ordinary watercourses this consent will be issued by the Lead Local Flood Authority, in this case Northumberland County Council. We therefore recommend that this is also included in the list of other consents at Figure 1 in the LDO Guide.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The other consents has been moved to the appendix and reference added to culverting watercourses.</p>

Ms Sophie Evans	Environment Agency	Sustainability Appraisal	The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report takes into account our previous comments on the Draft SA Scoping Report. We would however additionally recommend that the need to protect groundwater resource (both quality and quantity) is identified as a key challenge in the Sustainability Appraisal, as this is not currently reflected in the document.	Comments noted. Amendment made.
Ms Angela Atkinson	Marine Management Organisation	Bates and East Sleekburn LDO	The MMO is the marine planning authority for England and will be preparing marine plans for all inshore and offshore areas of the English waters over the coming years. The first marine plans are currently being prepared for the East of England Inshore and Offshore areas. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply to the mean high water springs mark. In our duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with existing development plans, which apply down to the low water mark, we are seeking to identify the "marine relevance" of applicable plan policies. We would suggest the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 be referenced in the document and the implications for the marine area are noted. In the absence of completed Marine Plans for your area you may also like to refer to the Marine Policy Statement. The MMO also is responsible for issuing marine licences under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. A marine licence may be needed for many activities involving a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. We would suggest that reference to this be made within the LDOs to ensure that necessary regulatory requirements are covered. Any works may also require consideration under The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended) and early consultation with the MMO is advised.	The 'marine relevance' of the LDOs has been taken into consideration as the LDOs have been drafted. In response to the MMOs comments, specific reference to the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the Marine Policy Statement has been added under the 'statement of reasons'. The issue of the potential need for marine licenses is recognised. Para 1.10 is considered to make it clear that the LDO applies only to planning consent and other consents may be required. This is reiterated later on in the document. Furthermore, a table of 'other consents' initially identified in the LDO Guide has been moved the appendix of the main document. Whilst not an exhaustive list the list includes Marine Licenses and links to guidance and information on the process on the MMO's web site. Reference has also been added to The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007. The document has also been reordered with a new section addressing submission and conformity. The section includes reference to pre submission discussions not only with the council but other regulators / statutory consultees which should help identify issues and determine other requirements and consents.

Ms Naomi Waite	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs - Introduction	<p>The Trust considers, overall, the documents produced to be comprehensive and thorough. The potential impacts from the LDO have been assessed to an appropriate level and the Trust feels that the proposals for mitigation are good. However, to ensure that the mitigation is successful and adverse harm is avoided at designated sites, the Trust considers it necessary for the Council to deliver mitigation early on. The Trust would strongly encourage the Council to: Secure the land needed for mitigation as early as possible; Demonstrate how the mitigation and sites used for this will be managed in perpetuity, and; Continue to work closely with nature conservation bodies, including ourselves, RSPB and Natural England throughout the process and after construction.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is working to ensure the effective delivery of development under the provisions of the LDOs. An officer working group has been established and is currently critically assessing options for securing strategic environmental mitigation. The Council has been keen to involve Natural England, Northumberland Wildlife Trust and RSPB in the LDO preparation process and will continue to keep the agencies advised of progress.</p>
Ms Naomi Waite	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	East Sleekburn LDO - Conditions	<p>p19. Retaining some existing tree and shrubs is welcomed, however the Trust feel that the use of the word "some" is too ambiguous and needs clarification. p24. Whilst the Trust welcomes the recognition of the short perennial/ephemeral vegetation on the sites and its ecological importance, we feel that conserving this by means of translocation alone may not provide the best results. We suggest a re-wording that allows for seed collection/hay strewing to be carried out if it is proven to be a more effective method of conserving the ecological interest of this habitat. p27 8.5 This paragraph appears to highlight that there is a need for further mitigation in respect to the impacts of any development on SSSI species. If this is the case, the mitigation needed should not only be "scoped" for but also should be fixed and agreed long before any development takes place. p27 8.6 The Trust strongly supports the creation of additional mudflat and saltmarsh habitats and would seek clarification on how this would be achieved by winter opening of the Wansbeck barrage.</p>	<p>The condition in respect of retaining the strip of trees along the boundaries of East Sleekburn Site 1 has been amended to specify a width of the planting that must be maintained at both the west and southern boundary of the site. The condition has been reworded to include the potential for seed collection / hay strewing. The Council is committed to ensuring the delivery of suitable mitigation measures. An officer working group has been established and is currently critically assessing options for securing strategic ecological mitigation. The Council has been keen to involve Natural England, Northumberland Wildlife Trust and RSPB in the LDO preparation process and will continue to keep the agencies advised of progress.</p>

<p>Port of Blyth</p>	<p>Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs</p>	<p>The issue in relation to the four formal submission processes is one of resources within the Local Planning Authority and indeed other regulators. From submission of the Screening Request until completion of notification of commencement of work is 63 days or nine weeks. This is similar to that of a normal planning application but requires resources to be in place to respond and also clear standing orders confirmed in the Local Planning Authority to delegate decisions to Planning Officers. Pre-application advice is also advised and clear determination periods and fees need to be established at the outset. There is a risk that the process does not actually reduce determination timescales. Also, if any works are necessary in the Marine Environment then Marine Licences are required and this will significantly slow down determination.</p>	<p>The document has been re-ordered to hopefully clarify the submission and notification process. The Council is committed to help secure development of the LDO sites and therefore will commit the necessary resources to ensure development enquiries for the sites and specifically developments under the provisions of the LDOs are effectively and efficiently dealt with. In respect of the overall timescales for determining conformity with the LDO, the Council have reviewed options for how this could be condensed. It has been determined that the submission for an EIA screening could be submitted alongside all other submission material, therefore the two processes could run concurrently. This would have the affect of reducing the timescales by 3 weeks but introduces a risk to developers should the EIA determination conclude that EIA was required and therefore development could not progress under the LDO. The LDO document has been amended to reflect this option. The requirement to notify the Council that development is due to commence is a very simple procedure (i.e. submitting a form) included for monitoring purposes. It is recognised that Marine licenses and other consents could influence timescales for progressing development. The need for other consents and early dialogue with other statutory consultees is emphasised throughout the document.</p>
<p>Port of Blyth</p>	<p>Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs - Conditions</p>	<p>The issues with conditions relate to both LDOs. The way the conditions are drafted it is difficult to see how phased development could take place. Consideration must be given to re-word conditions to allow phased development to take place without a need to discharge all conditions for the whole site area (such as contaminated land). There are numerous examples of revised wording to allow phased development on these major sites. It would also seem sensible to relate building heights to a datum. As, presently drafted, there is no reference to where the building height would be measured from. The condition relating to Development</p>	<p>Comments noted - the conditions have been re-worded to clarify and facilitate the scope for development to occur in phases. Clarification has been added in respect of building heights from OD. Building heights for the Bates site have also been revised in response to consultation comments. Development design considerations are identified in the LDO Guide which specifically considers the issues of industrial shed type developments. To clarify design considerations a requirement has also been added to Table</p>

Design is not clear and concise. It may be more appropriate to set out a palette of materials or BS colours. Similarly, there are conditions imposed setting "very good" BREEAM targets. It must be confirmed if surveys, assessments and public engagement already undertaken meets BREEAM requirements or these targets may be difficult to achieve. Reasonable targets are set to trigger Transport Assessments but surely this work should be scoped to confirm the level of assessment required and potentially baseline data gathered. It is assumed that the required Flood Risk Assessment does not require any form of sequential testing, this should be confirmed. Sustainable drainage is difficult to achieve on Brownfield sites with issues such as contamination etc. In some ways, discharging surface water into the Estuary as quickly as possible may be of benefit and the issues of surface water drainage could be considered now without the imposition of a condition that is onerous and potentially could not be achieved. The land contamination conditions are where things could be significantly improved and, as drafted; there are discrepancies between the two sites. There are good examples of land contamination conditions that allow phased development. Similarly, the desk study prepared may need to be updated over the six year period. It is recommended that the land contamination conditions are re-visited. All of the above points are necessary to ensure the Local Development Orders are deliverable and do not in themselves impede development.

1, requiring developers to submit a statement demonstrating how development has had regard to achieving high quality and inclusive design. The condition in respect of sustainable design gives the option of achieving BREEAM 'very good' or 'excellent' or achieving 10% of energy consumption from renewable resources. This is considered to be in line with national energy objectives and adopts a nationally recognised standard. The consultation undertaken on the draft LDOs is considered to be unlikely to fulfil the specific BREEAM qualifying consultation requirements. However, consultation relates to only one credit. Credits can be secured through a wide range of other measures. Recognising the specific requirements of the buildings and sectors being targeted (including the potential for large industrial sheds) the condition does include a clause 'unless it can be demonstrated that the nature of the building / business prevents this'. The wording of the condition has been amended to clarify that such an exception would only be permitted if it was suitably demonstrated through testing. The Council is working with Arch on issues of LDO development delivery and has established an officer working group to address such issues. To date, various site assessment work has been collated and it may be that further data could be collected specifically in relation to transport. In developing the LDOs the Council has consulted the Environment Agency. The Agency confirmed in respect of the Flood Risk that a sequential test would not be required/appropriate. A condition in respect of sustainable drainage is considered to be essential to address the risks and impacts of flooding/contamination. A further condition has also been added with regard to surface water drainage. It is recognised that SUDs can be difficult to achieve, however the viability of incorporating SUDs can't be determined without further assessment. The condition is worded

accordingly.

Mr Justin Hancock	Banks Group	Bates LDO - Conditions	<p>Bates Regeneration has recently submitted reserved matters plans for 257 new homes on this land in pursuance of the outline planning permission. In addition Northumberland County Council has constructed and opened a primary school on land abutting the LDO land and we feel that this should be explicitly acknowledged in the LDO. In terms of amenity and health & safety the proximity of the school will have to be taken into account in the design of any new development. The recent use of the site has not been very sympathetic to the site's context. In particular the glass cullet handling and loading operation caused noise nuisance. This activity necessitated the construction of a 5m reinforced earth bund within the housing site. We welcome the prospect of a better neighbour development in terms of noise and dust going forward. The proposed noise limit of 55db (LAm_{ax}) at the SSSI would act as a deterrent to adverse noise impacts at the school and new housing. However we would recommend that the condition explicitly identifies the school and adjacent houses as sensitive properties requiring the same noise controls throughout the year. We support the need for noise assessments following BS4142 and 5228. We would recommend that developments are designed to minimise noise pollution through the sensitive location and orientation of noise generators such as extractor fans. We recommend that a condition is added relating to health and safety. Certain processes would require HSE consultation when they are proposed this close to housing or schools because of the risk of explosion. We would not want such processes to be permitted without proper assessment at Bates because this would affect the marketing of houses on the site. It is unclear from the LDO how the assessments of noise, transport or flooding impact would be carried out when the LDO is in place. Would the highways or flood impacts be capable of preventing an unacceptable development? A draft condition limits building heights to 35 metres. This is extremely high in the context of residential neighbours. It is the equivalent of an eleven storey building. We would request that Northumberland County Council carry out assessment of the impact of building heights in this location. At the very least the Council should</p>	<p>Bates Regeneration proposals for new homes are acknowledged in section 2 of the LDO. As requested this has section has been amended to make reference to the primary school on the site. In addition under the heading of development considerations the section on residential amenity has been revised to reflect the amenity / health and safety considerations given the proximity of the school. There are two conditions addressing issues of noise. The proposed noise limit of 55db(LAM_{ax}) at the Staithes and SSSI is a limit that has been specifically identified to limit disturbance to protected sites / bird populations. The issue of safeguarding adjoining properties are addressed in a separate condition. The required assessments, which are conditions of the LDO, are in effect aspects of development which need a specific approval, beyond what is permitted by the LDO. It is feasible that an assessment could deem particular proposals unacceptable. In response to consultation, a requirement has been added to Table 1 relating to development design. In addition, further analysis has informed an amendment to the permitted building height at the southern boundary of the site. The development condition has been revised to reduce the height of buildings within a set distance of the boundary. The quay / jetties are an important asset of the site and currently remain operational. It is considered unlikely that the existing footpaths along the estuary can be consolidated/linked up in this location. The LDO makes it explicit that it only grants planning consent and there are other consent regimes which developers need to comply with. The document has been reorded to also help emphasise the encouragement of early consulttation with key stakeholders. The Health and Safety Executive are</p>
--------------------------	-------------	------------------------	--	---

			<p>consider a set-back distance to reduce the potential visual impact. A condition prevents prejudicing a potential road link to Wimbourne Quay. We support this because a road link would be beneficial. We also suggest that new development should not prejudice creation of a pedestrian footpath link along the rivers edge. We appreciate that at present such a link is not possible because of the presence of cranes and the general state of the foreshore. However if the type of development becomes storage then the opportunity for a riverside walk would be beneficial in drawing the centre of Blyth into the riverside regeneration area. Notwithstanding the comments above and the attempt to control the impacts of development on the environment we agree with the conclusion that individual developments will need to be screened for EIA because it is quite possible that they will raise significant environmental issues at the time of submission.</p>	<p>one such stakeholder, identified in the LDO Guide.</p>
Mr Justin Hancock	Banks Group	Bates LDO - Definitions	<p>We note a typographical error on page 25. It is stated here that "no material that could become windborne shall not be stored on the site other than within buildings". The word "not" should be removed.</p>	<p>Comments noted - error amended.</p>
Mr G. Allan	Eden District Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	<p>Response acknowledging consultation and confirming no comments.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Miss Rachael Bust	Coal Authority	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs - Conditions	<p>It is pleasing to note that the Council has responded positively to the Coal Authority's two established concerns of land instability due to coal mining legacy and the need to avoid the unnecessary sterilisation of coal resources. The Coal Authority considers that the draft is sufficiently clear to ensure the land is safe and stable and also prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources, both of which are requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

	North Tyneside Council		The proposal due to its distance away would not have an adverse impact upon North Tyneside and therefore it is considered that this Council should raise no objections to the proposals.	Comments noted.
Ms Erin Robson	Newcastle International Airport	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs - Conditions	Thank you for consulting Newcastle International Airport (NIA) on the above proposal. The proposal has been assessed by the aerodrome safeguarding team and I have the following comments to make: NIA would request that all lighting associated with the development be fully cut off in order to prevent any distraction to pilots carrying out complex manoeuvres whilst preparing to land.	Comments noted. The draft condition in respect of lighting/floodlighting in Table 2 has been amended to address the Airport's concerns with specific reference to directional lighting.
Councillor Mr John Robert Potts	Blyth Town Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	The Committee emphasised their support for the LDO and hoped that its comments would be seen as constructive criticism.	Comments noted and welcomed.
Councillor Mr John Robert Potts	Blyth Town Council	Bates LDO	The Committee enquired whether one developer would be attracted or whether there would be multiple developers for the Enterprise Zone. The Committee said one major concern was traffic on Cowpen Road and its capacity, and the knock-on effect on the rest of the town. The Committee believed that small and medium-sized enterprises would be unable to fund the necessary improvement works. The draft Development Order contains a condition requiring a transport assessment, but the Committee asked that NCC carry out the necessary preparatory work by the collection of data. The Committee indicated similar concerns for the other studies, particularly as some could only be undertaken at certain times of the year.	One developer might be the outcome, However it may also be that there are several developers. Highway issues are acknowledged to be a key development consideration in the Bates LDO and accompanying LDO Guide. The transport / access requirements of development will be influenced by the specific needs of individual businesses which will be appraised through transport assessment/transport statement. Any existing evidence the Council is able to share with developers which may assist such an assessment will be reviewed. A range of site assessment work has been assembled which has informed the LDOs whilst more technical details will be shared with developers. This includes existing ecological survey work.

Councillor Mr John Robert Potts	Blyth Town Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	The Committee enquired about the references to coal extraction in the draft papers and suggested that the accompanying papers, whilst noting government policy on coal reserve sterilisation, clearly indicate the likelihood of coal being extracted. The Committee also noted that extraction would have major implications for the water table and closed mine pumping.	The LDO supports the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework including in relation to preventing the unnecessary steralistaion of coal reserves and ensuring land is safe and stable. Evidence suggests that coal seams in the area are narrow and widely spaced. It is therefore anticipated that extraction is unlikely to be economically viable. Notwithstanding this initial view, further investigation will be necessary to determine whether extraction is feasible.
Councillor Mr John Robert Potts	Blyth Town Council	Bates LDO	The Committee raised the issue of flood prevention works.	There is a small area of the Bates site within flood risk zones 2 and 3. Any development on this part of the site will need to be subject to flood risk assessment and if appropriate flood defense measures implemented. There are proposals for flood risk defenses where there is an existing ferry landing. This is acknoweldged in the LDO which states that development must not prejudice such measures and encourages early consultation with the Environment Agency.
Councillor Mr John Robert Potts	Blyth Town Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	The Committee also suggested that a definition of "Off-Shore Industry" be placed into the Development Order giving as wide a scope as possible to the types of industry which could be attracted.	The definition is intended to briefly describe what the 'off-shore industry' could include without prescribing too much detail. A further example has been cited to help clarify and a further foot note has been added to the statement of reasons giving some additional background to the North East's existing off shore sectors.
Councillor Mr John Robert Potts	Blyth Town Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	The Committee noted the effect of a local development order including in respect of the potential height of development. They asked that consideration be given to encouraging any businesses to communicate their intentions to the Town Council.	The Council is considering how best to communicate development proposals to the Town / Parish Council's. It is important to acknowledge that any such notification would be just that and not consultation.

<p>Dr Elisabeth Charman</p>	<p>RSPB</p>	<p>Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs</p>	<p>We found the consultation documents, in general, to be comprehensive. We believe the Council has done a thorough job in assessing the impacts of the LDOs on the designated parts of the Blyth Estuary. We also consider the options for mitigation on site to be good. We also recognise and commend the Council's approach to the potential for cumulative impacts to the SSSI resulting from future developments in the Blyth Estuary area. However, it is vital at this stage that the Council shows commitment to delivering areas of strategic mitigation for cumulative impacts up front and ahead of a time when they are required to ensure no overall impact to the designated sites. We discuss this in further detail in our response. As we understand this process, a LDO grants permission for the type of development specified in the LDO. Section 3.6 of each document notes that the LDO would grant permission for Uses Classes B1 (a), B1 (b), B1 (c), B2 and B8. Development which would normally incur EIA regulations would not be permitted automatically under this permission. However, we welcome Northumberland County Council's Submission and Notification process which highlights that all development under the LDOs will be subject to EIA regardless. We also welcome the clarity stated in Sections 4.5 and 4.6 that state an LDO cannot permit Schedule 1 development (under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact) Regulations 2011) or which is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or European Offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans and projects).</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is committed to ensuring the delivery of suitable mitigation measures. An officer working group has been established and is currently critically assessing options for securing strategic ecological mitigation. The Council has been keen to involve Natural England, Northumberland Wildlife Trust and RSPB in the LDO preparation process and will continue to keep the agencies advised of progress. The LDOs have been subject to EIA screening and the EIA screening decisions were published alongside the LDO consultation. There will however be a need to screen specific development proposals. The LDO has been re-ordered to help further clarify the submission process including the need for EIA screening. A conformity process has also been illustrated in diagrammatic form including the EIA screening exercise.</p>
------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------------------------	--	--

<p>Dr Elisabeth Charman</p>	<p>RSPB</p>	<p>Nature conservation and ecological assessment</p>	<p>3. Approach/Methodology Section 3.1 SUPPORT We welcome the statement that "Northumberland County Council is committed to a high level of due diligence in respect of the natural environment of the Blyth Estuary" Section 3.12 SUPPORT As identified in Section 3.12, the NPPF refers to the planning system's role in contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment, including through minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity. In addition, the NPPF requires local authorities to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure (paragraph 117) and promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks. According, the Council should seek to apply this policy throughout the Local Development Order process. 5. Ecological Resources and Features Sections 5.14 - 5.31 COMMENT Consideration should be made as to the potential for little ringed plover to colonise the sites, given their bare nature as described in Sections 5.14 - 5.31. 6. Identifying and assessing likely impacts of development on SPA/Ramsar sites/species Table 2 European Sites COMMENT In the case of Northumbria Coast SPA and Ramsar site, some sections are significantly closer than 2 km. This table should identify the minimum and maximum distances to this site from all of the LDO areas individually. We agree that the East Sleekburn Site 1 is sufficiently far from the SPA and the SSSI boundary and presents no suitable habitat for the birds which are qualifying features of the designated sites. Therefore, it is unlikely that there will be an impact on the designated sites through the development uses permitted by the LDO. Table 4 SUPPORT with COMMENTS Noise: Mitigation for noise should include the decommissioning phase as well as construction and operational phases. The applicant should demonstrate that noise will not exceed 55 db (LAMax) anywhere within the SPA, not just restricted to Blyth North Staithes. We commend the Council's use of LAMax as a measure. Details of how this will be monitored should be given. Cumulative effects:We support restrictions on access to the SPA adjacent to the beach and pier to provide quiet refuges during development. The Council should set out how this will be achieved practically on the ground. 7. Identifying and assessing likely impacts of development on the Northumberland Shore SSSI & local biodiversity interest sites Section 7.9</p>	<p>Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment Comments noted The wording of conditions .in respect of landscaping have been revised to reflect the aim to achieve net gains in biodiversity in line with the requirements of NPPF. Specific requirements in respect of little ringed plover are not identified as these were not identified through survey. A condition has however been added in respect of site/ vegetation clearance during bird breeding/nesting to clarify legal requirements. Table 2 has been amended to reflect the proximity of the sites to the SPA and Ramsar. Table 4 has been amended accordingly recognising decommissioning and the wider SPA. Monitoring of LDO development is referenced in the LDO Guide. Factors such as noise will be monitored and enforced in the same way that they would for a planning application. Any consideration of restricting access to the SPA needs to be reconciled with wider policy objectives, notably not restricting public rights of access. As above, the Council is committed to ensuring the delivery of suitable mitigation measures. An officer working group has been established and is currently critically assessing options for securing strategic ecological mitigation to address the LDO site and wider development sites with the Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone. In reference to noise the reference has been amended to include decommissioning. As above, specific requirements in respect of little ringed plover are not identified as these were not identified through survey. A condition has however been added in respect of site/ vegetation clearance during bird breeding/nesting to clarify legal requirements. Clarification of achieving a net gain in biodiversity has been added to the document. A development condition in Table 2 includes the need for Sustainable Drainage. Reference is given in the LDO Guide to the use of green infrastucture for serving multiple purposes including biodiversity gains. Objection noted - As above, the Council is committed to ensuring the delivery of</p>
------------------------------------	-------------	--	--	--

Dr Elisabeth Charman	RSPB	Bates LDO - The Bates Site	Section 2.27 SUPPORT Whilst the site does not have an ecological designation, as the report notes (section 2.24) it is close to Northumberland Shore Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA). We welcome the commitment Northumberland County Council make to protecting these areas in Section 2.27. Section 2.29 COMMENT In considering the impact of development at the Bates Site, the Council should take into account the impact of the proposed and existing housing immediately to the south and south west (Section 2.29).	Comments noted - in assessing impacts of development account was taken of the potential cumulative impacts of other developments including the new housing development.
Dr Elisabeth Charman	RSPB	Bates LDO - Statement of Reasons	Section 3.25 SUPPORT Monitoring of impacts through the lifetime of the LDO to ensure minimal impacts to the designated sites, is vital. We note this commitment in Section 3.25 We also welcome the clarity stated in Sections 4.5 and 4.6 that state an LDO can not permit Schedule 1 development (under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact) Regulations 2011) or which is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or European Offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans and projects).	Comments noted.
Dr Elisabeth Charman	RSPB	Bates LDo - Prior information and requirements	Table 1 Conditions SUPPORT with COMMENTS We support the conditions for compliance with the LDO, in particular: "New external lighting shall be designed in accordance..." This is essential to avoid disturbance onto the SPA and SSSI. Lighting should be directional. "No construction or operational noise shall exceed 55db(MAX)..." This is essential to avoid disturbance onto the SPA and SSSI. This condition should be extended to include the decommissioning phase. "prior to the commencement of development details of provision for undisturbed feeding and roosting habitat for wading birds..."	Comments noted. The condition in respect of lighting has been further clarified with reference to directional lighting. The condition in respect of noise has been amended to include decommissioning phases and to include any part of the Ramsar / SPA.
Dr Elisabeth Charman	RSPB	East Sleekburn LDO	Section 2.27 SUPPORT Whilst neither Site 1 (west) nor Site 2 (quay) have ecological designations, as the report notes (section 2.24) Site 2 is close to Northumberland Shore Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA). We welcome the commitment Northumberland County Council make to protecting these areas in Section 2.27.	Comments noted.

Dr Elisabeth Charman	RSPB	East Sleekburn LDO Statement of reasons	Section 3.25 SUPPORT Monitoring of impacts throughout the lifetime of the LDO to ensure minimal impacts to the designated sites, is vital. We note this commitment in Section 3.25	Comments Noted.
Dr Elisabeth Charman	RSPB	East Sleekburn LDO	Table 1 Conditions SUPPORT with COMMENTS We support the conditions for compliance with the LDO, in particular: "At Site 1 (west) some existing tree and shrub planting shall be retained and protected at the western boundary..." However, we also suggest that at both sites there should be a requirement for development to result in an overall net gain for biodiversity and this should be set out as a condition for compliance. "At Site 2 (quay) no development is permitted which encroaches on the intertidal habitat." However, this condition would also benefit from a definition in terms of the limits of the intertidal habitat. "New external lighting shall be designed in accordance..." This is essential to avoid disturbance onto the SPA and SSSI. Lighting should be directional.	Comments noted. The wording of development conditions has been amended to reflect comments recieved including in respect of clarifying the need for directional lighting.

Sleekburn Estate	The Sleekburn Estate	East Sleekburn LDO	<p>Sleekburn Estate have participated in the preparation of the emerging Core Strategy and detailed representations were submitted on their behalf earlier in the year. In those representations Sleekburn Estate noted their support for the principle of the Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone. Sleekburn Estate similarly support the principle of a Local Development Order to simplify the planning process / extend permitted development rights. In the circumstances Sleekburn Estate wish to record their agreement with the Council's Statement of Reasons for creating a LDO (section 3) and the draft Order itself. Sleekburn Estate's only other point is that it would be good if the LDO extended further. As detailed in representations to the emerging Core Strategy, the Estate own Sleekburn Grange and Mount Pleasant Farms which lie to the south of East Sleekburn. These farms and the appearance of the area are blighted by the legacy of a number of power lines leading to the major transformer at the Old Power Station site. The Estate consider there is a need for the whole area including these Farms to be comprehensively planned. In representations to the emerging Core Strategy it was suggested the extent of the Strategic Site be widened to include these Farms. This would be logical on the ground, the BEREZ Zone then being land to the north of the River Blyth. In addition it would hopefully support the delivery of strategic objective of developing the low carbon sector whilst improving the appearance of the area.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes Sleekburn Estate's support in principle for the BEREZ and the LDO and has noted relevant comments submitted in relation to the Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation. The LDO boundaries have been informed by development considerations and constraints. The current boundaries are considered to represent cohesive development sites and allow for development to be effectively managed through the appropriate use of conditions. As reflected in the Core Strategy Issues and Options document, the Council is seeking to plan comprehensively for a wider area known as the Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone which is being promoted for employment uses. The Sleekburn Grange and Mount Pleasant Farms will be assessed as part of this process. It should however be noted that there are no proposals to move the transformer station or power lines and this infrastructure clearly provides a development constraint.</p>
Miss G Turner	Morpeth Town Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	<p>Morpeth Town Council welcomes consultation and has no comments to make.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Mrs Kristina Bell	Scottish Borders Council	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	<p>Response acknowledging consultation and confirming no comments.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Mr Brian Oliver	Bedlington Forum	East Sleekburn LDO - About this consultation document	<p>The type and nature of the companies which could be attracted to the Brock Lane and the Cambois sections of this two part development must be carefully monitored as there could be some unwanted negatives generated by such an expansion. Without a separate dedicated connecting roadway between the two sites there could be considerable disruption caused due to industrial traffic travelling between the two locations. Certain types of manufacturing processes could become a cause for concern to local residents who live down-wind of the Brock Lane development, the new Banks housing site could potentially be effected by any such unwanted smells, dust or even noise pollution, it all depends very much on what is being manufactured or assembled and the processes they use. I use the example of the former company Vald Birn Ltd, where residents were continually plagued by pollution related problems from this site. These two development sites should not be marketed in such a way that it only attracts very large single occupancy businesses which would take over the whole site. As a prime example to this I sight the huge financial and labour losses which followed when Siemens in Newcastle closed down in other words, don't allow all the eggs to be put in one basket. Putting a life span (6 years) on Local Development Order (LDO) is to be applauded, but there must be a well-planned out follow-on strategy, ready to go and in place long before the expiry date of the LDO. Overall we are in support of this bold project particularly when such excellent road, rail and sea infrastructures already exist, the potential at these two sites to bring much needed investment into the Cambois area is tremendous, but it must never be jobs at any cost.</p>	<p>The LDO only applies to specific sectors, as identified in Section 4. It is not expected that the industries will give rise to significant issues such as those relating to emissions. However, many different scenarios have been planned for and the conditions of the development permitted by the Order will ensure any unwanted adverse impacts of those sectors, such as those relating to residential amenity will not arise. The impact of traffic and vehicles using Brock Lane will be subject to further testing before development however it is considered there is capacity on this route. Development which occurs under the provisions of the LDO will be subject to the planning enforcement regime that would apply any form of development.</p>
Mr Daniel Gaunt	Highways Agency	Bates and East Sleekburn LDOs	<p>Response confirming no comments. The LDO includes a requirement for a transport assessment which addresses previous comments made.</p>	Noted
Mr Mark Garner	NHS North of Tyne	Bates and East Sleekburn	<p>No comments.</p>	Noted

LDOs

<p>Trustees of the Sleekburn Estate and Dysart Developments</p>	<p>East Sleekburn LDO – site 1</p>	<p>The Trustees and Dysart Developments have land holdings in close proximity to this site to the south and to the south-west beyond the Spine Road. The sites are being promoted through engagement with the council and representations to Northumberland Local Development Plan Core Strategy Issues and Options and also the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). A plan extract from the February 2012 SHLAA shows East Sleekburn Site 1 (West) in the context of our client's land holdings notated as site references; 5017, 5019, 5045 and 5156. These representations are made to the draft Local Development Order as well as the following associated documents Local Development Order Guide; Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion; Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment; Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone (BEREZ) strategic employment area for low carbon industries is generally supported in principle in recognition that Northumberland County Council is committed to creating the conditions for economic recovery and growth. The justification for creating the Local Development Order is accepted subject to the development considerations and conditions identified in the LDO being robust in that they comply with planning policy and also meet all the requirements that would be expected from a development of this size should it be considered through the usual planning development management process. The comments made refer to the various sections and paragraphs of the Local Development Order and cross-referenced to the other associated documents where required.</p>	<p>Comments noted as relating to LDO and associated documents. The support in principle for the Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone is noted.</p>
---	------------------------------------	---	---

Trustees of the Sleekburn Estate and Dysart Developments	East Sleekburn LDO and the Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment	<p>Site Description Paragraph 2.3 of the LDO describes the location of Site 1 (West). Given the proposed end use of the site, it is essential that the Local Development Order takes on board the location of residential properties at East Sleekburn Village and also the housing estate at Sanfield Road. Development Considerations We understand the Council and its partners have assembled site information for the East Sleekburn Site in order to provide a detailed understanding of the development considerations. With reference to ecology (paragraph 2.24 of LDO) we note from the Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment (NCEA) that a Phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken of the East Sleekburn Site 1 (West) in March 2011. The conclusion was that no signs of protected species have been identified on the site, although watercourses may offer suitable habitat for water vole and otter. We would comment that the developer will be required to update the Habitat Survey at the point where details are submitted for the proposed development. We also note at Table 5 of the NCEA the potential likely effects of LDO development on SSSI and local biodiversity interest of the sites. With reference to East Sleekburn Site 1 the potential impacts are on breeding birds (skylarks and meadow pipit), loss of nesting habitat, destruction of nest and disturbance of birds and young as well as local pollution, flooding and loss of suitable riparian mammal habitat and loss of woodland planting and hedgerows and loss of some wet areas. The mitigation measures to avoid these potential likely effects as detailed in Table 6 should be referenced within the conditions within Table 2 of the LDO. At present there is no reference to the requirement for no site clearance to take place during the bird nesting season which is March - August inclusive. In terms of residential amenity at paragraph 2.31 of LDO, reference is made to protection during operation and construction phases. However, the detail of the proposed development in terms of site layout and scale and massing of the proposed buildings must demonstrate the amenity of nearby residents will not be adversely impacted on before any scheme can be confirmed as compliant with the LDO. It is essential that relevant conditions are imposed to avoid future conflict and potential complaints at a future date.</p>	<p>In preparing the LDO, full consideration has been given to the surrounding context including the surrounding residential areas. The analysis has informed the parameters of development and conditions of the LDO. Development Considerations The Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment acknowledges that habitats evolve and wildlife interest can quickly develop and therefore as time passes further ecological surveys may be required. Standard practises suggests updating every two years. This is reiterated in the LDO Guide . The potential likely effects of development on SSSI and local biodiversity interests of the site, and subsequent mitigation measures identified in Table 6 of the Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment have been addressed through conditions of the LDO and through advisory notes in the LDO Guide. In addition the Council is working with Arch to consider delivery implications of the LDOs including in relation to environmental mitigation. The requirement for no site clearance was assumed as there are already legislative requirements to this effect. However, for clarity the LDO conditions table has been amended to include this requirement. The LDOs do not seek to prescribe site layout details. However a requirement has been added to Table 1 requiring developers to submit various details including detailed site layout proposals and a statement demonstrating how the development achieves high quality and inclusive design.</p>
--	--	--	---

Trustees of the Sleekburn Estate and Dysart Developments	East Sleekburn LDO - Statement of reasons	Lifetime of the LDO It is stated the LDO will be in place for 6 years following the date of adoption. It states at paragraph 3.23 that the uses that have been implemented before expiry will be allowed to continue to trade/operate but no new uses or changes of use will be allowed without planning consent; unless it is a permitted change of use as prescribed in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (and its subsequent amendments). We raise concern regarding this given the proposed development permitted by the LDO is so specific in relation to a target sector and suggest that permitted rights to change between the uses are removed to prevent the purpose of the development from being watered down or indeed significantly change its form. Predevelopment Advice, Consultations and Notification At paragraph 3.37 developers are encouraged to initiate early engagement of key stakeholders in advance of development occurring. Whilst we understand that some consultation has been undertaken with the local community by Northumberland County Council, we strongly suggest that local residents are kept informed particularly at the point when developers are looking to confirm a site layout including the proposed scale and massing of any buildings.	The LDOs do not seek to restrict permitted changes of use, as prescribed by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (and its subsequent amendments). Any new development is only permitted by the LDOs if it is within the target sectors. However, in the longer term it is considered the Council needs to positively plan for potential new industries or changes in market demand and does not consider there to be a justified case for removing such permitted development rights. Due to the nature of LDOs, which seek to permit development upfront and effectively simplify the planning process, there will be no further opportunity for local communities to influence factors such as site layout. This was taken into account when planning consultation on the LDOs. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the consultation values of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. It was more exhaustive than regulations require including widespread neighbour notification letters and community consultation drop in events in both Blyth and Cambois. It was made explicit during consultation that this was people's opportunity to have their say and that they would not be consulted again in the way they would if development was progressed under a regular planning application route. The LDO has been re-ordered to emphasise and clarify the submission / conformity process.
Trustees of the Sleekburn Estate and Dysart Developments	East sleekburn LDO - The Local Development Order	The description of development as drafted includes reference to the predominant uses acceptable within the site which are B1, B2 and B8. The description also makes reference to three criteria which must be met in order for those uses to be acceptable. One of the criteria attempts to consider B1(A) Office Use in this location as acceptable if it does not exceed 2,500 sqm. However, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local authority's to apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centres uses that are not in an existing centre	B1(A) office use and A1 retail use are recognised to be main town centres uses as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework. The town centre uses permitted by the LDOs were identified on the grounds of the needs of the target sectors and site specific considerations. They are intended to be secondary uses, supporting the business/industry uses which can optimise the sites' locational advantages - i.e with Port facilities and access to

and not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. There is no reference to any sequential site assessment having been undertaken in order to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF. If this exercise has been completed we suggest that it is made available as one of the associated documents to the LDO. If this exercise has not been undertaken we suggest the reason for this is documented within the LDO in order to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF. It should also be noted that there is no floorspace threshold set for consideration of town centre uses on sites outside of town centres which are subject to the sequential assessment. The threshold of 2,500 sqm stated in the NPPF refers to the threshold size at which an impact assessment of the development is required. The 2,500 sqm is not the threshold for consideration of the sequential test. We strongly suggest that the Council reviews the acceptability of office development in light of the NPPF i.e. demonstrate the site has been subject to a sequential approach and then if over 2,500 sqm subject to an impact assessment, as the text is currently drafted is incorrect and does not represent national policy. At paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 reference is made to other uses that may be permitted, including A1 Shops and A3 Restaurants and Cafes. These uses would be acceptable if the A1 uses are for the sale of predominantly convenience goods; development does not exceed gross floorspace of 300 sqm (including mezzanine floors) with no individual unit being greater than 200 sqm; and meet the requirements and conditions identified in Tables 1 and 2 of the LDO. If these uses are acceptable as being ancillary to the main purpose of the development, we consider that they should be stated within the description of development together with the criteria that need to be met in order that it is absolutely clear what uses and their scale and massing can be developed on the site. It may also be helpful to reference in the text the justification of the gross floorspace sizes that are considered acceptable for A1 and A3 uses and also the definition of convenience goods which is currently referred to as Footnote 21.

off-shore sectors including Round 3 off-shore wind farms. To help ensure that the permitted town centre uses were supporting and would not have adverse impacts on existing centres, various criteria and conditions were imposed, including - Use Class B1(a) not being permitted in isolation. In the context of these objectives and development parameters, it was considered sequentially testing alternative sites would not be appropriate or meaningful. This justification has now been documented and will be referenced accordingly as part of the LDO evidence base. In respect of the NPPF threshold for an impact assessment the LDO has been amended to reflect NPPF and to clarify that an impact assessment would be required for office use over 2,500 sq m. The principle of development in this location is recognised to be a separate issue i.e. according to sequential test considerations and has been documented. We consider that the issues you raise in respect of A1 and A3 uses can be addressed through formatting changes to make it more evident that these uses fall under the heading of 'Description of development permitted by the LDO'. Justification for the criteria is documented in the sequential test considerations paper (and as stated above will be referenced accordingly). It should be noted that the gross A1 floorspace has been reduced to 250m².

Environmental Impact Assessment Reference is made at paragraph 4.5 to the development permitted by the LDO having been screened in respect of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations) 2011. At paragraph 3.3 of the Local Development Order Guide it states that the development permitted by the LDO is unlikely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location and is therefore not EIA development. It is noted that the screening opinions are based on various assumptions and are at this point limited in their scope. We understand until the detail of the proposed development is forthcoming it is not possible to fully understand all of the potential impacts. However, as the LDO is essentially equivalent to outline planning consent, there has to be sufficient information available to be robust in the conclusion of any screening opinion. Indeed, there is case law relating to EIA screening of proposed developments of this nature which have taken through the planning application process. We note the requirement at Table 1 within the LDO and with reference to paragraph 3.5 of the LDO Guidance which requires a further EIA screening to ensure a detailed scheme complies with the Order.

Environmental Impact Assessment The Draft LDO Guide makes an inaccurate reference to the EIA screening determinations and has been reworded to reflect the conclusions of the EIA Screening determination i.e. 'The Screening Opinions conclude that the impacts of development permitted would not be so significant to require an EIA for the reasons documented'. It is acknowledged in the following paragraph that the screening opinions are necessarily based on various assumptions. However, the Council can confirm that there was sufficient information within the LDOs, to enable the Council to make robust EIA screening determinations. As noted, further EIA screening is a condition of the LDOs.

Trustees of the Sleekburn Estate Dysart Developments

East Sleekburn LDO - Conditions

Table 2 lists a number of conditions that seek to ensure the proposed development is compliant with the LDO. It is essential that these conditions have been well thought through and indeed satisfy all of the tests for conditions, these being: Necessary; Relevant to planning; Relevant to the development to be permitted; Enforceable; Precise; Reasonable in all respects. Having looked over the conditions we have the following comments:

Site Layout With reference to Site 1 (West) the existing tree and shrub planting should not only be retained and protected at the western boundary with A189 but also be retained and protected at the southern boundary with Brock Lane as well as being regularly maintained.

Development Scale It is stated the building height must not exceed 35m. The scale of buildings to the southern boundary of East Sleekburn Site 1 must be carefully considered given their proximity to residents of East Sleekburn Village. Whilst it is likely the electricity pylons and overhead lines will form a standoff zone between the village and any proposed development on the site, we consider the height of any buildings in this part of the site should be significantly lower than 35m given the likely visual impact.

Landscaping This condition requires a high quality landscaping scheme to be implemented with an emphasis upon retaining and filling gaps in boundary planting to screen development. With reference to the LDO Guide paragraph 4.54, we note reference is made to the significant tree planting strip located to the western boundary of East Sleekburn Site 1 and the requirement to retain a level of screening. However, no reference is made to the southern boundary beyond which there are more sensitive uses. We suggest the future developers of the site give full consideration to the boundary treatment and any additional planting to enhance that which currently exists.

Lighting The proposed condition expects new external lighting to be designed in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Engineers Guidelines for Sensitive Sites and positioned/directed away from the estuary. This condition should make reference to the proximity of

Site Layout and Landscaping The condition in Table 2 in respect of landscaping has been amended. It now specifies a width of tree planting at both the western and southern boundaries to be retained. The condition includes provision for continued maintenance. Development Scale A preliminary landscape analysis informed the defined development parameters including building height.

Landscaping The condition in respect of landscaping has been amended prescribing the retention of trees along the western and southern boundaries of the site. **Lighting** The lighting condition in Table 2 refers to the Institute of Lighting Engineers Guidance which in turn deals with many aspects of external lighting including light spill, nuisance. However, this had been made more explicit in the wording of the condition.

Noise The LDO includes conditions in respect of noise which will be assessed ahead of development and enforced in the same way as regular development.

Ecological Assessment and Mitigation The findings of the Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment have informed the LDO development conditions. In addition, the Council is working to critically assess options for strategic ecological mitigation measures.

residential dwellings to the south and east of East Sleekburn Site 1 and ensure that flood lighting does not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the existing or indeed any future residents. We suggest the wording of the condition is changed to include this provision.

Noise Any noise created by the construction, piling or operations on the site must be assessed in order to ensure that it will be not have an adverse impact on residents that live close by. It is essential that the proposed development is at this stage or at the detailed stage subject to a noise impact assessment to fully demonstrate compliance with national policy. The location of noise generating uses in close proximity to residents has the potential for causing conflict and to generate complaints to the local authority.

Ecological Assessment and Mitigation As stated earlier reference needs to be made within this condition to Table 6 of the NCEA to ensure that the mitigation to deal with the likely significant effects of the LDO on local biodiversity interest are included within the development scheme.

**Mr David
Webster**

East
Sleekburn
LDO -
Introduction

I write to you with reference to the above proposals in East Sleekburn, which you call 'East Sleekburn site 1'. From the outset I have to object to this, and I do so for the following reasons. 1 The council has numerous 'brown field' sites and industrial areas. Some of these industrial areas are at present empty and could be adapted for the purpose. 2 The proposed land was developed by the council to act as a natural barrier for the village to reduce noise pollution etc. Obviously the council don't care anymore! 3 To develop the land involved will mean the destruction of woodland. Has the council heard of global warming? Although tiny in impact in this case, if every council adopted this policy then we'd all be in trouble. The council MUST act in favour of the environment. 4 The area supports wildlife. During the hours of darkness, in particular, it is a thoroughfare for local foxes on their way to and from adjacent fields. Indeed bats have been seen in the last few days and so they are roosting somewhere in the close vicinity. Owls are also regular as are stoats and/or weasels. Deer live in the fields and if you'd care to check with NPower and the Police there have been numerous occasions of people trying to

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council is planning positively for new and emerging sectors likely to locate in the area. Specifically, the Council is planning for the growth of the low carbon and renewables sector and has named an area around Blyth as the Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone. The intention is to prioritise low carbon and renewable related businesses in this area creating clusters and supply chains which build on the existing strengths of the area including in research and development at Narec - the National Renewable Energy Centre. East Sleekburn site 1 is an important development opportunity within that zone. It has been identified for its suitability and availability, including in respect of its proximity and accessibility to Port facilities and the strategic road network; its scale to accommodate the likes of large manufacturers; and the willingness of owners to dispose of the site. The ecological value of the site has been fully

poach them. The below picture was taken on June 1 st 2011. 5 There is a public footpath / right of way leading up to the Cow Gut. 6 Noise . It goes without saying that there is going to be increased vehicular noise. I don't think there can be any argument that our peace and quiet, a basic human right, under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (see various judgements from the court of human rights in Strasbourg, including at least one against the British Government) will be adversely affected. Noise is a recognized pollutant. We have a bridge leading into the village which has a weight restriction. Cars travel through that area at speed as well as vehicles way over the weight limit. We had a serious car accident in July 2012 which the council said they would address. All good sound bites for the press, but as per usual absolutely no actions from the council. Yet again another example of how we are forgotten about until someone comes up with yet another hair-brained idea to try and spoil the area. During the summer of 2003 on June 4 th there was a major accident on Brockdale (opposite Spring Ville) in which 4 cars were written off. East Sleekburn is a lovely little village and there is lots of wildlife. Any further development will spoil the character of the village and drive the wildlife away. In conclusion This is an unnecessary expansion to the outskirts of the village neither wanted nor needed by the residents. There will be unnecessary disruption to the residents, once again, an increase in vehicular traffic in a small village, a blot on the village's landscape, and potential disruption and loss of local wildlife. Why not use the land and put in some windmills? It won't stop the wildlife, it's green, and it means the trees etc won't be lost. I hope you take notice of our objections and worries and you throw out this planning in the same way you threw out the last few proposed developments in this vicinity. You, the councillors, are our elected representatives and we ask you to vote the way in which we want and to say no.

assessed as part of the process of developing the draft LDO and is recorded accordingly in the associated Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment. The assessment concludes that overall the site has a relatively low ecological value and no ecological designations. Conditions are however imposed in the interest of conservation of biodiversity / protected species. It is recognised that the site has recent woodland planting and more mature tree planting at its boundary with the A189. There is a condition requiring a high quality landscaping scheme with an emphasis upon retaining and filling gaps in boundary planting to screen development. In addition a specific condition requires existing tree and shrub planting to be retained along the western boundary with the A189 and the southern boundary with Brock Lane. The LDO Guide further emphasises the importance of screen planting and the need to retain rather than replace planting where feasible. There is a public right of way which runs along the edge of the site is acknowledged. The right of way is not affected by the LDO. Issues of residential amenity have been fully considered in developing the LDOs. The forms of development permitted and the use of criteria and conditions will effectively avoid and mitigate potential impacts of new development such as noise.

Mrs Joy Webster

East Sleekburn LDO - Introduction

I object to this planning, for the following reasons: 1 The council has numerous brown field sites and industrial areas. Some of these industrial areas are at present empty or partially used and could be adapted for the purpose. 2 The proposed land was developed by the council to act as a natural barrier for the village to reduce noise pollution etc. Obviously the

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council is planning positively for new and emerging sectors likely to locate in the area. Specifically, the Council is planning for the growth of the low carbon and renewables sector and has named an area around Blyth as the Blyth

council doesn't care anymore! 3 This land is a public woodland walk, used by many locals daily. It was provided for use by the local community and provides a natural corridor for wildlife. 4 The corridor is home to a small herd of deer, foxes, many bird species including, long tailed tits, chiffchaffs, great & blue tits, barn & tawny owls and many more. 5 Bats are roosting in the area, and fly over the woodland, and adjacent fields feeding at dusk. 6 The council should think carefully before destroying woodland - global warming and the destruction of wildlife habitat. If every council destroyed woodland, and green spaces the country, in fact the world would be in very serious trouble. 7 I believe this is a decision based on greed, and not thinking about using land wisely. 8 The council MUST act in favour of the environment. 9 Noise . It goes without saying that there is going to be increased vehicular noise. I don't think there can be any argument that our peace and quiet, a basic human right, under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (see various judgements from the court of human rights in Strasbourg, including at least one against the British Government) will be adversely affected. Noise is a recognized pollutant. 10 A weak bridge in the village has needed attention for about 15 years there is no money nor have we had any support to sort out the vehicles that abuse the restrictions . No money for that . We have a serious speeding problem through the village no Money or any support to sort it out. 11 Several serious accidents in the village, one just recently of course the County Council will investigate Where are you not a word nor an action as usual nothing for this village. You need to sort out your priorities. 12 Part of the site is the motorcycle park designed to keep bikers off fields and public spaces ...place for enthusiasts to be safe and enjoy without disrupting others " your taking that away too, another local resource. 13 The last knee jerk action was to try to destroy another piece of woodland in the village, for a fire station. Again greed and no thought. I ask, why do you always feel you can destroy our peace and natural spaces ??? Why not think carefully and use land that is available and going to waste or is it just you want the grant money and have no care whether there are any jobs or not , as long as you get the money ! East Sleekburn is a little village and there is lots of wildlife. Any further development will spoil the character of the village and drive the wildlife

Estuary Renewable Energy Zone. The intention is to prioritise low carbon and renewable related businesses in this area creating clusters and supply chains which build on the existing strengths of the area including in research and development at Narec - the National Renewable Energy Centre. East Sleekburn site 1 is an important development opportunity within that zone. It has been identified for its suitability and availability, including in respect of its proximity and accessibility to Port facilities and the strategic road network; its scale to accommodate the likes of large manufacturers; and the willingness of owners to dispose of the site. The ecological value of the site has been fully assessed as part of the process of developing the draft LDO and is recorded accordingly in the associated Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment. The assessment concludes that overall the site has a relatively low ecological value and no ecological designations. Conditions are however imposed in the interest of conservation of biodiversity / protected species. It is recognised that the site has recent woodland planting and more mature tree planting at its boundary with the A189. There is a condition requiring a high quality landscaping scheme with an emphasis upon retaining and filling gaps in boundary planting to screen development. In addition a specific condition requires existing tree and shrub planting to be retained along the western boundary with the A189 and the southern boundary with Brock Lane. The LDO Guide further emphasises the importance of screen planting and the need to retain rather than replace planting where feasible. There is a public right of way which runs along the edge of the site is acknowledged in para 2.30. The right of way is not affected by the LDO. Issues of residential amenity have been fully considered in developing the LDOs. The forms of development permitted and the use of criteria and conditions will effectively avoid and mitigate potential

away, Please leave us alone. In conclusion This is an unnecessary expansion to the outskirts of the village. I have no objection to the creation of jobs in our area, god knows we need them " but use the old power station land, and plough interest into the off shore wind farm technology. Fill up the west Sleekburn industrial area, and the North Seaton area, and the West Hartford industrial area, and Cramlington ...many more without destroying woodland, land already available. There will be unnecessary disruption to the residents; once again, this village has suffered enough in the past, an increase in vehicular traffic in and around a small village, a blot on the villages landscape, and disruption to and loss of local wildlife, not to mention a probable detrimental effect on house prices. I ask you take notice of our objections and worries and you throw out this planning in the same way you threw out the last few proposed developments in this vicinity. You, the councillors, are our elected representatives and we ask you to vote the way in which we want and to say no. Think about the locals and not yourselves.

impacts of new development such as noise.

Mr Alan Carter

East Sleekburn LDO - Introduction

Why is this area again being targeted?there is an abundance of sites neglected ,by this council in need of attention and development.This woodland,was(I believe) planted as part of the now aborted Great North Forest and provides a wonderful amenity for many people like myself who love to walk and enjoy NATURE.I have to question planning policy which will destroy this area, isnt the cost of the tree planting taken into account ?(Id wager that some of my council tax money paid for it, if so I would want it all back) I and countless others fail to see the need for any more such developments, arent there enough UNUSED already?I am asking for something sensible from the planners;rational thought.I ,along with others and the wild life do hope to be able to coninue to use and enjoy what this smal lwoodland gives Please consider US.

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council is planning positively for new and emerging sectors likely to locate in the area. Specifically, the Council is planning for the growth of the low carbon and renewables sector and has named an area around Blyth as the Blyth Estuary Renewable Energy Zone. The intention is to prioritise low carbon and renewable related businesses in this area creating clusters and supply chains which build on the existing strengths of the area including in research and development at Narec - the National Renewable Energy Centre. East Sleekburn site 1 is an important development opportunity within that zone. It has been identified for its suitability and availability, including in respect of its proximity and accessibility to Port facilities and the strategic road network; its scale to accommodate the likes of large manufacturers; and the willingness of owners to dispose of the site. The ecological value of the site has been fully assessed as part of the process of developing the draft

LDO and is recorded accordingly in the associated Nature Conservation and Ecological Assessment. The assessment concludes that overall the site has a relatively low ecological value and no ecological designations. Conditions are however imposed in the interest of conservation of biodiversity / protected species. It is recognised that the site has recent woodland planting and more mature tree planting at its boundary with the A189. There is a condition requiring a high quality landscaping scheme with an emphasis upon retaining and filling gaps in boundary planting to screen development. In addition a specific condition requires existing tree and shrub planting to be retained along the western boundary with the A189 and the southern boundary with Brock Lane. The LDO Guide further emphasises the importance of screen planting and the need to retain rather than replace planting where feasible.