

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Northumberland County Council is required, under Regulation 4(3)(b) of The Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012, to provide a summary of any representations submitted to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

This document provides a summary of those representations which were made in relation to the Submission Draft Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

Electronic copies of the representations made on the Plan, and which were submitted to the independent examiner, are available under the Eglingham Parish tab on our Neighbourhood Planning web page:

<https://www.northumberland.gov.uk/Planning/Planning-policy/Neighbourhood.aspx>

List of Representations

1. Alison McGarrigle
2. Andrew Norwood and Frances Buckingham
3. Anne Logan
4. Anthony Henfrew
5. Coal Authority
6. David and Barbara Biesterfeld
7. David and Siobhan Patterson
8. David Alston
9. David and Janice Myers
10. David Jones
11. Graham Thompson
12. Historic England
13. James Logan
14. Jane Hamilton
15. Janis Jones
16. Joel Lester Sher
17. John and Kay Waters
18. John and Ruth Hunter

19. John Carr Ellison
20. John Rutherford
21. Jon Radgick
22. Judith Scott
23. Katherine Clark
24. Ken and Prudence Mariks
25. Lawrence Holmes
26. Lord Vinson
27. Lorna Tuner
28. Margaret Bell
29. Ministry of Defence
30. National Highways
31. Natural England
32. Northumberland County Council
33. Peter and Gil Ridgway
34. Raymond and Sue Brown
35. Ron Bell
36. Sally Black
37. Sport England

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
A McGarrigle		Supports the Plan saying it is a significant, and thorough, piece of work and should support the community into the future.
A Norwood & F Buckingham		The village plan should remain unchanged, in particular with respect to the village boundary. Further development cannot be considered to be sustainable.
A Logan		Supports the Plan.
A Henfrey		Supports the objectives and detail of Policy 5, which is based on firm, well-researched evidence and on the strong wishes of local residents.
Melanie Lindsley Principal Planning & Development Manager	Coal Authority	Within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including: mine entries, coal workings and reported surface hazards. As the Plan does not allocate any new sites for development, they have no specific comments to make on this document.
D & B Biesterfield		<p>Support the proposed policies especially Policy 5, the Landscape Protection policy - 'Area of High Landscape Value and its protection and enhancement'. The landscape is of a standard and quality higher, in many respects, than substantial parts of the Nationally designated National Park and Coastal AONB, between which the Eglingham Parish area sits.</p> <p>They support the decision to call the proposed designated area an 'Area of High Landscape Value' to achieve continuity with the earlier local designation within the former Alnwick and Berwick District-Wide local plans.</p>
D & S Patterson		They endorse the objectives and details contained in policy 5 of the Plan.

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
D Alston		Supports the Plan, which encompasses all the issues which contribute to making the Parish of Eglingham a special place to live.
D & J Myers		They see no reason why the boundaries (of Eglingham Village) should change.
D Jones		Fully supports Plan, particularly those policies relating to Settlement Boundaries and the Area of High Landscape Value. Commends the outline of the Plan, which maintains and protects Eglingham Village.
G Thompson		Fully supports the Plan, in particular the ambition to retain the local green spaces and surrounding landscape which is of high value and rich in wildlife. Also very importantly the settlement boundaries as outlined in the plan.
Jules Brown Historic Places Adviser, North East & Yorkshire	Historic England	<p>Comments made by Historic England on the pre-submission draft plan do not appear to have been picked up therefore, these comments are repeated here.</p> <p>They welcome the vision and objectives set out in the draft plan particularly as those regard heritage and note that opportunities have been taken to identify Local Green Space with historical significance (NPPF paragraph 102) and the special qualities of the area to be reflected in development (NPPF paragraph 127).</p> <p>Specifically, they recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to policy 3 - to recognise the significance of the Conservation Area, to reflect statutory duties and for clarity. • Amendments to Policy 6 – to better reflect the NPPF. • Policies Map – clearly identifying the non-designated heritage assets identified in Appendix A. • Supporting text – to avoid confusion, substituting other words for ‘list’, ‘listed’ or ‘listing’ such as ‘record’ or ‘set out’.

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glossary – add ‘conservation’ and ‘significance’. • Community actions – recommend an action to update the conservation area character appraisal during the life of the Plan. <p>Additionally, they recommended considering including a policy to offer solutions to heritage assets that are at risk from their condition or vacancy, or are vulnerable to becoming so during the life of the plan.</p>
J Logan		Supports the Plan.
J Hamilton		Supports the Plan.
J Jones		Supports the Plan, particularly the Area of High Landscape Value. The Settlement Boundaries should remain as they are, thus avoiding any further infrastructure issues.
J L Sher		Fully supports the objectives and detail of policy 5.
J & K Waters		Supports the Plan, it will help preserve and respect the character and beauty of the area.
J & R Hunter		Fully support the Plan especially the policy relating to settlement boundaries.
J Carr-Ellison		Strongly supports the Plan in particular the protection and enhancement of areas of high landscape value.
J Rutherford		Complete support.

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
J Radgick		Fully supports policies to protect, preserve and enhance the area.
J Scott		Supports the Plan in safeguarding our communities, lifestyle and beautiful surrounding countryside.
K Clark		Fully supports the Plan especially the points and objectives outlined in Policy 5.
K & P Marks		Fully support the village boundaries as detailed in the draft neighbourhood plan thereby preventing any further development.
L Holmes		Supports the Plan, particularly the proposed settlement boundaries as shown in the plan. Also, the aspiration to retain the sense of place by preserving the local green spaces the surrounding landscape and the rich wildlife, and by retaining the historic buildings and architecture.
Lord Vinson		Strongly supports the Plan, in particular, Policy 5 because the landscapes that it aims to protect are of extremely high value, they form part of a wider series of interconnected landscapes, all of quite extraordinary beauty and importance, and their combined essence is at the heart of the wider character of North Northumberland.
L Turner		Supports the Plan.
M Bell		Supports the Plan. It establishes a clear path for the future of the village, and in particular ,the definition of development boundaries is of great value to sustaining the quality of life in Eglingham Village.
Chris Waldron Assistant Safeguarding Manager	MOD / Defence Infrastructure Organisation	The area covered by any Eglingham Neighbourhood Plan will both contain and be washed over by a safeguarding zone that is designated to preserve the operation and capability of RRH Brizlee Wood. Within any new Neighbourhood Plan, policies and the reasoned justification

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<p>supporting them should, ideally, refer to the presence of safeguarding zones and/or provide a developer with an indication as to potential limitations that might apply to certain development types.</p> <p>In order to provide a broader representation of MOD interests, and to ensure prospective developers are aware of the implications of developing within an area containing MOD safeguarded zones, it is requested that the Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan contains policy wording that makes clear that only those applications for development which would not compromise, restrict or otherwise degrade the operational capability of safeguarded MOD sites and/or assets will be supported.</p>
Sunny Ali Regional Spatial Planning Manager	National Highways	There are no negative consequences associated with the Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the SRN. Accordingly, they offer no further comment.
Sally Wintle Adviser Operations Delivery, Consultations Team	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.
P & G Ridgeway		Fully supports Plan - its aims and the policies developed to deliver them.
Dr RDH & Mrs S Brown		Supports Plan, particularly those policies relating to Settlement Boundaries and the Area of High Landscape Value.
R Bell		Supports the Plan especially the definition of development boundaries for the village.
S Black		Supports Plan, particularly those policies relating to Settlement Boundaries and the Area of High Landscape Value.

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
Planning Technical Team	Sport England	The neighbourhood plan should reflect and comply with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 102 and 103.
Sarah Brannigan, Neighbourhood Planning team	Northumberland County Council	<p>POLICY 1 – Settlement boundaries for the villages of Eglingham and South Charlton Recommend deleting paragraphs 2-5 as they largely repeat what is in the Northumberland Local Plan.</p> <p>POLICY 2 - High quality and sustainable design Criterion g) refers to ‘non-visually obtrusive solar panels’ and could be in conflict with PD rights. Recommend deleting this part of criterion g).</p> <p>POLICY 3 – Eglingham Village Conservation Area Support the inclusion of a policy that is specific to the local Conservation Area but raised concerns as to how wording would be interpreted in decision making. Recommended deleting the list of buildings CA1-CA8 and also the viewpoints listed I to vi because it is not clear why they have been included.</p> <p>POLICY 4 - Local Green Spaces in the villages of Eglingham and South Charlton The Council supports this approach, which seeks to protect green spaces that are of demonstrable importance to the local community.</p> <p>POLICY 5 - Area of High Landscape Value and its protection and enhancement The Council queried a number of points made in the supporting text, and suggested amendments to improve accuracy and clarity. For the Policy, the Council considers that the terminology ‘Area of High Landscape Value’ implies a level of protection that is stronger than actually intended and suggest that it is re-written as an ‘area of valued landscape’.</p>

Eglingham Parish Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<p>POLICY 6 - Non-Designated Heritage Assets and Areas of Archaeological Interest Development Suggested re-wording policy to better align with NPPF, 2023 (para 209).</p> <p>POLICY 7 - Community Facilities The Council considers that a neighbourhood plan policy is an appropriate mechanism for identifying facilities that are especially valued by the local community. However, they recommend deleting paragraph 2 because it repeats Policy INF 2 of the Local Plan. Additionally, they advise re-wording paragraph 3 because as currently written it is sufficiently different from the approach set out in policies INF2 and INF 3 of the Local Plan (though it is not clear why) and this could create confusion in decision making.</p> <p>POLICY 8 - Habitats and Species Recommend deleting this policy as it adds nothing to existing Local Plan policy, particularly Policy ENV 2 Biodiversity and geodiversity.</p>