

Embleton Parish Council
36 Christon Bank Village
Christon Bank
Northumberland
NE66 3EY

Mr C. Collison
Planning and Management Ltd



Dear Mr Collison

Re: Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Responses to Regulation 16 comments

Embleton Parish Council, as the Qualifying Body for the Embleton Neighbourhood Plan would like to respond to comments that have been submitted at Regulation 16 consultation stage on the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

1.0 Northumberland County Council (NCC): Covering Letter

1.1 We appreciate the support that we have been given by NCC throughout the process. They have been kind enough to attend almost all of our Steering Group meetings and have provided us with useful advice throughout the process; they have helped us with all our maps and given us technical advice throughout the process. We are therefore somewhat dismayed at the response that has been submitted by them at this late stage in the consultation process. Having worked together on this Plan for over 3 years, we find it hard to express how disappointed we are to see the extent of their comments. Although some comments were to be expected; the majority of them were not expected and we are extremely concerned that we should have an opportunity to respond, as the implication seems to be that we have ignored comments made previously by NCC.

1.2 By way of background, it should be noted that at Regulation 14 stage, NCC provided us with an entirely new version of our Plan, in the form of a re-draft of a number of policies with tracked changes, and a 'clean' version for us to accept and use. They also advised we didn't have to accept their changes "*I should also emphasise again that these are suggestions for improvement from me and my team. I hope they are helpful, but please do not feel obliged to accept all or any of the changes we've suggested.*" On the advice of our planning consultant, we chose not to adopt the approach of having a plan re-drafted for us by NCC. We considered that this approach both undermined much of the work that we had been doing with the community over the years, and also undermined local democracy in plan-making. We re-drafted the Plan ourselves, with the assistance of our planning consultant.

1.3 However, it is important to note that we did accept a number of recommendations made by NCC, and spent a good deal of time going through the responses alongside those from other statutory bodies and amended the Plan to the extent that we felt that the policies addressed some of the key concerns raised, without losing the overall intention of the Parish Council for the Neighbourhood Area. The Consultation Statement submitted with the Plan provides detail about the significant number of changes we did make and explains why we chose not to make other changes.

1.4 Although we are not surprised to see the NCC re-iterate some of the policy wording suggestions raised previously, we are discomforted by the extent of those concerns, many of which have not been raised until now.

1.5 The re-drafted Policy 1 submitted (which we have not seen before) is, in our view, repetitive, lengthy and unwieldy and we have tried to stay away from having overly lengthy and repetitive policies (whilst accepting that repetition can sometimes be inevitable). The suggested Policy 1 repeats national planning guidance in the NPPF (in particular, policy in paragraph 79), which we consider to be unnecessary. This kind of repetition is something we have specifically tried to avoid.

1.6 The suggestion of having a new Policy 1, and deleting Policy 5 (and potentially, Policy 9) is in our view, unhelpful. Although we consider that the outcome at the end of the day would result in a Plan that says much the same thing as it does now, we do not agree that this is a preferable way of wording the policies. There are many ways in which policies can be worded, and many ways in which the drafting of policies can be carried out. It is not an exact science.

1.7 If, in your opinion, these changes are necessary in order for the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions, then we would be prepared to accept them as our aim is to get our Plan through examination and to referendum as soon as possible. Substantial delays have already occurred through the last-minute change introducing the need to do a Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Strategic Environmental Assessment that were raised rather late in the day by NCC, contrary to their initial advice.

1.8 Notwithstanding comments made above in relation to the covering letter, we would make the following points in relation to specific points made in the table attached to NCC's letter. To make things easy, we have adopted a similar table format to address each point below:

p.3:	We have no objection to a list of planning policies being provided in the contents page.
p.4 para 1.1:	We have no objection to the term 'Neighbourhood Area' (or 'Plan Area').
p.7 para 2.5:	Agreed – no comments.
pp. 9- 11:	We have no objection either way, but do not feel this comment relates to whether the plan meets the basic conditions.
pp. 12-14:	This matter has never been raised before and we do not feel it affects whether the Plan meets the basic conditions. In addition, we regret the suggestion that a 'template' format has been used. It is accepted that a similar framework has been used to that in other Neighbourhood Plans in the local area, in particular North Northumberland Coast, which recently passed examination. We felt this format worked well for our area, because many of the issues that we considered important were also important in that area. The North Northumberland Coast Neighbourhood Plan was split into 3 distinct areas: 'People' 'Prosperity' and 'Place'. A different approach has been adopted here, where we established a set of objectives (with a significant amount of local consultation), and then sought to develop policies to meet these objectives. Inevitably there is some cross-over between objectives – this will always be the case, but we do not feel that the plan is fundamentally flawed, or that it fails to meet the basic conditions.
p.13 OBJECTIVE 3:	We note the NCC's objection to the allocation of the school site which was raised at Regulation 14 stage. Nevertheless, we consider the school to be an important community facility and would like to define it as such in the Plan. We do not agree that the identification of the school as a community facility fails to meet the basic conditions.
p.15 and in subsequent topic headings:	Noted, but the drafting and layout of the Plan is really a matter for the Qualifying Body. It is a matter of opinion as to which layout works best, and although we respect the opinion of the LPA on this matter, we do not

	consider that this makes a fundamental difference to the Plan or whether it meets the basic conditions.
P.15 Para 6.1:	Noted.
p.15 Para 6.2:	Noted; the information is there to explain rural exceptions for the purposes of interpreting Policy 1. Each paragraph seeks to explain and justify each sub-paragraph in Policy 1; it is for this reason that the paragraphs are set out in this way.
p.15 Para 6.3:	Noted.
p.16 – Policy 1;	Noted and we have responded to this point in the body of the letter above. In short, we do not agree with the revised policy suggested – we consider it to be lengthy and repetitive, and do not agree that it is clearer than the policies suggested in the Submission Plan. However, if it is considered that the Plan would not meet the basic conditions as drafted, then we would accept the revisions suggested.
p.17 – Policy 2:	Noted. We have no objection to the policy being amended as suggested.
p.18 – Policy 3:	We would support whatever approach best ensures the protection of habitats and species. We have been advised by Natural England, and the County Ecologist; we note Natural England's response which appears to support the policy as drafted.
p.20 Policy 4:	We are happy with the wording of part a) – we agree that 'safe access' could be removed, as it is already covered in part j) of Policy 4. The removal of the word 'Urban' is not objected to, nor is the suggested re-wording objected to in relation to sustainable drainage. With regard to part f) we agree that 'significant' could be added. We note that County Ecologist comments; we consider this is covered in part i) of the policy; and note that paragraph 6.19 already refers specifically to measures such as providing nesting habitats for birds and bats could provide measurable net gains for biodiversity. With regard to comments about the lack of policy on Coastal Erosion: this is a Neighbourhood Plan, not a Local Plan. A Neighbourhood Plan does not need to cover all areas of policy – it only needs to cover those areas that are seen as important to the local community through local consultation. No-one in the local community raised coastal erosion as an issue. These matters can be covered by strategic planning policies in the existing Local Plan and (in time) the Northumberland Local Plan.
p.21/22:	Noted. Commentary may apply to different parts of the Plan, this doesn't affect whether the Plan meets the basic conditions.
p.22:	We have commented on this in more detail on the section above 'covering letter'. We do not agree that Policy 5 should be deleted. Reference to 'open countryside' is intended to define the difference in planning terms between the settlement and the countryside, where different planning policies will apply. The word 'open' could be removed for clarity; however, we note that when refusing a recent planning application (18/01014) and the subsequent appeal both NCC and the Planning Inspectorate used the term 'open countryside'.
p.23 Policy 6 and supporting text:	Agree.

p.24 Policy 7:	We disagree. The school field meets the tests set out in paragraph 100 of the NPPF and this is covered in more detail in the supporting evidence. We understand why the Strategic Estates Team would not like the school field designated as a Local Green Space. However, the tests in policy are to do with value to the community, not the aspirations of landowners for the future use of the site.
p.27 Policy 9	We disagree. This is set out in our response to the covering letter. However, if it is decided that it is necessary to delete Policy 9 and use the suggested revised Policy 1, we will accept that decision.
P.29 Policy 10:	We are unclear as to how this policy conflicts with part c) of Policy 1. We have no objection to 'whenever' being incorporated into the policy instead of 'if/when'.
P.30 Policy 11:	We used the evidence gathered in relation to the Northumberland Local Plan to produce this policy – an approach which we consider to be acceptable. We do not think it is necessary for the Local Plan to be 'made' in order for us to use the evidence available that supports it. We are aware that the Local Plan may not be 'made' for some time and we would like this policy to remain as we are unable to predict what developments may come forward and be approved within the Neighbourhood Area over the next year or so. We do not understand how the comments about major development and paragraph 6.53 are relevant.
P.31 Policy 12:	We do not agree that this policy should be deleted. Policy 1 provides an overarching 'setting' to what development will be supported in the Neighbourhood Area. Other policies in the Plan are specifically devoted to specific types of development, giving a specific set of criteria and considerations that are particularly relevant to that type of development. We accept that the last paragraph can be removed if this is covered by a stand-alone policy elsewhere in the Plan.
P.31 Policy 13:	No comments
P.33 Policy 14:	Please see comments made previously. The school is considered by the community to be a community facility. It has been in existence for over 300 years, is at the heart of our community and forms a key component of our vision statement. We are not seeking to prevent the loss of the school (although that would be a great loss for our community); but we are identifying the school buildings and the school as an important part of our community. With regard to comments about the last paragraph of the policy, and its consistency or otherwise with Policy 1; we could use the same terminology as Policy 1 (i.e. to 'serve' the settlements of Embleton and Christon Bank). This is subject to other policies in the Plan (i.e. landscape etc.) so we do not feel that there is an inconsistency if this approach is adopted.
Pp.36 to 39:	NCC have kindly provided us with maps. We are happy to agree whatever scale of maps is considered appropriate.
APPENDIX B:	We have already stated why we do not wish to adopt the changes to the Plan as proposed by NCC; however, we have also stated that we are prepared to accept these changes if they are necessary for our Plan to meet the basic conditions.

2.0 Diocese of Newcastle

2.1 We note the further comments submitted by the Diocese of Newcastle. In particular, we note the submissions made by Peter Derham, Registered Architect with regard to the Glebe Field site.

2.2 We do not agree with the findings of that report. We have followed the guidance published by Historic England on non-designated heritage assets as far as we have been able, and also followed guidance published by Historic England on Neighbourhood Planning. Whilst recognising that we are not experts in the historic environment, we have employed, as far as we have been able, the methodology that is set out as good practice. We maintain that the Glebe Field is an important open space in the village, and that it does contribute to the significance of the character and appearance of the Embleton Conservation Area. Historic England have been supportive of the approach we have taken, and we stand by our position on this matter.

2.3 We also note the ecology report that has been submitted, which maintains that there is little or no ecological value on the site. We do not have the resources to provide equivalent reports, but we do have local knowledge and the background reports submitted by the Plan qualify sightings of wildlife locally at that site, including bats and barn owls. Although there is no public access to the site, this does not mean that it is not appreciated by the local community.

2.4 We note comments with regard to consultation, and the fact that additional evidence has been provided post Reg.14 stage. This is an interesting approach to take when the Diocese have themselves now provided supporting evidence at Regulation 16 stage which was not available to us (or any other consultees) previously.

2.5 Notwithstanding this we consider it entirely reasonable that, in response to comments made (by the Diocese at Regulation 14 stage) in relation to lack of evidence, we undertook to provide more detailed evidence in relation to our identified Local Green Spaces in order to improve the evidence base and ensure that there was robust evidence to support our community's aspirations for Local Green Space designations. We consider this to be good consultative practice, and not a flaw in the process. If it were correct to re-consult at Regulation 14 stage every time an evidence-based document was updated or improved, it would make for a very lengthy process, something that we do not believe the government intends. There has never been any doubt within the community that The Glebe Field is an important green space within the village of Embleton.

2.6 We do not agree with the assertion that the Submission Plan is 'substantially different' in respect of the content of its policies from the Regulation 14 Plan. We accept that some of the evidence base was updated and made more robust on the advice of NCC, but this made no difference to the policy content of the Plan.

2.7 Although the community do have aspirations for the use of the Local Green Space referred; it was not designated on that basis, and this has been made clear in the supporting documents. We agree that aspirations for a site are not sufficient to comply with paragraph 100 in the NPPF. However, we have made it clear in our supporting information, that the Local Green Space is valued for its historic significance, beauty and ecological value. The residents of Embleton village have noted the presence of a number of different species on the site. With the greatest respect to the ecological survey team, we think that people who live in the area and see the site every day, probably have a good idea of the biodiversity the site supports.

2.8 Paragraph 3.18 in the letter from Diocese states: 'For the avoidance of doubt, we can confirm that at no point were the Diocese consulted or notified of the proposed local green space designation'. Regardless of this text it is demonstrably the case that the Diocese should have observed from the notes of the meetings it attended that the community wished it to be designated as LGS. At no stage has the Diocese disputed or challenged the records of the meetings nor has itself submitted any records of the meetings to the Parish Council. The attached Appendix A contains notes of three meetings held between the Diocese and members of the Parish Council plus the official minutes of an Embleton Parish Council meeting attended by the Diocese's representative where the goal of Local Green space designation for the Glebe Field is made clear.

2.9 With regard to non-designated Heritage Assets: it is also true that this evidence base was improved following Regulation 14 stage consultation. This was largely carried out due to specific comments made by Historic England, whereby they requested a more comprehensive evidence base to support the proposed list of non-designated heritage assets.

2.10 This piece of work was carried out by members of the Steering Group and the revised and improved evidence on non-designated heritage assets has been supported by Historic England in their response to the Regulation 16 consultation which states: *'We are particularly pleased to see the additional evidence on non-designated heritage assets to support Policy 6. Consequently, we welcome the content of the publication draft plan so far as it affects our interests, and have no further comment to make.'*

2.11 With regard to comments made by the Diocese in relation to our proposed Principal Residence policy; we have no further points to make. The points raised are similar to those raised at Regulation 14 stage and we do not share the view of the Newcastle Diocese on this matter. We understand that they wish to develop their own site and do not wish to have a future principal occupancy restriction on the site as they consider that this will reduce the future value of the site and will also reduce options to sell off the units as holiday homes. It is hardly surprising that they take the stance they do.

2.12 The information presented in the table on page 28 seeks to demonstrate that the North Northumberland Coast Neighbourhood Plan (NNCNP) policy on Principal Residence housing has failed, because the demand for new development has reduced dramatically in that area. The Northumberland Coast is a sensitive area in terms of landscape and nature conservation. It is the view of our community, that areas such as this should only accommodate development that will meet local needs by serving to stimulate local communities by providing more principal residence housing.

2.13 The approach being taken by the Diocese, is to argue that the policy in the NNCNP has failed, because significantly fewer proposals for development have come forward since the Plan has been in force. We consider this to be a good thing; proposals for unnecessary, and potentially damaging development have not come forward and this is exactly what we want to ensure. This is our community plan, to meet the needs of our community.

2.14 We are also aware that within the North Northumberland Coast area, the significant pressure that there was for development is now significantly reduced, resulting in less pressure on our most sensitive landscapes. Only proposals that actually benefit the area are coming forward. This is exactly the reason why we need such a policy; to ensure that new development, where it does happen, benefits local people; indeed, this is a key part of our vision and our objectives.

2.15 Furthermore, the figures presented in the table on page 28 misunderstand the concept of the 'plan period'. NCC have stated that they have (at present) in excess of an 11-year housing land supply. Embleton has met and significantly exceeded the housing requirement set out by NCC in Policy HOU3 in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan. Although we accept that this figure is a 'minimum' and not a 'maximum', we are of the view that this is a sensitive area where future development should be carefully planned and we have already significantly exceeded the 'minimum' housing requirement before the Plan is even in place.

2.16 We do not agree that the Principal Residence policy will impact on the delivery of affordable housing. The emerging NCC plan regulates for the building of permanent resident only homes for the county where the number of second homes exceeds 20%. There has been a large (16 unit) affordable housing scheme delivered recently in Embleton. The implication that affordable housing can only be delivered through larger schemes is, in our view, flawed.

2.17 We disagree with a number of other statements in the letter from the Diocese but believe we have covered the key points in this response.

3.0 Lichfields for Guy Douglas

3.1 We note the comments in this letter, which are similar to those submitted at Regulation 14 stage, so have no further responses to make.

In conclusion Embleton Parish Council would like to express their gratitude for the opportunity to respond to the representations made on the Regulation 16 version of our Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely

Terry Howells
Chairman – Embleton Parish Council

Appendix A: Consultation with Diocese notes:

The table below shows the schedule of meetings held with the Diocese:

Date	Meeting
5 th January 2018	Landowner Meeting
21 st February 2019	Proposed Development on the site
25 th March 2019	Parish Council Meeting
13 th August 2019	Further discussions on the proposed development

1: Embleton & Christon Bank Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Note of landowner meeting relating to Church of England Glebe Land in Embleton.

Friday 5th January 2018

Terry Howells and David Ainsley, representing the Embleton & Christon Bank NP Steering Group, met Archdeacon Peter Robinson at his Morpeth office having been referred to him by Embleton Parish Church Warden, Christine Hunter.

The Archdeacon expressed his appreciation for the setting up of the meeting as the initiation of one had been high on his agenda. He explained that he is responsible for real estate matters including Glebe land and Church buildings on his extensive “patch” (this being an area extending from and around, but not including, Newcastle to the Scottish border and west into Cumbria in the lead mining communities of the Pennines).

The Archdeacon further explained that Glebe land is required by the Church to deliver revenue and/or capital for its Diocesan Board of Finance. However, in this context, the Archdeacon stressed that the Church wished to work with local communities. Thus it might contemplate the setting up of a Community Land Trust, jointly with Embleton PC such that, for example, its Glebe land could accommodate “affordable” housing in the years ahead. This could be relatively low density in layout and take account of its setting, including views to and from the Church and the vicarage as well as the exterior cladding of the buildings that are eventually built. *(Note: David Ainsley volunteered to research whether there are national examples of Glebe land being assigned to Community Land Trusts in the joint interests of Church and Community).*

The Archdeacon mentioned that, in the meantime, any community use for the Glebe land, including that which might involve the generation of revenue, would be appreciated by the Church. To this end Terry Howells and David Ainsley undertook to revert to the Archdeacon with ideas and proposals.

Finally it should be recorded that the imminent arrival of Embleton’s new vicar, Allison ? was discussed. Allison is expected to be very engaged with the community and the use of the Glebe land will be a subject in which she will take much interest. Thus it was resolved that a meeting, after Easter, should be set up to include Allison, the Archdeacon and representatives of the NPSG.

Note prepared by David Ainsley 07.01.2018

2. Meeting re building proposal on the Glebe Land, Station Road, Embleton. Thursday 21st February 2019

Notes of meeting

The meeting was requested by Archdeacon Peter Robinson on behalf of the diocese and was attended by Terry Howells on behalf of the Parish Council and Karen Greenhoff on behalf of the NPSG

Present

Peter Robinson (PR)	Archdeacon (Diocese)
Ian Beswick (IB)	Sec, to the Houses and Glebe Committee (Diocese)
John Swanson (JS)	Countrylife Homes Ltd.

Terry Howells (TH)	Chair of Embleton PC, member of the NP Steering Gp.
Karen Greenhoff (KG)	Member of the NP Steering Gp.

The group initially met at Station Road to view the land north of Holy Trinity Church (the Glebe Land). Significant sightlines were pointed out including the proximity of three listed structures – the church, the dovecote and the Moot Hall (TH). The following points were also raised for consideration:

this vantage point (Station Road) gives the only open view of the church from the village (TH)

the field is within the Conservation Area and is specifically mentioned as an important green field site even though Dovecote Close houses were built several years ago (KG)

the land is within the proposed Settlement Boundary in the NP (Currently designated as local green space) although this document is currently out for community consultation

The group continued discussions in the Dunstanburgh Castle Hotel.

PR gave background to the concept of Glebe land and it's management by the Diocese.

Key factors:-

The Diocese operates as a Charitable Trust and are required to maximise (as far as possible) the financial contribution of revenues from all glebe land.

All glebe land contributes to central Diocese income and this is then distributed across all parishes within the Diocese (stipends etc.) It does not remain in the parish containing the glebe land. This means that any income (capital or revenue) will not benefit Holy Trinity Church directly.

JS tabled a series of site plans and artist impressions of housing that he proposed were of suitable size (2 and 3 bedroom) homes on the plot of land.

16 houses facing onto Dovecote Place and also onto Station Road

Access from the existing roadway serving Dovecote Place

Target market was the 50+ age range

All houses would have ground floor bathroom facilities to enable buyers to access future lower ground living if required

All build materials would be sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area

Views of the church would be restricted but some available between the new buildings where vehicle access and parking spaces are provided

The scheme would retain the whinstone boundary walls and mature trees

There is no intention to offer any affordable houses – either lower market pricing or social housing for rent

Discussion and Q/A of Issues Arising

TH and KG clarified the housing provision in the N Plan area and how the numbers of newly built and/or with pending planning applications had far outstripped that suggested by the planning frameworks produced by NCC. The CAN housing need assessment showed little or no demand for additional homes (TH)

Several community groups have requested access to the glebe land for social and recreational use (KG) and this can be accommodated adjacent to the Parish Room possibly with the provision of an additional gate (JS)

The allocation of the Glebe land and local green space was challenged (PR) and it is the intention of the Diocese to object to this suggestion. The closing date for comments was confirmed as 27th February 2019 (KG)

JS challenged the concept of primary occupancy for new build houses and how this could be enforced. He believed that this may impact on the ability to obtain a mortgage on a property and then the direct impact on housing market demand and house prices at re-sale. TH re-affirmed the output of the housing analysis and KG provided the breakdown of primary occupancy, second homes and holiday lets across the parish – with particular emphasis on recent housing developments and the comments generated at the initial community consultation event.

The proposed development site has a direct visual impact on a Grade 1 listed building (Holy Trinity Church) and a further two Grade 2 listed sites – Moot Hall and the Dovecote (TH) In the case of the church it reduces its spatial value to the rest of the village and contemporary buildings here will affect the nature of the designated (2008) Conservation Area character (KG)

TH reminded PR of the meeting held in January 2018 when PR said that he would not allow anything to happen to the Glebe land which was against the wishes of the parish. PR stated that was still his wish but pressure from the Church Commissioners to maximise the returns from Glebe lands limited his options

The SHLAA designation (Ref. No. 0148) identifies land north of Holy Trinity Church as a site of 0.37 ha and potential site for 9 houses (KG). This was acknowledged but the Diocese proposal remains for 16 two storey properties.

The Way Forward

PR/ IB requested an early meeting to present their housing proposals to the Parish Council. The next available date was confirmed as the March meeting (TH) and the presentation would be included as the first item on the agenda. Any AV equipment needed should be confirmed in advance.

3: Extract from the Parish Council Meeting held on 25th March 2019

874. Newcastle Diocesan Board of Finance – Glebe Land Housing Proposal. John Swanson (CountyLife) & Ian Beswick (Newcastle Diocese) attended the Parish Council (PC) meeting to present the Glebe Land housing proposal. CountyLife are a development company 'specialising in individual developments at high quality locations throughout the north east of England'. Such developments have included The Haven at Beadnell, Castle Garth at Bamburgh, Seafield at Seahouses, Corbridge semi-retirement homes, and Rothbury Town Square river front houses. CountyLife have an outline planning application for the Glebe Land in Embleton which includes 14 units of 5x2 bedroom and 9x3 bedroom houses. The houses were described as having a high-quality design, with character using natural materials (e.g. stone & slate). A sketch plan was presented which includes two terraces within the development, access from the corner of Dovecote Close and retention of the existing Glebe field wall. **CountyLife recognises the planning issues that; the Glebe land is allocated in the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) as open green space, falls within the conservation area, and has archaeology beneath the site.** Other issues also include affordable housing provision, the primary residency proposal within the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and sustainability issues. J Swanson stated that until recently he was a Director at Karbon Homes who manage a number of affordable homes in North Northumberland. He stated that there was little need for affordable homes in North Northumberland and that Karbon Homes had had to sell off a few affordable homes as there was no demand to rent, they were sold by the developer at market prices. He quoted two empty affordable homes in Dovecote Close as examples of the lack of need. Questions posed to J Swanson & I Beswick by Cllr's and the public (permitted by the Chairman) included those of:

- Sustainable Development (Cllr Cornall). The houses are to have timber frames, power points in garages for car recharging and air source heat pumps.
- Primary Residence (Cllr Cooper). CountyLife confirmed that it was intended that any houses built on the Glebe land could be sold as second homes or letting properties.
- Lacking benefits for Embleton village (Cllr Fyffe). Additional housing of the type proposed does not equate to more children in the village school or even more business for village enterprises, therefore the development lacks benefits for the local community.
- Number of properties on site (Cllr Imeson). CountyLife have included 14 as this is the 'best fit for size of land'.
- No bungalow developments (Cllr German). CountyLife added that the site could potentially have bungalows as the development is in the early stages of design & planning.
- Ownership (Cllr German). At present the land remains under Diocese ownership. The option of purchasing the land as a community asset could potentially be considered by the Diocese.
- Covenants on the land (Cllr Cornall). CountyLife advised that there are no covenants on the land.
- One member of the public added that they felt 'let down by the church' and their proposed use of the Glebe land. The public member requested that land title deeds & covenants could be viewed to see what historic provisions may have been made and questioned what the relationship between the Diocese of Newcastle and the development company was. J Swanson advised that the deeds are available from the Land Registry and the relationship was a private matter.

The full minutes of the meeting can be found on the Parish Council's website:

<https://northumberlandparishes.uk/embleton/documents/minutes>

4: Further Discussions on Proposed Development held on 13th August 2019.

From: David Ainsley

Sent: 14 August 2019 19:40

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Yeterday's Glebe land meeting

Dear Alison,

Many thanks for your part in yesterday's meeting which Terry and I very much appreciated. By way of a record of what was discussed I have set out below some of the main points from our chat.

1. It was noted that County Life's Outline Planning Application had been taken down from NCC's website or withdrawn. It is not clear precisely which nor indeed why, although the PC has been led to believe that outline applications are not permissible in respect of land within conservation areas.

2. IB undertook to clarify whether simply further detail on the outline application is required by NCC or whether only a full application would be accepted.

3. The D of N advised it is under pressure from above (!) to derive best value for the Glebe land. It was acknowledged by all present, however, that, in the circumstances, best value could be judged in absolute financial terms or in a "missional" sense.

4. It was noted that the neither Embleton Parish Council nor any other party had been offered the opportunity to buy the land. Despite questioning IB was unwilling (unable?) to confirm that any other offer for the land would now be considered or what monetary value the D of N has placed on the land. Indeed, no information was forthcoming as to how County Life have come to be the prime mover in this matter or on what basis. Confidentiality was cited in this respect, apparently notwithstanding the Church's pastoral mission and its public persona, including its place in the Embleton community.

5. It was highlighted by the PC/NPWG that its first choice would be for the land to remain undeveloped for the enjoyment of it by the community as local green space, and that its least acceptable choice would be a development which severely impacted upon views of the Church from the north AND which permitted second or holiday homes in defiance of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Embleton. In terms of new residential developments, the draft of the said emerging Neighbourhood Plan mimics the NPs of many of its NCC counterparts, including in particular the "made" plan of the North Northumberland Coast. It was also pointed out by the PC contingent that Mr Mark Bridgeman of Falloden Estates who is currently developing the new site to the north of Creighton Place is complying fully with the emerging permanent residences requirement of the NP

6. The corresponding first choice of the D of N (on the evidence of its approach thus far) appears to be a comparatively high density residential development, without use restrictions, aimed at deriving maximum financial income from the land.

7. Both parties agreed that a key reason for their attending the meeting was to establish whether acceptable middle ground between their respective positions might be found, including one of the following: a development of affordable dwellings; a retirement home; or assisted living accommodation. The PC/NPWG cited permanent, year round employment as being a significant attraction of the latter two options.

8. It was agreed that the parties should retire and reflect on the meeting with a view to a further dialogue and meeting(s) in due course.

Kind regards,

15/10/2019 Gmail - FW: Yeterday's Glebe land meeting

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=a9b6f912f0&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1645399005894769882&simpl=msg-f%3A16453990...>

2/2

David