

Embleton 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 Embleton Neighbourhood Plan.

Copies of the representations made on the Plan, and which were submitted to the independent examiner, can be made available on request from the County Council by contacting the Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Team on 01670 623619 or by email at: NeighbourhoodPlanning@northumberland.gov.uk

List of Representations

1. Lichfields, on behalf of Guy Douglas
2. The Coal Authority
3. Highways England
4. Historic England
5. National Grid
6. Natural England
7. R & K Wood Planning LLP, on behalf of the Newcastle Diocesan Board of Finance
8. Northumberland County Council (NCC)

Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
Mr Michael Hepburn, Lichfields, on behalf of Guy Douglas	N/A	<p><i>Mr. Douglas states that Policy 5 (Settlement Boundaries for Christon Bank and Embleton) is overly restrictive and contrary to the NPPF as it does not allow flexibility to adapt to change (NPPF paragraph 11).</i></p> <p><i>He objects to the current draft of the settlement boundaries saying it fails to include enough land to deliver the objectively assessed housing need; therefore the Plan is not robust or sound. And, he argues the restrictive nature of the settlement boundaries coupled with a reliance on existing permissions means that the Plan is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Northumberland Local Plan which requires that the identified housing needs of the area are met.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Douglas argues that Embleton requires its settlement boundary to be removed or amended to include a site on its periphery to ensure the Plan is flexible enough to provide sustainable development over the Plan period. He suggests that his land to the west of The Villas should be allocated for residential development including an appropriate proportion of affordable housing for local people and the elderly to meet identified needs.</i></p>
Melanie Lindsley Development Team Leader, Planning	Coal Authority	<i>The Coal Authority identify the Neighbourhood Area as lying within the current defined coalfield. In addition, they highlight recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the form of mine entries and likely historic unrecorded coal mine workings within the Neighbourhood Area.</i>
Paul Dixon Planning & Development Yorkshire & North East	Highways England	<i>Highways England do not envisage that there is any element of the Plan that would cause any major consequence to the Strategic Road Network. Therefore they offer no objection to the Neighbourhood Plan.</i>

Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
Jules Brown Historic Places Adviser	Historic England	<i>Historic England welcome changes made as a result of previous comments on the pre-submission draft plan. They are particularly pleased to see the additional evidence on non-designated heritage assets to support Policy 6.</i>
Lucy Bartley Consultant Town Planner	Wood Group, on behalf of National Grid	<i>National Grid have identified that it has no record of electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus, within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</i>
Carolyn Simpson Lead Adviser - Sustainable Development	Natural England	<p><i>Natural England consider that policies 1, 5, 9 and 12 support development for which Coastal Mitigation Service (CMS) contributions would be appropriate to mitigate recreational disturbance impacts on the European Sites. They acknowledge that whilst mitigation for increased units of accommodation is not stated within policy 9, the required mitigation for this policy is explicitly included in policy 1, which they understand is an overarching policy for the entire plan.</i></p> <p><i>They point out that whilst a requirement for mitigation has been stated in policy 13, for the purposes of the CMS 1 holiday let unit is considered to be equivalent to 1 residential unit; as presented, proposals supported by policy 13 would not constitute a net increase in accommodation, and hence contributions to the CMS would not be required.</i></p>
Robin Wood	R & K Wood Planning LLP, on behalf of the Newcastle Diocesan Board of Finance	<p><i>The Newcastle Diocesan Board of Finance ('Board') criticise the evidence base supporting the Neighbourhood Plan, and raise concerns about consultation matters. They propose the Glebe Field should be allocated for housing development, and not designated as Local Green Space, and not identified as a non-designated heritage asset.</i></p> <p><i>The Board raise concerns relating to Neighbourhood Plan preparation consultation matters and the form of the plan that has been consulted on. They argue the Plan as</i></p>

Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<p><i>now submitted is substantially different when compared to the pre-submission version and say there should have been a further consultation at Regulation 14 stage. The Board have concerns that the Plan proactively restricts any further new residential development, other than affordable housing on exception sites. They set out a case for, and request a modification of the Neighbourhood Plan to include the allocation of the Glebe Field for housing purposes.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding Policy 6, the Board say there is no evidence to validate the conclusions reached in relation to the Glebe Field.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding Policy 7, the Board request the Glebe Field should not be designated as a Local Green Space and set out a case to show why the land is not demonstrably special for reasons of historic significance, tranquillity, and richness of wildlife.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding Policy 8, the Board request the Glebe Field should not be identified as a non-designated heritage asset. They say there is a lack of evidence to support its inclusion on the basis of ‘integrity and rarity’.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding Policy 10, the Board argue this Policy is inconsistent with the national objectives of sustainability as expressed in paragraph 8 of the NPPF and therefore it does not comply with the basic conditions test.</i></p>
<p>David English Planning Manager - Neighbourhood Planning & Infrastructure</p>	<p>Northumberland County Council (NCC)</p>	<p><i>The County Council, as Local Planning Authority, responded with comments on: minor changes to correct errors or to ensure the Plan is clearly written and unambiguous as required by para 16d, NPPF; and individual policies.</i></p> <p><i>Objective 3 NCC advise the deletion of the intention to ‘protect’ the school, as this is a matter for the County Council as Local Education Authority.</i></p>

Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<p><i>Policy 1</i> NCC say this Policy is unclear and ambiguous and therefore fails to meet the basic conditions. Specifically: the Policy introduces the term 'Principal Residence' without any explanation; Part b is poorly expressed and as written is inconsistent with the definition of 'rural exception sites'; Part c as written is inconsistent with the subsequent controls created through Policy 10; Part d fails either in Policy 1 or Policy 9 (which is cross referenced) to have regard to para 84 of NPPF; Para e fails to have regard to para 84 of NPPF.</p> <p>The County Council offer suggestions to better represent the intentions for this Policy and the supporting text.</p> <p>NCC say the final paragraph regarding contributions to the Coastal Mitigation Service should be created as a stand-alone policy as this is recommended by the County Ecologist and this change would also deal with the omission in Policy 9 to address the impact of recreational disturbance to European designated sites associated with tourist accommodation which that policy supports.</p> <p><i>Policy 2</i> NCC say this policy is poorly drafted in that all proposals will be within a landscape character area and that it fails to give proper reference to the documents to which it refers and is therefore imprecise. They suggest modification to improve clarity.</p> <p><i>Policy 3</i> NCC advise deletion of the first two paragraphs of this policy and the creation of a new overarching policy that recognises the need for contributions to the Coastal Mitigation Service from development that may adversely impact European designated, and other protected sites. NCC suggest suitable wording for this new policy.</p>

Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<p><i>Policy 4</i> For clarity and certainty, NCC advise making a number of modifications to this policy including, in part f) the addition of ‘significant’ before ‘adverse amenity impact’. NCC also recommend modifying the policy to address coastal erosion and that opportunities should be taken to add ecological enhancement to Policy 4.</p> <p><i>Policy 5</i> NCC contend that this policy does no more than Policy 1 sets out to do. For this reason, they advise deleting Policy 5 and modifying Policy 1 and the relevant supporting text.</p> <p><i>Policy 7</i> NCC object to the inclusion of LGS4 (school fields) saying the evidence provided does not justify designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p><i>Policy 8</i> NCC object to the inclusion of the School on a list of non-designated heritage assets since this creates further burdens on the Council should the school be no longer viable.</p> <p><i>Policy 9</i> NCC recommend modification or removal of this policy as it covers matters that can be dealt with in a redrafted Policy 1. They argue that a policy covering home working would add little to normal planning considerations and any relevant considerations would be covered in a modified Policy 1. NCC point out that the final sentence fails to distinguish between positive or adverse effects and advise modification to indicate that decision makers should consider any significant adverse effects. NCC suggest a further modification so that the policy addresses only those controls over tourist accommodation and related development.</p>

Embleton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Summary of representation
		<p><i>Policy 10</i> NCC highlight the discrepancy between Policy 1 (part c) and this policy. They suggest the last paragraph use of the phrase ‘...if/when...’ introduces a degree of unnecessary uncertainty and for clarity, recommend modification to replace that phrase with the word ‘...whenever...’</p> <p><i>Policy 11</i> NCC question the need for this Policy and suggest that this matter may be left to the emerging Local Plan given the clear intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to limit the scale and location of any future residential development, at least during the plan period.</p> <p><i>Policy 12</i> NCC advise deletion of this policy because the matter can adequately be addressed in Policy 1.</p> <p><i>Policy 13</i> NCC recommend deleting reference to ‘...within the Neighbourhood Area’ and the final paragraph which is not necessary provided changes recommended to Policy 3 are implemented.</p> <p><i>Policy 14</i> NCC object to the inclusion of Vincent Edwards C of E Aided Primary School in the list of community facilities proposed for protection, as this is a matter for the County Council as Local Education Authority. They suggest the final paragraph conflicts with the intentions of Policy 1 e) which creates uncertainty.</p>