

# **Lesbury 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 Lesbury 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](mailto:NeighbourhoodPlanning@northumberland.gov.uk)

### **List of Representations**

1. Coal Authority
2. Highways England
3. Historic England
4. National Grid
5. Natural England
6. Northumberland County Council
7. Northumberland Estates
8. AW Stephenson
9. Ian Clough
10. Janice McLaughlin
11. John and Lorain Starkey
12. Katherine Ash
13. Nigel and Janet Towers
14. Richard Fairbairn
15. Tom Wilson

| Lesbury Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Name  | Organisation (if applicable)                            | Summary of representation   |
| Melanie Lindsley,<br>Development<br>Team leader,<br>Planning  | <b>The Coal<br/>Authority</b>                           | <i>The Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield. According to the Coal Authority records there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the area; However, it is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to allocate any sites for future development. On this basis the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan.</i>  |
| Paul Dixon,<br>Planning and<br>Development  | <b>Highways<br/>England</b>                             | <i>Highways England had no particular concerns with the policies and provisions within the Neighbourhood Plan.</i>  |
| Jules Brown,<br>Historic Places<br>Adviser  | <b>Historic England</b>                                 | <i>Historic England made a number of comments on the pre-submission draft plan, in their letter of 11 February 2019, and were pleased these had been taken into account.</i>  |
| Matt Verlander,<br>Director   | <b>Avison Young, on<br/>behalf of National<br/>Grid</b> | <i>National Grid identified that it had no record of electricity and gas transmission assets, including high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</i>   |
| Martin Kerby,<br>Senior Adviser.<br>Northumbria Area<br>Team  | <b>Natural England</b>                                  | <i>Natural England advised that the Plan would not hinder the conservation objectives of the Marine Conservation Zones. They recommended referring to the Berwickshire &amp; North Northumberland Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC), North Northumberland Dunes SAC and Northumberland Marine SPA in the list of designated sites. They were broadly supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan vision; however they recommended the following amendment would provide stronger emphasis on ensuring new developments protect and enhance biodiversity:<br/>“All new development will be well designed, having paid special attention to our unique sense of place, the historic and natural environment...”</i> |
|   |   |   |

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

| Name  | Organisation (if applicable)                              | Summary of representation  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>David English,<br/>Planning Manager,<br/>Neighbourhood<br/>Planning and<br/>Infrastructure</p> | <p><b>Northumberland<br/>County Council<br/>(NCC)</b></p> | <p><i>NCC made a number of comments on the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>NCC suggest that the principles of clarity of expression and meanings should apply to a neighbourhood plan as a whole. We would therefore suggest that it would be helpful to review the presentational style used in the Plan, specifically the relationship between Objectives and Policies</i></p> <p><i>It would seem simpler and therefore clearer to just list the Objectives rather than attempt to create specific chapters with Policies that ‘deliver’ an Objective.</i></p> <p><i>Section 3 is reviewed and presented just as a Vision and Objectives and the explanatory text is removed since this is repeated before each policy</i></p> <p><i>Section 5 is modified to remove the Objectives (text in green boxes), since this seems repetitious, and topic headings are created or retained above the introduction of each Policy</i></p> <p><i>It is important that settlement boundary policies are appropriately constructed having regard to national policy and guidance. We have therefore made some recommendations in that respect.</i></p> <p><i>Policies 1, 3 and 5 are intended to work together to describe the type of development that will be supported within settlement boundaries, and that which will be supported in the countryside beyond. We do think that the relevant matters could be covered better in a single policy that describes how development would be supported and managed in the Neighbourhood Area.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst we recognise and support the Parish Council’s desire to encourage the</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      |                              | <p><i>provision of affordable housing through rural exception sites, including as community-led schemes, the Plan as currently drafted repeats this support in three different policies. Repetition of this support should lend no greater weight in the determination of any planning application and is therefore unnecessary. For clarity this matter needs to be dealt with only once in the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 1 - Recommend delete the words 'small-scale, Recommend replace the words 'b) small-scale' with 'b) small sites for...'. Recommend modification to Policy 1 to better reflect limitations set out in paragraph 84 of the NPPF to ensure clarity and consistency in decision making; The final sentence which seeks to define small-scale housing development should be deleted for the reasons given above.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 3 - The controls identified at paragraph 84 of the NPPF should also be better articulated; Recommend delete '..design...' after '...innovative...'; and replace '...and...' after '...outstanding...' with '...or...'</i></p> <p><i>Policy 4 - It would not be normal practice to seek SuDs schemes or landscaping schemes on domestic extensions. It may therefore be more appropriate to qualify the terms so that the Policy relates where necessary. Recommend delete '...and access' from part a); and add an additional criteria j) safe and suitable convenient access can be achieved and made available for all users of the development before it is first brought into use. delete Part d) as currently drafted; and replace with d) a Sustainable Drainage System with multifunctional benefits has been incorporated or demonstrate why such a system would not be practicable; for clarity recommend after the word '...proximity...' insert '...to neighbours...' and delete '...of...' after the reworded '...proximity to neighbours, the...' The policy implies that any adverse amenity impacts do not arise from development. This is too onerous and should be qualified. Recommend insert the word '...significant...' before '...adverse amenity...'.</i></p> |

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

| Name       | Organisation (if applicable)  | Summary of representation  |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|
|            |                               | <p><i>Policy - Recommend delete Policy 5 and transfer supporting text to explain as necessary a modified Policy 1.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 6 - Recommend delete part e).</i></p> <p><i>Policy 7 - Recommend create a separate Local Green Space policy</i></p> <p><i>Policy 9 - Recommend modification: delete 'The background paper...' and replace with 'Background paper: Non-designated Heritage Assets (insert date of document), a link to which is provided...', and replace '...Plan Area...' with '...Neighbourhood Area...'</i></p> <p><i>Policies Map - Recommendation: add boundaries of Lesbury Conservation Area to the Policies Map</i></p> <p><i>The County Council also made a number of comments on the supporting text and narrative affecting the flow and rhythm in which that Plan is read and some text changes to better reflect advice and guidance in the NPPF and PPG.</i></p> |
| Guy Munden | <b>Northumberland Estates</b> | <p><i>Northumberland Estates submitted representations under the following sub headings.</i></p> <p><i>Basic Conditions</i></p> <p><i>Northumberland Estates consider that the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the Basic Conditions Test in several ways, notably by not conforming to national planning policy or the local development plan</i></p>   |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      |                              | <p><i>Sustainability Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Northumberland Estates consider that the correct procedure has not been followed in respect of the Strategic Environmental Assessment and the consultation requirements pursuant to Regulation 13 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which require full and proper consultation on the Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan prior to being submitted to the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Clearly there is potential that the Neighbourhood Plan is at risk from judicial review should it progress to independent Examination following the current consultation period.</i></p> <p><i>Duty to Cooperate</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that the Lesbury Parish Neighbourhood Plan has not been prepared according to this best practice guidance, has ignored the responsibility and duty to cooperate with other relevant bodies, and therefore has not been prepared in accordance with national planning policy and fails the Basic Conditions Test.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan has not been prepared with sufficient involvement or consultation with neighbouring Parish Authorities, specifically Alnmouth Parish Council.</i></p> <p><i>The adopted Development Plan (Alnwick Core Strategy) identifies Lesbury/Hipsburn/Bilton/Alnmouth (Policy S1) as together forming a Sustainable Village Centre. As per the Basic Conditions Test, the Neighbourhood Plan should conform to the strategic policies of the Development Plan, however the Neighbourhood Plan only has regard to Lesbury/Hipsburn/Bilton and does not include Alnmouth within its spatial area or policy considerations. Given the Development Plan's identification of this cluster of settlements functioning as a single Village Centre, it is incompatible that the</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      |                              | <p><i>Neighbourhood Plan seeks to plan for only three of these settlements and ignore Alnmouth.</i></p> <p><i>For example, strategic planning matters that are relevant to each of the settlements of Lesbury/Hipsburn/Bilton/Alnmouth include Alnmouth Station (an East Coast Main Line Station connecting to Edinburgh, Newcastle and London), with all of these settlements having a strategic interest in the sustainability and future of this infrastructure asset. Not only is Alnmouth Station of importance to Lesbury/Hipsburn/Bilton/Alnmouth, it is a strategic infrastructure asset in Northumberland, and its future should not be left to the plan-making of a Neighbourhood Plan that has a very localised and specific spatial interest.</i></p> <p><i>Alnmouth Station is one of the few Mainline Railway Stations in Northumberland, and its user catchment area is vast with people commuting and travelling to and from Alnmouth Station from a very wide geographical area, making Lesbury/Hipsburn/Bilton/Alnmouth one of the most sustainable locations for development in North Northumberland, if not the entire County.. It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan has not consulted with wider strategic bodies and authorities in regard to Alnmouth Station, such as Network Rail or Northumberland County Council, and has therefore failed to recognise a strategic infrastructure asset and failed to plan positively for the wider area of North Northumberland beyond Lesbury Parish.</i></p> <p><i>Other assets that are cross-boundary matters across Lesbury Parish and Alnmouth Parish include Hipsburn Primary School and adequate sports facilities. This school is located in Hipsburn, but attracts pupils from Lesbury, Alnmouth and the wider Parish. Without meaningful consultation with Alnmouth Parish and the wider school catchment area, the Neighbourhood Plan has planned for the future of Hipsburn Primary School with no regard to the actual catchment area of the school, which falls across Parish boundaries and outside of the Neighbourhood Plan area. It is considered that the</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      |                              | <p><i>Neighbourhood Plan has not positively prepared a strategy for the sustainable future of Alnmouth Station or Hipsburn Primary School as the Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates no identification of these assets as cross-boundary matters or matters that require strategic and wider consideration beyond the boundary of Lesbury Parish.</i></p> <p><i>Further cross-boundary issues that have been ignored by the Neighbourhood Plan relate to the consideration of housing. As NPPF paragraph 26 states, ‘joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular plan area could be met elsewhere.’ The Neighbourhood Plan includes a Housing Needs Survey that was carried out throughout Lesbury Parish, which has formed the evidence base for the conclusion that only 45no. additional dwellings are required during the plan period 2016-2036. Given that Lesbury/Hipsburn/Bilton/Alnmouth function as a single Sustainable Village Centre as defined in the Development Plan, it is certainly not a ‘positively prepared and justified strategy’ (NPPF, para.26) to base an objectively assessed housing need on a Housing Needs Survey that does not truly represent the cross-boundary nature of the Sustainable Village Centre.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan should have thoroughly included Alnmouth Parish within its Housing Needs Survey and as part of its responsibility to cooperate with neighbouring authorities it should also have the vision to plan for the sustainability of the wider area by supporting development within Lesbury Parish to support Alnmouth Parish, especially given its joint-nature as a Sustainable Village Centre in the Development Plan.</i></p> <p><i>By providing no new housing development within the Parish of Lesbury (to serve the Parish of Alnmouth), the existing housing stock will continue to be bought as second-homes and there will be less opportunity for families and young people to live in this area. Without intervention, the future of Alnmouth will be like Beadnell (North Northumberland) where 90% of the houses are in use as second and holiday homes and</i></p> |



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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      |                              | <p><i>the social fabric of the community is undermined. The Neighbourhood Plan should make provision to address the continuing trend of second home ownership by identifying housing sites that can be developed as a mix of private and affordable housing that are restricted to permanent occupants only, in order to secure future residents to preserve the community and social sustainability of the area.</i></p> <p><i>There has been no attempt to work with neighbouring Parish Authorities or with wider strategic bodies throughout the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, and it is considered that this lack of soundness in the plan-making process fails the Basic Conditions Test.</i></p> <p><i>Settlement Boundaries</i></p> <p><i>Specifically, the Neighbourhood Plan's identification of settlement boundaries is fundamentally not in conformity with the Development Plan. Paragraph 5.8 identifies the basis of the proposed settlement boundaries as the Alnwick Local Plan (1997). It is seriously questionable whether the settlement boundaries of a Local Plan that is over 20 years old can be considered a justifiable and robust position. Furthermore, Policy H2 of the Alnwick Local Plan which specifies that planning permission will be granted within the settlement boundaries was not listed as a 'saved policy' in the Secretary of States Direction and therefore expired in September 2007. Therefore, Policy H2 and the previously identified settlement boundaries of the Alnwick Local Plan are no longer relevant and not part of the Development Plan, as the Alnwick Core Strategy (2007) replaced the Alnwick Local Plan and did not identify any settlement boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan's reliance on the policy of settlement boundaries from the Alnwick Local Plan is extremely out-dated and is not in accordance with the Development Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan identifies settlement boundaries around Lesbury, Hipsburn and Bilton. Paragraph 5.10 states that these boundaries accommodate enough</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation   |
|------|------------------------------|---|
|      |                              | <p><i>land to meet the housing requirement for the area as set out in Northumberland County Council's emerging Local Plan. This is questionable and it is unclear where these infill sites within the settlement boundaries are located. 45no. units is the minimum number required and identifying such restrictive settlement boundaries will result in only a very limited number of houses being delivered over the plan period to 2036. It is considered that the proposed settlement boundaries are extremely negative to housing delivery and will greatly restrict the sustainability of the Parish over the plan period. Again, as principal landowner, Northumberland Estates queries where the supposed infill sites are located within the settlement boundaries and would suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan allocates these sites on the Policies Map to ensure deliverability.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 3 is highly restrictive to all development (not just housing) outside the settlement boundaries. This is in opposition to the Neighbourhood Plan's aspiration for 'further development at the railway station, which could be a hub for community and visitor facilities, as well as a business hub' (Paragraph 2.34 and Policy 6). There is an inconsistency within the Neighbourhood Plan in that Policy 3 restricts development at Alnmouth Station given that it is outside of the identified settlement boundary, yet also claims an aspiration for the development of community and visitor facilities and a business hub.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 10 states that extensions to existing car parking facilities at Alnmouth Station will be supported, including pedestrian accessibility, landscaping and improved highway safety. This is welcomed and supported by Northumberland Estates, but would caution that Policy 9 is incompatible with the remainder of the Neighbourhood Plan including the settlement boundaries of Policy 3, and as it stands Policy 10 is simply undeliverable. If the Neighbourhood Plan is sincere in its desire to improve car parking at Alnmouth Station, this should be reflected and designated on the Policies Map with an area for development identified within the settlement boundary.</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation   |
|------|------------------------------|---|
|      |                              | <p><i>Housing Needs Survey</i></p> <p><i>Northumberland Estates consider the methodology (and therefore the conclusions) of the Housing Needs Survey that is supporting Neighbourhood Plan Policies 1, 3, 4, 5 to be flawed.</i></p> <p><i>the Housing Needs Survey certainly should have included Alnmouth given that Alnmouth is part of the same designated Sustainable Village Centre, but the Housing Needs Survey should have included the wider area including places such as Longhoughton, Boulmer, Shilbottle and Warkworth, as well as the smaller settlements around these areas.</i></p> <p><i>The Housing Needs Survey shows no sign of consulting with Registered Providers active in the area or with Affordable Housing Officers at Northumberland County Council. Registered Providers would have been able to offer a much wider strategic picture of the true local housing need of the area, having knowledge of the delivery of affordable housing and where there is highest demand. There may be high levels of housing need and demand for affordable housing outside the Lesbury Parish area, but this does not mean that Lesbury Parish has an exemption from making provision for a wider area, particularly as it has all the services and facilities to make it a sustainable location for new housing.</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan has not been prepared in accordance with the NPPF by only taking into account Lesbury Parish and not considering the neighbouring areas, the Housing Needs Survey is therefore flawed and should be disregarded as an evidence base and any proposed policies that rely on it should also be disregarded until a robust housing needs survey has been carried out.</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan did not consult Northumberland Estates as part of the Housing</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|------|------------------------------|--|
|      |                              | <p><i>Needs Survey. This is considered to be a significant information gap in the results of the survey. Over recent years Northumberland Estates have completed several residential developments in Lesbury and the surrounding area, including acting as Registered Provider to enable delivery of affordable housing. Northumberland Estates are in the unique position as having direct and relevant evidence of market signals and the demand for affordable housing in the local area.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that the Housing Needs Survey supporting Policies 1, 3, 4, 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan is not robust and has failed to take into account relevant market signals, of which Northumberland Estates has extensive knowledge. The Housing Needs Survey and relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan therefore do not meet the Basic Conditions Test to comply with national planning policy and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Housing</i></p> <p><i>Objective 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that any new housing meets the Parish's housing requirement defined in the emerging Local Plan for Northumberland. This housing requirement set out in Policy HOU3 of the emerging Local Plan (which is not part of the Development Plan) identifies the housing requirement for Lesbury Parish as 45no. units from 2016-2036. The emerging Northumberland Local Plan can only be afforded limited weight as it has not completed its public Examination.</i></p> <p><i>it should be noted that Policy HOU3 of the emerging Local Plan specifies 45no. units as the minimum housing requirement over the period 2016-2036. 45no. units is not a maximum, and in planning terms should be interpreted as the absolute minimum number of houses required. Unfortunately, the Neighbourhood Plan has interpreted this number as a maximum, which is evident through the lack of housing allocations or basic acknowledgement that this is a minimum number anywhere in the text of the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation   |
|------|------------------------------|---|
|      |                              | <p><i>It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan’s reliance on rural exception sites to deliver affordable housing is a very negative approach, and instead should seek to allocate new housing sites to provide a mix of private and affordable housing in a well-planned and co-ordinated manner, including the opportunity to secure planning obligations for the local community. Reliance on rural exception sites for purely affordable housing will inevitably face viability issues and ultimately lack of delivery. To plan for a meaningful number of affordable housing this should be planned for alongside private market housing to ensure deliverability. This approach is supported in the NPPF where it specifies that a proportion of market homes are allowed on rural exception sites to enable the delivery of affordable units.</i></p> <p><i>Northumberland Estates objects to Policies 1, 3, 4, 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan in light of the above comments. As principal landowner, there are not considered to be any available or suitable small-scale infill sites within the identified settlement boundaries, rural exception sites are a negative approach to affordable housing delivery, and the development of social, community, leisure, recreational and educational facilities are not deliverable or realistic outside of the planning and development process (i.e. these items are delivered as part of new development, not in isolation)</i></p> <p><i>Community Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Somewhat ironically, the Neighbourhood Plan states in paragraph 5.32 that ‘where a proposal would lead to the loss of any of these facilities, it is considered that this would not be sustainable development, as it would result in the further erosion of sustainable communities.’ It is considered that it is not any future development proposal that would threaten the loss of any of these facilities, but the Neighbourhood Plan itself. The Neighbourhood Plan makes no effort to preserve or enhance local services and facilities, instead hoping that by offering no new housing or opportunities for young families that</i></p> |

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

| Name | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation   |
|------|------------------------------|---|
|      |                              | <p><i>the existing shops, services and school will somehow sustain themselves. The reality is that without provision of new housing opportunities and the benefits that development would bring, the community assets listed in Policy 6 will inevitably be unsustainable in the medium to long-term. It is the Neighbourhood Plan, not any future development proposals, that will erode the existing community and contribute to the lack of sustainability of local services and facilities. Without accepting that new development will bring opportunities and benefits, including enhanced facilities at Hipsburn Primary School, a new multi-use games area, a community orchard and enhanced facilities at Alnmouth Station, these items (and therefore Policy 6) are undeliverable.</i></p> <p><i>Local Green Spaces</i></p> <p><i>Northumberland Estates would challenge the robustness of the evidence base that has formed the designation of the Local Green Spaces, and query whether any robust survey work has informed these designations, such as tree surveys, ecology surveys or landscape and visual assessment?</i></p> <p><i>Settlement Edges</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan is very restrictive to new housing except through rural exception sites, yet adds another layer of restriction by not allowing new development along the ‘sensitive edges’, despite identifying the entirety of Lesbury and Hipsburn’s east-facing boundary as ‘sensitive’. This effectively removes an entire boundary from consideration for development, further restricting the possibilities for the delivery of housing. Northumberland Estates consider that this ‘sensitive edge’ should be revised and more evidence required to determine whether the full east-facing boundary is appropriate and whether it really is a ‘sensitive edge’ as the Neighbourhood Plan concludes.</i></p> |

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

| Name              | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation  |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--|
|                   |                              | <p><i>Of particular concern is the area included within the ‘sensitive edge’ at the north of Lesbury village facing north towards Longhoughton along the B1339. It is not considered that this view north (west of the B1339) should be regarded as a ‘sensitive edge’ to be protected. This area is not within the AONB designation unlike the eastern-facing ‘sensitive edge’, and furthermore the topography of the land to the north rises sharply to Longhoughton which precludes any key views of or from the perceived ‘sensitive edge’.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan precludes major housing development within the AONB boundary. Including this north-facing boundary as a ‘sensitive edge’ is highly restrictive to delivering new housing (including rural exception sites) in Lesbury, given that this location would be deemed a sensitive edge despite being outside the AONB boundary and having no significant key views. Northumberland Estates suggest the Neighbourhood Plan amends the ‘settlement edges sensitive to new housing development’ to exclude this north-facing view on the west of the B1339. Without making this amendment, Policy 1 and 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan have little prospect of being delivered.</i></p> |
| AW Stephenson     | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>      | <i>I am submitting this e-mail to express my support for the Lesbury Neighbourhood Development Plan</i>  |
| Ian Clough        | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>      | <i>I endorse the Lesbury Neighbourhood Plan</i>  |
| Janice McLoughlin | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>      | <p><i>As a resident of Lesbury I would like to express my strong support for the Lesbury neighbourhood plan as now articulated. I think it provides a highly appropriate balance between growth and retention of the important and valued rural nature of the local area. The volume of housing development proposed matches very closely projections of what future housing needs in the area are in the long term and the settlement boundaries are vital to retaining the separation of different areas within Lesbury and to avoid</i></p>   |

| <b>Lesbury Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations received and submitted to the Independent Examiner</b> |                                     |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name</b>  | <b>Organisation (if applicable)</b> | <b>Summary of representation</b>  |
|  |                                     | <i>urban creep. The apparent need for improved carpark provision at the train station cannot be a justification for housing developments way beyond the needs of the community. The plan is something we need.</i>  |
| Mr and Mrs Starkey   | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>             | <i>We are writing to inform you that we wish to pursue our objection to the settlement boundary as currently documented in the evolving Lesbury NDP. Our property (Fir Tree Cottage) has a stream flowing through it and is bordered on two sides by meadows. The proposed settlement boundary has been set to align with the stream rather than our boundaries with the two meadows. The boundaries with the meadows are physically formed by a mixture of farm fencing, hedgerows and trees.</i>  |
| Katherine Ash  | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>             | <i>I support the Lesbury Neighbourhood Plan. It is the result of a thorough and comprehensive assessment of both local people's needs and priorities (both now and in the future) it provides a crucial way to ensure any development is sensitive and appropriate and that short term gains or financial limitations do not allow us to permanently compromise on the best solutions to problems and overshadow the value of our rich rural community of people, landscape and wildlife.</i>   |
| Mr and Mrs Towers  | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>             | <i>The Lesbury NDP "Documentation on Settlement Boundaries" report itself says "the methodology for defining settlement boundaries must be clear, easy to understand, and replicable" and we ask that someone stand back and really ask if allocating a part of our property to be on one side of the settlement boundary and the rest to be on the other side is "clear, easy to understand and replicable." The property has never been split and was bought by the previous owner as one lot in the 1950s. Furthermore, the argument that "this is how it was in the old Alnwick Local Plan" is not sustainable because the draft settlement boundary has been redrawn in the current NDP draft from that shown in the old Plan. We did not own Brookside at the time of drafting the old Plan.</i><br><br><i>We asked the PC to reconsider their presentation of the settlement boundary but sadly their reply does not address our query and so we advised the PC in August 2019 that we wish to appeal against their decision</i> |
| Richard Fairbairn  | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>             | <i>We have reviewed the submission carefully and fully support the draft plan that we</i>   |



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

| Name       | Organisation (if applicable) | Summary of representation   |
|------------|------------------------------|---|
|            |                              | <p><i>believe reflects a positive, fair and sustainable vision for the development of the Parish.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst we understand the background and reasons for identifying key visual receptors into and out of the Parish as shown in Policies Map 2 (based on the AONB perspective), we do not consider this to be a complete list. Views into the Parish from B1339 Longhoughton Road, A1068 Alnwick Road and the east-coast mainline viaduct are also important to the landscape value and perceived visual character of the Parish.</i></p> |
| Tom Wilson | <b>Lesbury Resident</b>      | <p><i>I would like to register my support and endorsement of the Lesbury Neighbourhood Plan. It is central and instrumental to the delivery of local democracy.</i></p>   |