

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT
LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD
PLAN - SUBMISSION VERSION (2021 – 2036)**

May 2021

Longframlington Parish Council

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

Contents:

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.0 | Introduction..... | 3 |
| 2.0 | Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan – Background..... | 4 |
| 3.0 | Consultation and Engagement Timeline | 4 |
| 4.0 | Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Neighbourhood Plan consultation (1 st March 2021 until 25 th April 2021) | 6 |
| 5.0 | Habitats Regulations Assessment..... | 7 |
| 6.0 | Strategic Environmental Assessment..... | 7 |
| 7.0 | Conclusions..... | 8 |

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX A: LIST OF STATUTORY BODIES CONSULTED AT REGULATION 14 STAGE

APPENDIX B: COPY OF LETTER SENT OUT TO i) STATUTORY CONSULTEES, ii) RESIDENTS AND iii) COPY OF NOTICE POSTED

APPENDIX C: COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES TO INITIAL VISION AND OBJECTIVES CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D: RESPONSES TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfill legal obligations set out in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and subsequent amendments. These Regulations require that when a qualifying body (in this case, Longframlington Parish Council) submit a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority, they must also provide a Consultation Statement. Regulation 15(2) describes what is required in a Consultation Statement. This states that a Consultation Statement must:
- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - explain how they were consulted;
 - summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement therefore sets out a brief background to the preparation of a neighbourhood development plan for Longframlington and sets out consultation events undertaken over the last two years.
- 1.3 The statement includes details of those consulted about the Plan at the various stages of plan preparation and the extent to which efforts were made to ensure the Plan was prepared with support and input from the local community. The Covid-19 pandemic reduced the ability of the Working Group to hold public meetings over the last year and the Regulation 14 consultation was undertaken without face to face meetings or open day due to the pandemic.
- 1.4 A number of responses were received during the time of that consultation, and the plan was amended accordingly. A description of the changes made to policies as the Plan emerged in response to the pre-submission consultation responses is contained in Appendix D.
- 1.5 Details of who were consulted, how, and when are also included. Appendix A contains a list of consultees; Appendix C contains a copy of the questionnaire sent to all residents during the vision and objective stage of consultation, and an analysis of the responses.
- 1.6 The methods used and outcomes achieved from engagement have resulted in the submission of a plan that, in the opinion of the Parish Council, best meet community expectations expressed during the various stages of plan preparation.

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

2.0 Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan – Background

2.1 The application by Longframlington Council to designate the civil parish of Longframlington as a 'neighbourhood area' was approved by Northumberland County Council on 11th March 2019.

2.2 Following the approval of the designated area, there followed two consultation events with the local community prior to the Regulation 14 consultation. Face to face consultation was cut short by the Covid-19 pandemic; following this, consultation was done online as thoroughly as possible, and in accordance with the published Covid-19 guidelines set out in National Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph 107 Reference ID: 41-107-20200925).

2.3 In order to keep an accurate and comprehensive record of the whole consultation process, the Parish Council website has publicly accessible records of all documents which are summarised below:

- Latest working draft of the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Latest consultation letter and details of how to respond to the consultation;
- All background evidence reports (Local Green Space Assessment, Settlement Boundary Methodology, Community Facilities and Recreation Areas assessment, Housing Paper)
- Record of the consultation process throughout the development of the Plan

2.4 These documents are also available online at the address below:

<https://northumberlandparishes.uk/longframlington/documents/neighbourhood-plan>

3.0 Consultation and Engagement Timeline

3.1 In general terms, local residents and businesses were kept informed about progress through the Neighbourhood Plan website hosted by Longframlington Parish Council, the village newsletter (Fram News) and public meetings and coffee mornings (prior to the pandemic) and a village Facebook page.

2018

3.2 Longframlington Parish Council organised a village meeting with a representative from Northumberland County Council giving a presentation to explain the neighbourhood planning process. Over 100 people attended the event.

3.3 Following this, a questionnaire was put in the Parish Newsletter (Fram News) asking people how they felt about the area, and in particular, how they felt the village should grow in terms of housing. A total of 50 questionnaire responses

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

were received. Most people who responded were concerned that there was too much housebuilding in the village and that the village was 'at capacity'.

- 3.4 A Steering Group was established by the Parish Council to oversee the development of a Neighbourhood Plan for Longframlington, and area designation was applied for.

2019

- 3.5 On 11th March 2019 Longframlington Parish was designated as a Neighbourhood Area.
- 3.6 In June 2019, a village presentation was held to further explain the Neighbourhood Plan process (see photo below). Approximately 80 people from the village attended. A survey was distributed at the event, and was also published in the parish newsletter, Fram News, which is delivered to every household in Longframlington Parish. The survey was also available to complete online, with the link shared on the village Facebook page.



Figure 1: Village presentation evening 20th June 2019

- 3.7 In September a drop-in session was arranged in the village Community Room (at the church). A stall was held at the village show, and children were asked for their views, wish-lists and pictures (mainly related to the play parks in the village). Display boards were set up showing the Parish, and people were asked for feedback on their views about the area.

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

- 3.8 Just over 70 responses were received to the survey carried out over the summer. A spreadsheet of responses was compiled. Following on from these responses, the Parish Council produced a further consultation based on a draft vision and objectives which reflected the views of responses made in the September consultation.

Vision and Objectives Consultation

- 3.9 A pamphlet setting out the vision and objectives was delivered to every house in the Parish, along with a questionnaire for feedback. This questionnaire was also available online and advertised on the village Facebook pages. To encourage more participation, a drop-in coffee morning was organised at St. Mary's Church on 5th September 2019, with a further drop-in session organised for October 2019.
- 3.10 Responses to the vision and objectives consultation were encouraging; approximately 83 responses were received, with an overwhelming majority of responses supporting the vision and objectives. A full breakdown of responses and comments is contained in Appendix C. Following a review of detailed comments, some amendments were made to the vision and objectives, to better reflect the views of the majority of respondents. A set of community projects was also drawn up in tandem with these responses.

2020

- 3.11 Production of the Neighbourhood Plan was held up during 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Most work on the plan stopped for a few months. Once things had settled down, the Parish Council began drafting the Plan based on the vision and objectives agreed and consulted the community with regard to the settlement boundary, with posters, Facebook page and information on the Parish Council website. Most residents were in agreement with regard to the settlement boundary and the Parish Council progressed the plan to the first statutory consultation stage.

2021

4.0 Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Neighbourhood Plan consultation (1st March 2021 until 25th April 2021)

- 4.1 Following a delay in the preparation of the Plan due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Parish Council commenced their pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan consultation. The consultation took place for a period of 8 weeks¹ and a list of consultees is contained in Appendix A.

¹ *in order to comply with national planning practice guidance in relation to Covid-19 and consultation procedures

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

- 4.2 Notices were placed on the Parish Council website and the individual statutory consultees listed in Appendix A were written to or e-mailed with information about how to view and respond to the plan.
- 4.3 No drop-in events were held due to the pandemic. However, the consultation was publicised in the village newsletter which is posted to every household. The Plan was also publicised on the village Facebook page. The Plan was available to view on the internet, and hard copies were also made available for those unable to access the online versions.

Statutory Consultees' Responses:

- 4.4 There were a number of responses from Statutory Consultees (identified in Appendix A). Many of them related to minor changes or additions to policy wording and criteria. These responses are listed fully in Appendix D which also shows what changes were made to the Plan by the Parish Council as a result of the suggestions.
- 4.5 Northumberland County Council were the only statutory consultee to respond with significant suggestions for alterations. All other statutory consultees either did not respond, or responded to say they supported the Plan.

Responses from landowners

- 4.6 There was one response received from a landowner with regard to a Local Green Space designation. Although not objecting per se to the designation, they wanted a more detailed explanation about the ownership of the space included in the Plan. Amendments have been made to reflect those comments.

Responses from residents

- 4.7 A summary of responses from residents is contained in Appendix D. Most residents were supportive of the Plan, although there were some comments made that were not supportive. There were also some requests for minor alterations to the settlement boundary to include areas of ownership to the rear of gardens. No changes were made to the settlement boundary as a result of these responses. The Parish Council has set out the reasons for all changes in the final column of the table in Appendix D.

5.0 Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 5.1 A Screening Opinion was sought as to whether Habitats Regulations Assessment would be required. The Plan was screened out; a copy of the full screening opinion is submitted with the Plan.

6.0 Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 6.1 The plan was screened to see if a Strategic Environmental Assessment would be required. The plan was screened 'out' and a final screening opinion was

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

produced by Northumberland County Council for the Parish Council on 14th January 2021. The screening opinion and report are submitted alongside the other neighbourhood plan documents.

7.0 Conclusions

- 7.1 The Submission Plan is the outcome of nearly four years of community engagement in various forms as outlined in this statement. It comprises a set of planning policies intended to guide development management decisions on planning applications so that they reflect the communities' expectations concerning controls and support for new development in the Neighbourhood Area.
- 7.2 The Parish Council believe that the Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan (Submission version) is a fair reflection of the views expressed by the local community throughout the various stages of plan preparation.
- 7.3 All legal obligations regarding the preparation of neighbourhood plans have been adhered to by the Parish Council. The Submission Plan is supported by a Basic Conditions Statement and by this Consultation Statement both of which adequately cover the requirements set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 [as amended]. The Parish Council has no hesitation in presenting the Plan as a policy document that has the support of the majority of the local community who have been engaged in its preparation.
- 7.4 This Consultation Statement demonstrates that publicity, consultation and engagement on the Plan has been meaningful, effective, proportionate and valuable in shaping the Plan which will benefit communities across the Parish by promoting sustainable development.

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)**

APPENDICES:

**APPENDIX A: LIST OF STATUTORY BODIES CONSULTED AT
REGULATION 14 STAGE**

**APPENDIX B: LETTER SENT OUT TO RESIDENTS AT
REGULATION 14 STAGE**

**APPENDIX C: COPY OF RESPONSES TO INITIAL VISION AND
OBJECTIVES CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

**APPENDIX D: RESPONSES TO PRE-SUBMISSION
CONSULTATION**

APPENDIX A: LIST OF STATUTORY BODIES CONSULTED AT REGULATION 14 STAGE

| Consultation Body | Organisation | Contact |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Local Planning Authority | Northumberland County Council | Rob Murfin, Planning Manager, Northumberland County Council, County Hall, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE61 2EF Tel: 01670 625542 Email: Rob.murfin@northumberland.gov.uk |
| | | David English (Planning Manager, Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure), Northumberland County Council, County Hall, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE61 2EF Tel: 01670 623619 Email: David.English@northumberland.gov.uk |
| The Coal Authority | The Coal Authority | Planning and Local Authority Liaison, The Coal Authority, 200 Lichfield Lane, Berry Lane, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, NG18 4RG Email: planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk |
| Homes and Communities Agency | Homes and Communities Agency | Homes and Communities Agency, St George's House, Kingsway, Team Valley, Gateshead, NE11 0NA Email: mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk |
| Natural England | Natural England | Consultation Service, Natural England, Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Business Park, Crewe, CW1 6GJ Email: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk |
| The Environment Agency | The Environment Agency | Planning Consultations, Environment Agency, Tyneside House, Skinnerburn Road, Newcastle Business Park, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 7AR Email: planning.nane@environment-agency.gov.uk |
| Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England | Historic England | Historic England, 41-44 Sandgate, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3JF Email: e-neast@HistoricEngland.org.uk |
| Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, George Stephenson House, Toft Hill, York, Y01 6JT townplanning.LNE@networkrail.co.uk |

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Highways England | Highways England | Asset Development Team - Yorkshire and North East, Highways England, Lateral, 8 City Walk, Leeds, LS11 9AT Email: planningYNE@highways-england.co.uk |
| Relevant Primary Care Trust | NHS Northumberland Clinical Commissioning Group | NHS Northumberland Clinical Commissioning Group, County Hall, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE61 2EF Tel.: 01670335161 Email: nccgenquiries@nhs.net |
| Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority | Avonline | Avonline, 42 Ashton Vale Road, Ashton Vale, Bristol, BS3 2AX Tel.: 0117 953 1111 Email: info@avonline.co.uk |
| | British Telecommunications Plc. | British Telecommunications Plc, Openreach Newsites PP 4AB, 21-23 Carliol Square, Newcastle CTE, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 1BB |
| | Briskona | enquiries@briskona.com |
| | CTIL (Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited) Acting on behalf of Vodafone and O2 | Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited, EMF Enquiries, Building 1330 – The Exchange, Arlington Business Park, Theale, Berkshire, RG7 4SA Email: EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk |
| | EE | Alex Jackman, Corporate and Financial Affairs Department, EE, The Point, 37 North Wharf Road, London, W2 1AG Email: public.affairs@ee.co.uk |
| | Three | Jane Evans, Three, Great Brighams, Mead Vastern Road, Reading, RG1 8DJ Email: jane.evans@three.co.uk |
| | Virgin Media Limited | Virgin Media Limited, Unit 2, Network House, New York Way, New York Industrial Park, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE27 0QF Virgin Media Limited (Head Office), 270 & 280 Bartley Way, Bartley Wood Business Park, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9UP |
| | Wildcard Networks | Wildcard Networks, Reliance House, Skinnerburn Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 7AN info@wildcard.net.uk |
| | Arqiva | Email: community.relations@arqiva.com |
| | Openreach | newsitereceptionedinburgh@openreach.co.uk |

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies | CTIL (Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited) Acting on behalf of Vodafone and O2 | Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited, EMF Enquiries, Building 1330 – The Exchange, Arlington Business Park, Theale, Berkshire, RG7 4SA Email: EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk |
| | EE | Alex Jackman, Corporate and Financial Affairs Department, EE, The Point, 37 North Wharf Road, London, W2 1AG Email: public.affairs@ee.co.uk |
| | Three | Jane Evans, Three, Great Brighams, Mead Vastern Road, Reading, RG1 8DJ Email: jane.evans@three.co.uk |
| Any person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989. | Northern Powergrid | Northern Powergrid, Records and Information, Manor House, Station Road, Penshaw, Houghton le Spring, County Durham, DH4 7LA |
| | National Grid | National Grid, National Grid House, Warwick, Warwickshire, CV34 6DA Email: box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK, Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 6JX Email: n.grid@amecfw.com |
| Any a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986. | Northern Gas Networks | Northern Gas Networks, 1100 Century Way, Thorp Business Park, Colton, Leeds, LS15 8TU |
| Sewerage undertaker | Northumbrian Water Limited | Laura Kennedy, New Development Team (Planning), Northumbrian Water Limited, Leat House, Pattinson Road, Washington, Tyne and Wear, NE38 8LB laura.kennedy@nwl.co.uk 0191 419 6767 |
| Water undertaker | Northumbrian Water Limited | Laura Kennedy, New Development Team (Planning), Northumbrian Water Limited, Leat House, Pattinson Road, Washington, Tyne and Wear, NE38 8LB Email: laura.kennedy@nwl.co.uk |
| Marine Management Organisation | Marine Management Organisation | Stakeholder & Networks Officer, Marine Management Organisation, PO Box 1275, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE99 5BN Email: consultations.mmo@marinemanagement.org.uk |
| Adjoining local authorities | All local authorities, including parish councils, that adjoin the neighbourhood area | Parish Councils consulted were: Brinkburn Parish Council (Garth Rhodes, Parish Clerk) Cartington Parish Council (Claire Miller, Parish Clerk) Edlingham Parish Council (Claire Miller, Parish Clerk) Newton on the Moor and Swarland Parish Council (Jan Anderson, Parish Clerk) |

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | Felton Parish Council (Clair Lewis, Parish Clerk) Northumberland National Park Authority, Eastburn, South Park, Hexham |
| Voluntary Bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area | | Rothbury Practice, Longframlington Surgery, Longframlington (hand delivered) Memorial Hall Committee, St Mary's Church, Longframlington (hand delivered) St Mary's Church, Longframlington (hand delivered) Longframlington United Reformed Church, Longframlington (hand delivered) Lower Coquetdale Red Squirrels: info@lcreds.org.uk Northumbrian Hedgehog Rescue Trust, Harrogate Lane, Longframlington NE65 8EA |
| Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area | | N/A |
| Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area | | N/A |
| Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area | | N/A |
| Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area | | N/A |

| Organisations who have asked to be notified about neighbourhood plans in Northumberland | |
|--|---|
| The Theatres Trust | Mark Price (Planning and Heritage Adviser), The Theatres Trust, 22 Charing Cross Road, London WC2H 0QL Email: mark.price@theatrestrust.org.uk |
| Sustrans | Sustrans, 2 Cathedral Square, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5DD Email: reception@sustrans.org.uk |
| National Farmers Union | Mr Andy Stephenson, Planning, National Farmers Union, Agriculture House, 207 Tadcaster Road, York, YO24 1UD Email: andrew.stephenson@nfu.org.uk |
| SSA Planning, Nottingham | Mark McGovern Mark.mcgovern@ssaplanning.co.uk |
| George F White | Craig Ross craigross@georgefwhite.co.uk |

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

Other local businesses consulted:

Denehouse Farm, Longframlington, NE65 8EE

Christmas Farm, Longframlington, NE65 8DA

Carr's Corner Newsagent Longframlington (hand delivered)

Running Fox, Longframlington (hand delivered)

R Green & Son Grocers, Longframlington (hand delivered)

Cuts Both Ways, Longframlington (hand delivered)

Village Inn, Longframlington (hand delivered)

Granby Inn, Longframlington (hand delivered)

Swarland Fence, Swarland, Northumberland, NE65 0HX

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)**

**APPENDIX B: COPY OF CONSULTATION LETTER SENT TO STATUTORY
CONSULTEES, RESIDENTS AND PUBLIC NOTICE DISPLAYED ON PARISH
BOARD**

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)**

APPENDIX C: VISION AND OBJECTIVES CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTATION STATEMENT: LONGFRAMLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (May 2021)

APPENDIX D: CONSULTATION RESPONSES to REG.14 CONSULTATION – STATUTORY CONSULTEES, OTHER CONSULTEES and RESIDENTS

Appendix D contains a list of all statutory consultee responses made during the second Regulation 14 consultation and a list of all residents and other consultee responses

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Coal Authority | Coal mining legacy features in the area, but because we are not allocating sites for development, no specific comments. | |
| Environment Agency | No specific comments | |
| Highways England | No specific comments | |
| Historic England | No specific comments | |
| Homes England | No specific comments | |
| National Grid | No specific comments | |
| Natural England | Support the environmental aspirations, particularly LNP1, LNP2, LNP5, LNP7 | Support noted with thanks. |
| NCC | <p>Page 3, Contents</p> <p>It would be more helpful for those using the Plan in future to list the policies by precise name and policy number and indicating where they are located in the Plan (by page number). This would give a much clearer direction to Planning Officers, Elected Members and potential applicants and their agents when using the Plan.</p> | Noted. However the policies are listed at the front. Page numbers can be added. |
| NCC | <p>4.2 Objectives Objective 1</p> <p>Objective 1 refers to the special landscapes around Longframlington. Whilst we understand that the Parish Council and the local community may consider the landscape in the Parish to be special, we are not aware of any particular local, national or international designations that apply to the landscape in the Parish. Unless there is evidence from an appropriately qualified and experienced person that describes the attributes that make those landscapes 'special' it would be more appropriate to amend the objective to refer to <i>'the countryside around Longframlington'</i>. This would better reflect the general protection</p> | Change made to re-phrase Objective 1 to refer to 'locally valued' landscapes, instead of 'special landscapes'. |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|------------------|--|---|
| NCC cont. | <p>expected to be given to the countryside through Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>The statement that ‘...there is a presumption against development which does not meet specified needs.’ is unnecessarily negative and fails to recognise that the purpose of the planning system is to support sustainable development, which can include development beyond settlement boundaries. This is clear from national planning policies concerning business, community, leisure, tourism and residential development in rural areas. We would advise rephrasing this objective to ensure it is presented to provide support for sustainable development.</p> | <p>Noted. This part of the objective has been removed.</p> |
| | <p>Objective 2</p> <p>This objective is overly restrictive in its geographic extent by seeking only to meet local needs in the Neighbourhood Area. It would be entirely reasonable for the housing needs of people resident in the rural parishes adjoining Longframlington to be met within Longframlington village. We would advise that this objective is reviewed to present a more reasonable and less restrictive approach to the definition of ‘local’ needs.</p> | <p>No change. This is an objective which reflects responses to our community consultation. The LNP is written for Longframlington, not other adjoining areas. The policy itself does not restrict housing to local needs only; however, the objective for the LNP is to encourage more housing to meet the needs of local people, whether that is achieved through the planning policies, or the community projects (or both)</p> |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|---|---|
| NCC cont.. | <p>4.4.1 Page 17</p> <p>This provides confused statements about how the Plan should be used. It is only necessary to engage policies that are relevant to the determination of any particular planning application. That judgement will be made by the decision maker based on the details of each application. The instruction to read the document as a whole seems unnecessary. The phrasing of what is meant by these sentences should be reviewed in the interest of clarity.</p> | <p>Noted. However, we feel it is important to make it clear that the plan should be read as a whole. Not everyone who reads the Plan will be familiar with the principles of the planning system, so we feel it is important to make this clear.</p> |
| | <p>5.2 and 5.2.1, Page 18 (and elsewhere throughout the Plan)</p> <p>It is unnecessarily repetitive to restate in full the objectives to which this policy relates. It would be sufficient to indicate in the supporting text which objectives this policy seeks to deliver simply by reference to the objective numbers. We advise that for clarity this presentational approach is reviewed and the Plan is modified throughout.</p> | <p>Noted. References to objectives have been removed and the Plan has been modified throughout.</p> |
| | <p>5.5.2 Policy LNP 1, New Housing Development</p> <p>The policy is titled <i>New Housing Development</i> and defines a settlement boundary for part of the Neighbourhood Area. From reading the Plan as a whole it would appear that the definition of a settlement boundary and its purpose in planning policy terms would only be engaged in the determination of planning applications for residential development. The Plan does not say this, but none of the remaining policies make reference to a settlement boundary. If this is intentional it would be necessary for clarity, and to meet the basic conditions in that regard, for the policy to indicate that the settlement boundary only relates to residential development. Only by doing this could a decision maker be certain of the intentions associated with the creation of a definite settlement boundary in the context of dealing with any other form of development.</p> | <p>Noted. Given that the policy is entitled 'New Housing Development', we consider that it is extremely clear that the settlement boundary refers only to new housing development. Other types of development are not confined to the settlement boundary so therefore do not refer to the settlement boundary. However, an additional sentence has been added to the policy to further clarify the purpose of the settlement boundary.</p> |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------------|---|---|
| NCC cont... | <p>The policy alternative could be to review other policies regarding business and other development and establish the controls intended over such other forms of development in the context of a settlement boundary. This could then be referenced in other policies or a single policy covering all forms of development could be created. In this way Policy LNP1 could be an overarching policy to manage new development within and outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>We would ordinarily advise that the policy should be drafted to set out the specific exceptions where development would be supported. This would create greater precision, clarity and certainty for decision makers that they were making decisions that reflect your intentions. However, the approach proposed which makes reference to national policy in general terms may be sufficient, but the usefulness of the Plan as a whole would be much improved if those normal exceptions set out in NPPF were at least set out in the supporting text.</p> <p>As drafted the Policy would fail to meet the basic conditions in terms of having regard to national policy and guidance in that it is incomplete and presents only a partial approach to setting out the matters relevant to the determination of a planning application. The ‘...latest national planning policy...’ would ordinarily be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application. This policy has the effect of elevating the status of whatever national planning policy may say now and in the future. This may be an acceptable approach. However, it fails to recognise that the starting point for decision making must be the statutory development plan. It would therefore be necessary for clarity, and to reflect the relevant legislation, to add to the final sentence the need for development proposals to be determined in accordance with relevant development plan policies, including where necessary other strategic and non-strategic policies, in addition to national planning policy.</p> | <p>This was considered carefully when the Plan was drafted. Other policies related to business and other development are not contained to the settlement boundary, which is there purely to direct the location of new housing development (as is clearly set out in the Policy). To start controlling other types of development using the settlement boundary would result in an overly complicated and overly prescriptive policy.</p> <p>We do not agree that there is a need to repeat national planning policy within the policy. By referring to national planning policy within the body of the policy, it is elevated to the status of policy. By referring to the ‘latest national planning policy’, it will enable this policy to remain better aligned with national policy in the event of future changes.</p> |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|---|---|
| NCC cont... | <p data-bbox="600 491 1122 526">6.3 Policy LNP 2, The Local Economy</p> <p data-bbox="600 564 1547 868">The supporting text and Objective 3 support the development of businesses. Unfortunately, Policy LNP2 introduces several restrictions or controls over the type and scale of business that it supports. The policy fails to have regard to paragraphs 83 and 84 of NPPF because it presents a more restrictive policy. Paragraph 83 of NPPF very clearly supports ‘...all types of business in rural areas...’ and it allows for no distinction on scale. The only controls associated with business development in rural areas are set out in paragraph 84 of NPPF which must be read in conjunction with paragraph 170 of NPPF.</p> <p data-bbox="600 906 1547 1110">The first sentence of the policy defines those types of business that will be supported. Any literal interpretation of this sentence would logically lead a decision maker to a conclusion that any other form of business development would not be supported. If that is not what is meant then the whole purpose of the policy would appear meaningless. This does not have regard to paragraph 83 of NPPF.</p> <p data-bbox="600 1149 1547 1251">In part b) it is unnecessarily repetitive to require biodiversity net gain when that matter is expressly covered by Policy LNP5. If reading the Plan as a whole is to mean anything then repetition should be avoided.</p> <p data-bbox="600 1289 1547 1353">In part c) it would be appropriate to reference the need to avoid highway safety impacts in addition to amenity impacts.</p> | <p data-bbox="1579 268 2029 488">With regard to the detail (i.e. repeating national policy within the policy); the Parish Council to the view that this approach resulted in a lengthy and unnecessarily repetitive policy.</p> <p data-bbox="1579 494 1968 564">Noted. Policy has been re-drafted.</p> <p data-bbox="1579 753 2029 1342">Policy amended to support the creation of new business, and then list those businesses which will receive particular support. Neighbourhood Plans are supposed to be able to identify which locally specific matters are most important to that area, and these are the types of business the Parish Council wish to encourage. The policy does not prevent other kinds of business, merely seeks to make it clear what businesses are particularly appropriate to this rural area.</p> |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|---|---|
| | <p>In part d) the caveat regarding 'well-designed' business units is unnecessarily repetitive given the intention of Policy LNP7; the introduction of a size limitation by the use of the term 'small' fails to have regard to national policy and guidance which does not limit the size or scale of business development in rural areas; and national policy and guidance places no specific restriction on the location of new development in terms of any relationship with existing development. This is therefore overly onerous.</p> <p>We would advise that the policy be reviewed and redrafted to better reflect the clear intentions of national policy and guidance to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.</p> | <p>Reference to biodiversity removed.</p> <p>Highway safety added to part c)</p> <p>Amended to clarify, and reference to 'small' has been removed. We have retained 'well-designed'. We do not think the policy fails to meet the basic conditions if it includes this.</p> |
| NCC | <p>7.3 Policy LNP 3 Community Facilities</p> <p>The first sentence offers unconstrained support for any form of expansion to existing facilities or the creation of new facilities. This fails to meet the basic conditions in that it does not recognise other amenity, environmental impact or highway safety impacts, all of which are generally limited through national policy and guidance and through other development plan policies. We would advise that this sentence be reviewed and modified to present reference to appropriate controls.</p> | <p>The policy has been amended</p> |
| NCC | <p>8.3. Policy LNP 4</p> <p>For clarity and to avoid the negative implications of the current terminology we recommend that the first part of the final paragraph be modified to say:</p> | <p>Noted. Changed.</p> |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|--|---|
| | <p><i>'Proposals resulting in the loss of any of these recreation areas will not be supported unless...etc'.</i></p> | |
| | <p>Outdoor Recreation Areas</p> <p>It would also be helpful to indicate when alternative facilities should be provided to give greater certainty in achieving the aims of the policy where open space is lost. We would recommend adding to the last sentence as follows: <i>'...prior to the loss of the existing space.'</i></p> | <p>Noted. This has been added to the end of the policy.</p> |
| | <p>9.3 Policy LNP 5 Biodiversity</p> <p>The NPPF states plans should protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, by identifying and pursuing opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The recent consultation carried out by DEFRA on Net Gain (July 2019) proposed that legislation will require development to deliver 10% net gains for biodiversity. Consultation respondents offered mixed opinions on this level, with many recognising that the practical consequences of any rate will depend on the quality of delivery, the metric and other policy details. Government maintain the view that 10% strikes the right balance between their ambition for development and the pressing need to reverse environmental decline. It is proposed that 10% will be a mandatory minimum national net gain requirement, but should not be viewed as a cap on the aspirations of developers that want to voluntarily go further or do so in the course of designing proposals to meet other local planning policies. LNP 5 states all development must demonstrate how it takes the opportunity to deliver net gains and goes on to set a minimum 10% net gain. We would advise that currently it would not be appropriate to create a specific minimum level through development plan policy since legislation has not yet been enacted.</p> | <p>Noted. Policy amended</p> |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|---|---------------------------|
| | <p>During the recent examination into the Northumberland Local Plan the Inspector examining the Local Plan has advised against including a percentage figure, because nothing has finally been agreed nationally. Instead, it is proposed to modify the draft Local Plan (Policy ENV2) to: <i>'secure a net gain for biodiversity as calculated to reflect latest Government policy and advice, through planning conditions or planning obligations'</i>.</p> <p>We would advise that it would be appropriate to amend Policy LNP5 in a similar way.</p> | |
| NCC | <p>10.1.1 Page 27</p> <p>This presents an incorrect interpretation of national policy regarding development in the Green Belt which is relevant to the application of policy concerning Local Green Space. Only 'inappropriate development' as defined in NPPF is required to demonstrate 'very special circumstances'. It would be helpful to amend the introductory text generally to fully reflect paragraphs 99 to 101 of NPPF, and in particular guidance on how development should be managed within Local Green Space.</p> | Noted. Paragraph amended. |
| NCC | <p>10.3 Policy LNP 6 Local Green Space</p> <p>The policy and supporting text are presented in such a way that it gives the impression of almost absolute protection for these two areas. This is not a fair reflection of national policy and guidance. Whilst there may be little detail in national policy concerning Local green Space, it is clear that the management of development should be consistent with Green Belt policy. We would therefore advise that, in order that the policy has regard to national policy and therefore is able to meet the basic conditions, it should be modified, along with the supporting text, to include appropriate reference to the management of development in these areas being consistent with Green Belt policy.</p> | Noted – policy amended. |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|---|---|
| NCC | <p>11.3 Policy LNP 7 High Quality and Sustainable Design</p> <p>Although the supporting text makes reference to local design features the policy provides no particular locally specific guidance or requirement beyond those matters generally addressed in current national policy and guidance. Nevertheless, in the absence of up-to-date development plan policy on the general matter of design and the creation of sustainable development we recognise that a general policy will be helpful in decision making.</p> <p>As currently presented, the introductory sentence is perhaps misleading. We are assuming that each of the criteria a) to h) would be applied to development proposals where it is appropriate to do so, recognising that all forms of development need not necessarily meet all of the criteria. However, the first sentence creates a caveat to the support for high quality and sustainable design by using the words ‘Where appropriate...’ at the beginning of the sentence. New development should always incorporate high quality and sustainable design. We would advise deleting the first two words of the first sentence, and modify the second sentence to add ‘where appropriate’ at the end of the second sentence.</p> | Noted. Changes made as suggested. |
| NCC | <p>Policies Maps The Policies maps included in the body of the LNP would be better printed out at a high resolution and larger scale to accompany the Submission Plan.</p> | Noted. We will discuss this with NCC who have kindly helped us with the maps. |
| NCC | <p>Community Projects. Page 37</p> <p>Strategic Transport Team</p> | Noted with thanks. |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|--------------|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>There is a suggested project around assessing transport provision which we will happily work with and support the parish council to ensure services meet resident's needs.</p> <p>In terms of the language used they reference the Thropton-Morpeth Arriva service as being the main bus service serving the community, I think it is worth referencing in the document that this service is actually Thropton to Newcastle via Morpeth, to highlight that links for education and employment in Newcastle do already exist.</p> <p>Finally they may want to reference that all services that serve Longframlington are supported services funded by NCC.</p> | |
| NCC | <p>Community Projects. Page 33</p> <p>Education Team</p> <p>Pupil data collated by the Council indicates that there are sufficient places in the local schools that serve Longframlington village to meet current and future demands, including additional pupils that may arise from the planned housebuilding. However, officers in the Education Group are open to further discussions with the Longframlington Neighbourhood Planning group in relation to pupil place planning should they wish to contact us for further information.</p> | Noted. |
| NCC | <p>Policy LNP7.</p> <p>Page 30</p> <p>Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Team</p> | |

| Organisation | Comments | Parish Council response |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>We are pleased to see the inclusion of SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) within policy LNP7 part d. However, we note that the inclusion of these is based on a biodiversity perspective. Whilst, SuDS do offer biodiversity benefits, the other benefits which they bring most notably reducing water quantity should not be dismissed.</p> <p>The only mention of flooding in the plan was again references under a biodiversity heading. It is encouraged that flood risk to new developments is expanded within the plan and more reference is given to mitigation measures including the use of SuDS within all developments which can reduce impact of flooding.</p> | |
| Northumberland National Park | Very supportive, no specific comments | |
| NOTM and Swarland Parish Council | No specific comments | |

| Name | Comments | Parish Council response |
|------------------|---|--|
| Bill Read | <p data-bbox="394 261 707 293">Scanned letter attached</p> <div data-bbox="394 293 1249 1362" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p data-bbox="501 389 815 571">Bill Read The Cedars Rothbury Road Longframlington Northumberland NE65 8HX Tel: 01665 570988 Email: bill@longfram.net</p> <p data-bbox="501 603 613 628">18th April 2021</p> <p data-bbox="501 644 703 724">Parish Clerk 5 Wardle Terrace Longframlington Northumberland NE65 8AB</p> <p data-bbox="501 740 591 762">Dear Garth</p> <p data-bbox="501 778 770 801">Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p data-bbox="501 817 779 858">Plan adoption formal process-First Stage Parish Consultation</p> <p data-bbox="501 874 622 896">1.2 Background</p> <p data-bbox="501 912 1137 1011">1.2.1 After "history" on the first line, I believe it should be added that the first significant modern housing development, circa 140 houses, commenced in 1973/75 with the construction of Cheviot Lodge, followed by the construction of Harecross Park, The Causeway, Cairn Park, and Cairn View throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, (continue with " the most recent period of growth" etc).</p> <p data-bbox="501 1027 1128 1107">NOTE – The illustrations throughout the Plan do not reflect the urbanisation of the village. There is hardly a glimpse of the now considerable amount of modern housing that has taken place since the 1970s, which has adversely affected the appearance and character of the village.</p> <p data-bbox="501 1123 1137 1181">2.2.1 Why retain these saved out of date strategic policies? Surely the forthcoming NLP will not include them, and because the LNP must be in conformity with the NLP then the LNP should not include them either.</p> <p data-bbox="501 1197 927 1219">2.5.1 What are the "development needs" of Longframlington?</p> <p data-bbox="501 1235 936 1257">4.2.1 Objective 1: omit " which does not meet specified needs".</p> <p data-bbox="501 1273 1128 1315">4.3.1 This policy is completely contrary to the concept of the LNP if the plan outlines what types of housing will be SUPPORTED outside the settlement boundary.</p> </div> | <p data-bbox="1509 772 2029 906">It is felt that the commentary in the Plan is clear. It is appreciated that there has been a significant amount of new housebuilding over recent years.</p> <p data-bbox="1509 944 2029 1110">Legislation requires us to use extant policies to test the LNP. At the present moment, the Northumberland Plan is not part of the Development Plan, although we appreciate it soon will be.</p> <p data-bbox="1509 1149 2029 1315">There appears to be a misunderstanding here. Policy 1 does not support new housing outside the settlement boundary except in certain circumstances.</p> <p data-bbox="1509 1353 1917 1378">Objective 1 is about landscape.</p> |

5.2.1 Objective 1. Remove "which does not meet specified needs"

Objective 2. Remove "and to prevent further major housing development which does not meet an identified local need"

5.3.5 With all the modern residential development that has already taken place in the village, and coupled with the substantial residential development still to be constructed, surely the LNP should only support any further development on brownfield sites within the village, or on rural exception sites on the periphery of the village if there is a proven need for local needs housing.

5.4.2 Omit

Policy LNP1 Omit third paragraph

Policy LNP 4 OR2. This is a potential school site in the right circumstances. Children are more important than dogs.

13.2 SCHOOL PROVISION. Surely this should be made a Policy instead of just a Project and every effort should be made to persuade the NCC to reclassify the old "school field" for a future school, especially bearing in mind the forthcoming impact of a further circa 200 or more residents. The number of young children in the village continues to grow.

Yours sincerely,

A blue rectangular box redacting the signature of the author.

Noted. No change.

The policy does support the development of brownfield sites within the village, and supports rural exception sites for people with an identified housing need.

No change.

We note comments about the school field, but the Parish Council cannot designate the site for a school or any other use without working with the landowner. This will be taken forward as a project.

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Becky Smith | Just thought I would email with my support for the neighbourhood plan. | Noted with thanks. |
| | I am strongly in favour of it. | |
| | I know new developments in the village are controversial but as a resident of the village previously for 20+ years until I moved away with work, we had the opportunity to come back last year, I don't think we would have been able to move back without the new developments. However I do believe it is important that there is a fair balance between keeping the character of the village, the need for new housing and infrastructure necessary for both moving forward and I believe the neighbourhood plan balances these factors very well. | |
| | Thank you all so much for what you do, especially over the last year. I am so proud and grateful to be able to call Fram home again. | |
| Deborah Hamilton | No comments as such, she asked for more information about the boundary (email conversation attached) | |
| Heather Maughan | Dear Parish Council, I have studied your Draft Neighbourhood Plan and cant understand why a small group of ageing population wish to inhibit the natural growth of our beloved village. Do any of you have growing families? I expect not! In Britain, a hamlet earned the right to be called a village when it built a church. The industrial revolution attracted people in larger numbers to work in mills, farms and Pits; the concentration of people caused many villages to grow into towns. Its always been a natural progression caused by an ever growing population. The local business need the support from the new houses and our tourists, we need the new influx to help support our little vibrant village. How many villages do we see with shops boarded up and pubs closed, There are so many new babys being born into the village, what is their future to be, move out, move to town, away from their families? I think that Northumberland County council is quite well equipped to handle planning applications and make decisions for Longframlington village, and we have no need whatsoever to involve a small minded group of people to take control of our future! Please leave well alone | Noted. The Plan has sought to strike a balance between giving the opportunity for affordable housing to come forward through exceptions sites, and allowing new housing development within the settlement boundary. There was strong support for this approach during the various stages of consultation. |
| John Whittaker | I would like to congratulate the authors of the Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan for the excellent | Noted with thanks. |

| | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>work done and the conclusions drawn. The amount of housing development is currently off the realistic and acceptable scale. It seems we are in a developers charter with any piece of spare ground ripe for development and the county council either unable or unwilling to oppose I wish to put it on record that my Wife and I support the plan wholeheartedly</p> | |
| Jon Gale | <p>I have studied the plan and fully support it and appreciate the amount of work undertaken, however I would like to make some comments.</p> <p>I feel it is important that the village residents come together as a community and local businesses thrive as we come out of lockdown.</p> <p>At the moment I feel that the North end of the village is a little cut off from the main facilities of the village due to the difficult pedestrian access.</p> <p>Narrow footpaths, overhanging vegetation, parked cars and speeding lorries inches from the pavement edge all make a trip to the shops etc not for the faint hearted.</p> <p>This will only be more apparent when the proposed new houses are built.</p> <p>I realise we can do nothing about the A697 running through the village but I would like to see some strategy in the village plan to make pedestrian routes safer, to enhance routes to facilities and thus support businesses.</p> | <p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>Some of these matters will be addressed through Community Projects.</p> |
| Keith Jackson | <p>Firstly, thanks to the team who have clearly spent much time and effort in developing the draft plan. It is well argued and a sensible stance.</p> <p>My comments are related to:</p> <p>LNP 5 – Biodiversity This policy seems to solely relate to new development impact and there is no specific objective in addressing climate change and loss of habitat that historical development will have contributed to.</p> | <p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>Some of these matters can be addressed as Community Projects. The</p> |

For example could an alternative use of the 'Old School field' be to plant this area with native trees and to incorporate wildflower meadow(NCC appear to be contributing 'gifts' of trees to communities for this purpose, which certainly has been accepted by some parts of the village I note). This would provide habitat for birds, insects and potentially other wildlife and help break up the continuity of buildings in this area of the village. Over time it would provide something of a corridor to the LGS1 woodland as well. I would comment that the potential proposed uses of this area which is somewhat 'landlocked' would be inhibited by road access and the fact that existing housing surrounds the plot.

Neighbourhood Plan policies can only relate to proposed development.

LNP7 – High Quality and sustainable design

Given the Government's approach to phasing out of combustion engines and also the use of gas in domestic properties, should developments be actively encouraged to incorporate EV charging points, and also rather than individual heating systems, consideration of a distributed heating system operated from a central renewable energy plant? These systems are common in Scandinavia, and given the proximity of commercial forestry, access to biomass for such units would be achieved on a 'low carbon miles' basis.

Noted. An additional criteria has been added to the policy to require the incorporation of EV charging points in new development.

Whilst not directly related to LNP7, the wider issue of EV charging infrastructure and the capability of the electricity network to support these needs some consideration as presently there are no public facilities in the village.

A community heating project could come forward as a Community Project if there was a desire to take this forward.

LNP2 – Local Economy Policy

Some direct reference to the digital economy should likely be made, along with provisioning of Fibre to premises (FFTP). Its likely that in the post COVID World, home working , at least in part will be the norm, and clearly most if not all businesses rely on fast data communication. I find it bizarre that recently constructed properties in the village are just Fibre to Cabinet!

Noted. This could be incorporated as a Community Project

Noted. This is beyond the remit of the NP.

These are all relatively small points no doubt, and indeed may not 'fit' within the needs of the plan structure.

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Ken and Carol Bruce | <p>We have read the plan and totally agree with the contents of this important document. We are looking forward to the day when the formal process is complete and the plan is adopted.</p> | Noted with thanks. |
| | <p>Please thank everyone that has been involved in producing the plan, their work is greatly appreciated.</p> | |
| Lynn Roxburgh | <p>In the late 1990s, early 2000's, the same NIMBY arguments for housing development were voiced but focused on estates that are now well established. Lessons about the failure to include local play areas, absence of well planned access roads, absence of mains gas, overload of mains water, drainage and electricity supply the decline of public transport and continued lack of educational facility in the village were all considered then and sadly remain desirable now. The style of "new" social housing wasn't well thought although it was necessary.</p> | Comments noted. |
| | <p>Somewhere in the attic there are papers that our son held onto following an earlier attempt to draw up some type of local plan that he was invited to participate in as a representative of young people in the village. It was a most disheartening experience as time and time again Longframlington Parish Council subsequently failed to take younger parishioners into consideration when new planning applications were presented and ideas for improving community amenities or infrastructure never materialised.</p> | |
| | <p>The So-called "vibrant" village lost its youth club and youth summer holiday schemes. It lost its play group despite lottery funding. The mixed economy of 2 and 3 tier education was foreseen but not challenged leaving Swarland School feeding to both. The "sustainable growth" of the economy lacks support in an area where investment in infrastructure such as broadband or even uninterrupted electricity supply hasn't been a focus. Many working in agriculture have looked to develop land in order to improve their livelihood as the rural economy is actually in decline.</p> | Noted. The Plan is seeking where feasible to address some of these matters. There is a limit to what can be achieved through planning policies. |
| | <p>The reality is the village is a dormitory for other towns, with few finding local employment (excepting more recent work from home demanded by the Covid-19 pandemic) and even the young and old, having to travel for socialising, education, work, support and healthcare.</p> <p>Some of those involved in this current plan should perhaps identify conflicts of</p> | |

interest as they or their families have benefited from housing schemes but now want to “protect” the village.

The new draft doesn't appear to have a positive purpose. Criticism of the past decade gives a most unwelcoming feel. Adequate analysis of future requirements doesn't come across.

In particular we've looked at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-2#basic-conditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum>

That says a neighbourhood plan should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies and it should take account of national policy and advice. We can't see this included in the draft. It says the LNP needs to demonstrate how its plan or order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset. These are touched on but not shown.

In addition we looked at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal> This LNP should promote sustainable development by assessing the extent to which the emerging plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives. But the assessment isn't included. And the expectation that plans should make explicit which policies are strategic policies isn't explained. Unless we missed it the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Air Quality Directive(2008/50EC) or the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) that need to be considered aren't included nor are the habitat regulation assessment process for land use plans, including consideration of the effect on habitats sites.

Although there is mention of what might be included there doesn't seem to be any detail. For instance, to reduce the likelihood of a neighbourhood plan becoming out of date once a new local plan (or spatial development strategy) is adopted, communities preparing a neighbourhood plan should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need, demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites, demonstrates that the neighbourhood plan is planning positively for

The Plan is, we believe, supportive of new sustainable development.

The Plan does not undermine strategic policies; indeed, Longframlington is able to deliver well above the housing requirement identified in the latest version of the emerging Northumberland Local Plan.

The full details with regard to how the Plan meets the strategic objectives will be contained in the Basic Conditions report that will be submitted with the Plan.

The Plan was screened for SEA and was screened 'out'. This is because it was not considered that it would have a significant environmental impact. The Plan was also screened to see whether a Habitat Regulations Assessment would be required. This was also screened out. These screening reports are available on the Longframlington website.

See previous comments with regard to housing supply.

new homes, and provides greater certainty for developers, infrastructure providers and the community. In turn this also contributes to the local authorities' housing land supply, ensuring that the right homes are delivered in the right places.

We would expect to see the housing figure for the neighbourhood area set out in the relevant strategic policies, an indicative figure provided by the local planning authority, or where it has exceptionally been determined by the neighbourhood planning body.

The site being allocated should be shown on the policies map with a clear site boundary drawn on an Ordnance Survey base map. A policy in the plan will need to set out the proposed land uses on the site, an indication of the quantum of development appropriate for the site and any appropriate design principles that the community wishes to establish. And an idea of the circumstances in which the neighbourhood plan is updated.

Northumberland County Council hasn't yet had its local plan ratified but it should be considered as should the strategic housing evaluation undertaken relatively recently, local planning authorities may be able to advise neighbourhood planning groups on suitable methods that will provide communities with access to physical copies of documents. A local planning authority should provide constructive comments on the emerging neighbourhood plan. A statement (a basic conditions statement) setting out how a draft meets the basic conditions must accompany the draft neighbourhood plan. If you don't say what the national policy objectives are how can we see they're not constrained by the LNP? support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans and spatial development strategies How can we see you have had regard to national policy and considered whether a particular policy is or is not relevant? How can we see you have regards to NCC Local Plan

<https://www.northumberland.gov.uk/NorthumberlandCountyCouncil/media/Planning-and-Building/planning%20policy/Local%20Plan/Northumberland-Local-Plan-Reg-19-Publication-Draft-January-2019-Web-PDF-Version.pdf>

You say residents were concerned about the sustainability of this level of growth, and about the impact it would have on the village. Concerns were raised at a

The housing requirement is set by NCC, not by the Parish Council. The LNP ensures that the housing requirement is met.

There are no sites being allocated.

The housing requirement figure in the emerging local plan has been used.

A Basic Conditions report will be submitted with the Neighbourhood Plan. Comments can be made on this report (and the Plan) at the next consultation stage.

The aim is to set out the principle of considering local character in planning decisions. We are unable to be prescriptive about this, as national planning policy does not allow it. We appreciate there is an eclectic mix of styles and character in Longframlington.

number of village meetings, and residents felt that a Neighbourhood Plan would allow local views to be taken into account in future planning application decisions. (2013-2018). Same could be said of period of growth in 1980s, 1990's when the earlier plan was proposed.

You advocate preserving the character and identity of Longframlington village and the wider Parish; historic, agricultural and rural character support the local economy and wanting to support creating the distinctive character of Longframlington. But what is the character? Is it typified by Front Street? The New Memorial Hall? A walk around the village green reveals the vast mixture of style and character architecturally from White Cottages to the Old Vicarage to an Edwardian brick built house to older farm buildings, so this needs clarification. It suggests a mistrust in LA planners who we've found to be very testing in terms of style/character .

We find that the draft leaves us asking far more questions than it answers and without evidence and facts or reference to the local planning authority work it's difficult to use this as a formal plan. We challenge the need for a settlement boundary drawn up to merely contain the village envelope but without drawing on other surveys or identifying future needs.

We're disappointed that the importance of education facilities that have been lacking for so many years aren't truly examined, for instance could the old Dennis Common site be valuable as a first school? And that sustainable future energy needs aren't identified as something to be fully reviewed for the community.

Three documents attached – two emails about the settlement boundary around their property, and one letter covering many points.

**Mark
Goddard**

I notice there is no provision in the plan to set an objective for the village to be bought into mains gas. The lack of mains gas continues to affect residents and force higher expenditure for heating existing buildings. Very few houses are suitable for changing to heat pumps (even the new houses in the village have microbore piping which isn't comparable).

The likely hood is that natural gas will be phased out for hydrogen delivered by the

We consider that we have used a proportionate evidence base to determine the settlement boundary (which is similar to that proposed in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan).

NCC are the education provider; the Parish Council cannot provide a school.

With regard to the settlement boundary comments: We note the comments, and the request to amend the settlement boundary to enclose more land to the south. No change is proposed. The area to the south of the village consists of older properties many of them with long burgage plots extending south. This is an important part of the character of Longframlington, and it is intended to retain the settlement boundary close to existing development in order to retain this important feature. The settlement boundary does not prevent all types of development coming forward; it is specifically designed to define areas suitable for new housing development.

Noted. This is not a matter that can be covered by a planning policy, but could be taken forward as a Community Project.

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>mains. The village should aim to join the main gas network in order to future proof, especially as costs for oil and LPG will rise considerably in the next 10 years.</p> | |
| <p>Mary McIlroy Hipwell</p> | <p>Thank you for the leaflet about the plan, and I have read it with great interest.</p> <p>As a relative newcomer to the village, but having had some input into another nearby plan, could I suggest that you add a section with a mechanism for amending it? I believe this is necessary in terms of the legislation, and solves future problems.</p> <p>I wonder also if some provision could be made to allow the extension of the allotments. They are becoming very popular and with all the new housing will become even more so.</p> <p>Finally, I do so agree about dark skies. Our streetlights in Simonside Drive are incredibly bright and on all night - not at all necessary!</p> | <p>There is a section in the plan which relates to monitoring. There is always the opportunity available to revise the plan regardless of whether it is specifically referred in the Plan. The Parish Council do not wish to formally commit to a timetable for review, but are aware that a review is possible, and following the adoption of the Northumberland Local Plan, there may be opportunities to review further.</p> <p>Noted; this is a matter which could be taken forward in a Community Project.</p> |
| <p>Michael Prestwich</p> | <p>Can I submit a possible rewording of paragraph 3.1.6 on page 12 of the altogether excellent plan? I should say that I have consulted Norma Sadler about this. It would be better, I think, if it were to read:</p> <p>Situated only 30 miles from the Scottish border, Longframlington often found itself in the middle of Anglo-Scottish conflict, and was even under Scottish rule for a time in the twelfth century. Brinkburn Priory suffered badly from Scottish attacks in the time of William Wallace and Robert Bruce. Later, the Border Reivers were active in the area, and in the eighteenth century the village was affected by the Jacobite Rebellions.</p> <p>My reasons for suggesting this are (1) I am not clear that the village was Scottish at 'various times', though Northumberland was effectively Scottish during Stephen's reign; (2) it is normal in historical writing these days to refer to Robert I of Scotland as Robert Bruce, not as Robert the Bruce' (3) Though Wallace may have attacked Brinkburn in the autumn of 1297, when he was based near Rothbury, Bruce was not with him. In later campaigns, as in 1311 and 1322, Bruce used a western route to enter Tynedale, and would not have passed close to Brinkburn. Other Scottish invasions of this period were not headed by Bruce in person.</p> | <p>Noted – wording has been altered.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------|
| | I should add that the draft plan seems absolutely excellent - you have done a splendid job with it. | |
| Nora Coulson | <p>I have read this with interest and broadly agree with the suggestions.</p> <p>In particular: 1) I support the idea of having a boundary clearly defined so that the village does not become an urban sprawl.</p> <p>2) I feel strongly that future development should be for affordable housing, including rented properties. Recent developments and plans approved do little to solve the housing crisis, local or otherwise.</p> <p>3) As the village develops there will be a need for a primary school.</p> <p>4) There is already a need for some provision for the elderly: a care home or sheltered housing, preferably both. At present, people in need of such accommodation have to move to Morpeth or further, which cuts them from their friends here – the last thing they need. The site of Dennis Common’s former garage would have been ideal for this.</p> | Noted. |
| Pat Butler | <p>I would like to register my support of the Neighbourhood Plan and to thank everyone for the time and effort they have put into such a comprehensive plan.</p> <p>I am very concerned with the incredible number of houses that have been built in the village in such a short length of time - an increase of over 60% if all the current applications are agreed. The overdevelopment of our village is ruining it's essential character and turning it into nothing more than a featureless sprawl. There has been a huge increase in the volume of traffic so far because of the increase in properties being built. This has resulted in much higher levels of noise and pollution combined with the loss of green spaces and destruction of hedgerows etc. This is only going to get worse as more lorries go hurtling through the village whilst building work is being carried out on building yet more large houses and the resulting increase in cars for the new residents.</p> <p>Longframlington will soon take on the appearance of a large housing estate swallowing up the original village centre.</p> | Noted with thanks. |

Schools in the area are struggling to cope and the doctor's surgery is under incredible pressure to cope with demand. Again these problems will only intensify as yet more housing is built.

Surely Longframlington has done more than it's fair share to help with the housing shortage and it is now time to say "Enough is enough". Let's try and retain what remains of our village where we can enjoy what is left of the area around us.

**Ralph
Manchester**

I have read the plan and was very impressed, please see some of my thoughts below:

Proposed school ground green area:

1. Would it be possible to utilise this better now to ensure it is not viewed in the future as a council asset to be sold?
2. Convert it into a flower meadow to encourage wildlife, plant some more trees and open it to the public to walk around? (would make a good community project)
3. Get the parishioners to request more allotments to prevent it from being used for something we don't want. (I'm not sure where the council would allocate more allotment space except here?)
4. Use it for a school and community facility (this is the only reason to build on it in my opinion since sheltered accommodation could be catered for with conversion of use of some other premises)
5. If a school were to be built would the separate community hall still continue in its current form?
6. Could the community hall be converted to a school for use by the community after hours? Will it be financially viable going forward without a dual use role?

These comments are noted. Some of these matters are being managed as community projects.

We think the wording is clear to protect these areas.

Other green areas:

Is the wording strong enough to protect the current green areas? The green area in Armstrong grove has a substantial underground storm storage and gas tanks), Fenwick Park green area is used by residents for recreation etc.

**Roger and
Helen
Coley**

Thank you for developing a comprehensive Local Neighbourhood plan, which my wife and I welcome.

Noted with thanks.

It is a pity that the pandemic delayed the process and the possibility of influencing the planning permissions in the meantime.

Our particular observations and questions:

Is it possible to include monitoring of noise, light and air pollution because of the possible increase of all with the advent of more vehicles on the road and in the air and houses to be constructed.

In relation to LNP7; is it possible that this will apply to extant planning permissions granted but not yet built? If not, how can the council bring to bear the concerns raised in the plan which affect future development?

We are very pleased at the council response with the suggestion of further initiatives being encouraged through the creation of the Community Projects Working Group.

Well done and thank you for all your hard work.

with ref a Vibrant Rural Economy as referred to in your neighbourhood plan

**Terry
Maughan**

What steps have the parish Council taken to help sustain, grow and expand any form of business or local tourism?

However below is the steps taken by the Parish council within weeks, to hinder and try and stop extension of a tourist business, that has the potentially to help sustain other village businesses in November, a rather quieter time of the year.

"*Consultee Comments for Planning Application 21/00332/VARYCO Application Summary*

Application Number: 21/00332/VARYCO

Address: Fram Park Longframlington Morpeth Northumberland NE65 8DA

Proposal: Removal of condition 10 (opening restrictions) pursuant to planning

This would be a matter for a Community Project and could be added, although it is not clear what this would achieve.

Planning policies will only be used to determine planning applications coming forward once the Plan is in place. Policies cannot be applied retrospectively to approved applications.

Noted with thanks.

permission A/81/A/259 to allow unrestricted opening 12 months of the year

Case Officer: North Area Team

Consultee Details

Name: Mr Garth Rhodes

Address: 5 Wardle Terrace, Longframlington, Morpeth, Northumberland NE65

8AB [Email: longframlingtonpc@gmail.com](mailto:longframlingtonpc@gmail.com)

On Behalf Of: Longframlington Parish Council

Comments

Longframlington Parish Council Object to this application for the following reason, The condition prohibiting occupation of the chalets between 31st October and the first December ensure they are let for holiday purposes only removing this condition would allow permanent residential occupation.

The Parish Council's objection could be overcome if the application was restricted only to the year 2021 which would allow the applicant to recoup some of the lost business that has been due to the Covid-19 pandemic."

This is very Hypercritical in my view.

on one hand you stating you are out to help the rural economy, i believe this is just to enable you to try and influence future planning applications, when in fact you are against most developments

Just look at other local villages that have lost shops and pubs as investors are forced to invest elsewhere

The village is thriving at the minute and its a lot to do with these the new developments as well as private investments within the local economy, lets get behind them

I am asking that you to take off your blinkers, and look at what good that could come from **really** supporting the local economy, and please give a lot more weight to these new developments. Its not all bad!

can i also suggest that your settlement boundary should extend to beyond the 30mph limit down Alwick Ford road just past Fram park. Longframlington pit and the surrounding houses have always been part of the village settlement area.

Comments noted. The policy proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan is supportive of rural development proposals and tourism development, subject to other policies in the Development Plan.

Comments noted with regard to the amended settlement boundary. No change proposed.

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Thea Johnson</p> | <p>Firstly, congratulations on compiling such a document! I'm sure it wasn't easy and I thank you all for your hard work and efforts. I really love the 'green' agenda within the plan. My only more comment would be that I feel the plan could be better in terms of equality, diversity and inclusion. For example, as a community, I really feel our Neighbourhood Plan should include a commitment to things like accessibility (of shops, pubs, GP, buses, green spaces, schools, homes, etc.) for all. I am not a wheelchair user, but if I was to hop in one now, I know I would not be able to enjoy the things in Fram I enjoy on my two feet. Just my thoughts!</p> | <p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>This could be addressed through a Community Project. The policy can be amended to include accessibility for new community facilities.</p> |
| <p>Tony Edwards</p> | <p>having read the neighbourhood plan, both my wife and I would comment that the expansion of housing within the village cannot continue at the present pace and comments by the Chair of the Parish Council are those of many residents who strongly feel that the infrastructure of the village cannot accommodate further housing.</p> <p>Flowing from the above, we would make the observation that in the village, which has a large aged population, the current surgery at the junction of the A697 and Rothbury Road is small and in need of modernisation. Would it not be possible to consider relocating to the field at Rimside Gardens now that the school option has been discounted. Negotiation with NCC would, I understand, be required, but could provide a modern, fit for purpose surgery to accommodate the increase in population, with parking space available, and even an adjoining pharmacy.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is noted; again, this is a matter which would need to be taken forward as a project by the Parish Council if there was the backing from the wider community.</p> |
| <p>Cussins</p> | <p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>REPRESENTATIONS TO LONGFRAMLINGTON REGULATION 14 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION.</p> <p>These representations are prepared by Savills UK Ltd on behalf of Cussins (North East) Ltd.</p> <p>Cussins are local housebuilder, based in Alnwick Northumberland, with a rich heritage of delivering high quality housing development in the North East. The history of Cussins spans three generations and they employ 100s of local workers in the planning, construction and sale of their properties .</p> | |

Since 2000 Cussins has built more than 350 homes in locations such as Longframlington, Alnwick, Morpeth, Warkworth, Embleton and Longhorsely. Cussins therefore have wealth of local experience in the Northumberland housing market.

Cussins are working with the owner of Lightpipe Farm which has outline planning permission for approximately 40 units (19/02085/OUT). With the landowner, Cussins are preparing a Reserved Matters application pursuant to outline permission 19/02085/OUT and subject to further negotiations are hoping to be in a position to commence construction in 2022.

Cussins supports the principle of the Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) subject to the comments below and the endeavours of the Parish Council in respect of preparing a blueprint for the future growth of the village. These representations provide some specific commentary relevant to Lightpipe Farm, which we hope the Parish Council will consider when it finalises the Draft LNP for submission.

R e p r e s e n t a t i o n s

All Neighbourhood plans must comply with the basic conditions set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). These basic conditions cover conformity with a range of different statutory and policy requirements. Of particular note is a requirement to have regard to **national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State**. These representations discuss aspects of the LNP in relation to national planning guidance

We note that the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map identifies a strip of woodland to the east of the A697/Front Street as Local Green Space (Policy LNP 6 and designation LGS1). Policy LNP6 states that LSG1 'Mature Woodland' will be protected as Local Green Space within the Neighbourhood Area. Paragraphs 99 and 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) give local communities the opportunity to identify and protect areas of green space which are special to the

local community. Once allocated development of these areas is inappropriate other than in very special circumstances which are described in the NPPF.

Noted.

Cussins has no objection in principle to the designation of LSG1 'Mature Woodland' as a Local Green Space. The Reserved Matters application that Cussins is preparing seeks to protect the woodland in line with the requirements of the outline planning permission. Notwithstanding, the following matters, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, are relevant and should be recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Local Green Space where there is a live planning permission

The PPG states that *“Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate where the land has planning permission for development. Exceptions could be where the development would be compatible with the reasons for designation or where planning permission is no longer capable of being implemented.”*¹

Noted. However, the planning permission does not relate to the land proposed for allocation as LGS.

It should be noted that the entirety of the proposed Local Green Space designation is in the red line of an extant outline planning consent for 40 dwellings (ref 19/02085/OUT and mentioned above). Whilst the indicative layout for the outline consent retained the woodland, the application was in outline and the detail of the development is yet to be approved. Cussins reserved matters application will be compliant with the requirements of the outline consent but, as per planning guidance the Local Green Space, it cannot be used as a mechanism to stymie the extant consent. The LNP policy should therefore recognise the existence of a planning permission and confirm that the site, of which the woodland is part, has planning permission for 40 dwellings.

The LGS meets the tests for LGS as set out in the NPPF. The land is not proposed for development as part of the approved planning permission.

Public access to Local Green Spaces

The PPG states that *“Some areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may already have largely unrestricted public access, though even in places like parks there may be some restrictions. However, other land could be*

Noted. There is public access through this woodland.

considered for designation even if there is no public access (eg green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty)."

The PPG states that *"Designation does not in itself confer any rights of public access over what exists at present. Any additional access would be a matter for separate negotiation with land owners, whose legal rights must be respected."*²

We recognise that there has been informal use of some parts of LSG1 by walkers and that there is an established Public Right of Way that passes through the woodland. Notwithstanding, the woodland is in private ownership and forms part of an extant planning consent as discussed above. This means that as part of the implementation of the planning consent, parts of the woodland for management purposes may need to be fenced off, put into the control of a third party management company or placed into the curtilage of a residential property. This detail will be agreed with the Council, in consultation with the Parish Council, as part of the determination of Cussins' reserved matters application.

The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore recognise the status of the woodland area as private land with a single Public Right of Way and note the implications that this entails.

Management of the woodland

The PPG states that *"Designating a green area as Local Green Space would give it protection consistent with that in respect of Green Belt, but otherwise there are no new restrictions or obligations on landowners."*³

The PPG states that *"Management of land designated as Local Green Space will remain the responsibility of its owner. If the features that make a green area special and locally significant are to be conserved, how it will be managed in the future is likely to be an important consideration. Local communities can consider how, with the landowner's agreement, they might be able to get involved, perhaps in partnership with interested organisations that can provide advice or resources."*

We are aware that the designation does not confer access rights. We have not at any point implied that access rights over and above the existing ones will be conferred.

The Neighbourhood Plan does not confer access rights.

¹ Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 37-008-20140306 ² Paragraph 017 Reference ID: 37-017-20140306 ³ Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 37-020-20140306 ⁴ Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 37-021-20140306

As stated above, the Reserved Matters scheme that Cussins is preparing retains the woodland in line with the indicative outline planning consent. Notwithstanding, it may be necessary to put the woodland into different forms of management to both support the woodland itself and ensure that the planning permission can be successfully implemented. This may include for example, woodland management to address arboricultural disease, measures to enhance the woodland through thinning and new planting or it may include placing some trees into the residential curtilage of private properties. In the case of the latter, those trees would still be protected and could not be removed.

The management of the woodland is not controlled by the planning system.

Cussins and the landowner would welcome further discussions with the Parish Council about the management and use of the woodland in the future. There may be options for increased public access, management or ownership of the woodland. Notwithstanding, the Neighbourhood Plan should recognise that as private land, the management of and access to the woodland will remain the responsibility of the owner.

Noted with thanks. The Parish Council would be open to discussions on this matter.

The Plan has been amended to add in further information about both LGS designations, to include the information suggested.

Conclusion

Cussins supports the principle of the Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan. These representations have provided some specific commentary about designation LSG1.

Noted with thanks.

Cussins has no in principle objection to the designation of LSG1 as a Local Green Space and the Reserved Matters application that Cussins is preparing will seek to retain the woodland in line with the outline planning permission. Notwithstanding, it should be recognised by the Neighbourhood Plan that:

Noted with thanks.

1. The Local Green Space cannot be used as a mechanism to stymie the development of 40 dwellings on the site and the policy should therefore

This is not the intention.

recognise the existence of a extant planning consent which includes the woodland.

Noted.

2. The woodland is in private ownership and with the exception of the Public Right of Way, rights of access are limited. As part of the planning permission, it may be necessary to consider a range of different ownership arrangements to ensure that the woodland is protected and the planning permission successfully delivered.

3. Management of woodland will remain the responsibility of the owner and as part of the different ownership arrangements being considered, different management regimes may be necessary, including placing some trees into the full management of individual property owners. This should be recognised by the Neighbourhood Plan.

Noted.

As stated above, Cussins and the landowner would welcome further discussions with the Parish Council about the management of the woodland in the future and we look forward to further engaging on the matter of the Neighbourhood Plan.
