

**Northumberland County Council (NCC) and Seaton Valley Community Council (SVCC)
responses to Examiner's Questions**

1. The emerging Local Plan - for the LPA

I have considered documents relating to the progress of the emerging Northumberland Local Plan (NLP), including the post-hearings letter of 24th February and the draft schedule of proposed modifications (February 2021). As far as I can tell, there are no site-specific changes or written comment from the NLP inspector in respect of (1) the land east of Cramlington and northwest of Seghill subject to Dysart Developments Ltd's reg 16 objection (the 30th page of the reg 16 objections document that you sent me or (2) any site where the emerging NLP is mentioned in 'Local Green Space and Protected Open Space Background Paper' ('the Background Paper'). I would be grateful for confirmation that this is the case.

Response from NCC:

There are no site-specific changes or written comment from the NLP inspector in respect of the land east of Cramlington and northwest of Seghill nor any site where the emerging NLP is mentioned in the 'Local Green Space and Protected Open Space Background Paper'.

2. Brickworks Reclamation Site, Seghill (POS66) - for the LPA and the QB

I adopt the PINS practice of only going where I am certain that there is a public right of access. As a result, I only viewed part of the Brickworks Reclamation Site (from the corner where Pit Lane meets Front Street) and would be grateful for further information on it. Firstly, I have been unable to find the NCC reference 3349, which the Background Paper mentions, and would be grateful for the document in which this appears (or the relevant extract if the document is lengthy). Secondly, I would be grateful for details of any proposed further reclamation scheme. I particularly wish to know if there is a scheme which would include development that is inconsistent with the proposed POS designation.

Response from NCC:

The site is one of many former colliery/industrial sites in the south east of Northumberland that were 'reclaimed' a number of decades ago. The project was led by the County Council and largely involved greening these sites to enhance the environment. It included, for example, works to reprofile former spoil heaps and deal with contamination issues as well as tree planting and creating other areas of green space. No further reclamation works are planned that would be inconsistent with the proposed protected open space designation. The site is also in public ownership - it is owned by NCC.

3. The coast from Seaton Burn southwards - for the LPA and the QB

I would be grateful for an answer to the following question. Are either the LPA or the QB aware of any proposed coastal defence scheme that would involve using part of a proposed LGS or POS.

Response from NCC:

Within Northumberland, at this location, we are not aware of any potential coastal schemes forthcoming.

4. POS32 Old Hartley Caravan and Motorhome site - for the LPA or the QB

I would be grateful for a copy of the document from which NCC ref 3051 comes (or the relevant extract if the document is lengthy).

Response from NCC:

3051 is the reference number for a proposed 'protected open space' site in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan under Policy INF5. This site (3051, Crag Point) was identified in the [PPG17 Openspace, Sport and Recreation Assessment, May 2011](#) and is listed in the appendix to this document. The Appendix may be viewed online at: <https://www.northumberland.gov.uk/Planning/Reports.aspx> (Scroll down to 'Infrastructure')

5. LGS 5, Land between The Melton Constable and Seaburn Grove, Seaton Sluice - for the LPA and the QB

The left-hand photo on page 56 of the Background paper is mainly of open grassed land not shown as LGS on Seaton Sluice policies map or on page 87 of the background paper. If this was intended to be LGS, can it the NP be modified to include without unfairness to an owner or other interested person?

Response from SVCC:

A number of photos were taken to include in the background paper. This one was included erroneously as it does not show an area of proposed LGS (or POS). We would suggest deletion of this photo from the document.