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**Small Settlements and the Green Belt**

Response from Broomhaugh & Riding Mill Parish Council

**Core Strategy – Full Draft Plan December 2014**

**1 Introduction**

Question 1 - No Comment

**2 A spatial portrait of Northumberland – opportunities & challenges**

Questions 2 – 6 - No Comment

**3 Spatial vision, objectives and outcomes**

Question 1 - No Comment

Question 8 – We would like to see a proactive & positive approach to renewable energy & energy conservation

**4 Delivering the vision for Northumberland**

Questions 9 - 10 - No Comment

**5 Delivering a thriving and competitive economy**

Questions 11 - 13 - No Comment

Question 14 – We would like to see more of the functions of the County Council returned to the main Commercial Centres

Questions 15 - 18 - No Comment

Question 19 – Wherever feasible tourist attractions should be made as accessible as possible by public transport

Question 20 – No Comment

**6 Providing everyone with access to a decent, affordable home**

Questions 21 - 22 - No Comment

Question 23 - The County Council have a policy of providing Affordable Housing (as defined in the Glossary p242), which includes Intermediate Housing (as defined in the Glossary p247), as 30% of their housing Target for Central Northumberland [p88, table 6.4]. We believe that this is a reasonable target but we consider that there is also a need for a target for a percentage of Low Cost Market Housing (as defined in the Glossary p249), (which is not part of Affordable Housing) in the Core Strategy. We consider that some Low Cost Market Housing would be appropriate for Riding Mill in order to bring some young families into the village and keep facilities such as the local school active. Rather than just leaving the % of Low Cost Market Housing in the market housing total for developers to decide we consider that the Core Strategy should set an overall  target for the level of Low Cost Market Housing within its housing target for Central Northumberland, and indeed for other areas.

Questions 24 - 27 - No Comment

**7 Green Belt**

Question 28 – Policy 20 should include an additional item:

g) to discourage the merging of settlements

Questions 29 - 36 - No Comment

**8 Protecting and enhancing Northumberland’s distinctive and valued natural, historic and built environment**

Questions 37 - 43 - No Comment

Question 44 – There should be a presumption against development on land that is part of a current flood plain

Questions 45 - 48 - No Comment

**9 Ensuring connectivity**

Questions 49 - 55 - No Comment

Question 56 – It is imperative that the whole County has the benefit of Super Fast Broadband (whether by fibre optic cable or wireless using the mobile network) & other IT related developments

**10 Community well-being**

Questions 57 - 59 - No Comment

**11 Managing natural resources**

Questions 60 – 61; 63 – 67; 69 – 72; 75 - 76 – No comment

Question 62 – A bond should be held by the County Council to ensure that reclamation is fully completed

Question 68 – There should be provision for carbon capture

Question 73 – There should be the same goals for recycling of commercial waste as there are for domestic waste

Question 74 – We request an amendment to Policy 59 amend the last sentence in paragraph one from – “Particular support will be given to renewable and low carbon energy developments where there is clear evidence that proposals are community-led and supported”. To (as shown in red) Particular support will be given to renewable and low carbon energy developments where there is clear evidence that proposals are community-led and/or supported.

Reason – This would give encouragement to community supported projects which are not community led, such as Fintry in Scotland where the community owns a fifteenth share in the Fintry Wind Farm but does not lead the project. See <http://www.fintrydt.org.uk/the-wind-turbine/>

Policy 59 seems to focus on reasons not to adopt renewable energy whereas we would prefer a positive approach.

Question 77 – Remove the words “....or financially...” from paragraph two

**12 Implementation**

Questions 78 - 80 - No Comment

**Small Settlements and the Green Belt**

Question 5 – We consider that this document is difficult to follow. It is unclear what is proposed. In addition the plan provided is of little help as it is difficult to identify the parcels of land referred to due to a lack of clear reference to roads & other land marks.

It appears to suggest that ribbon development along the A68 village bypass might be acceptable which we consider to be totally inappropriate & potentially dangerous.

It does not include the clear proposals put forward by the Parish Council, after considerable deliberation, in its response to question 46 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document:

“If there is to be further development in the village of Broomhaugh & Riding a potential option would be the land north of the A695, south of the River Tyne & situated between the Cricket Ground & the A68 Bypass.”

This is an area on the periphery of the village with the lowest visibility impact & good access with clear sight lines. We consider all other areas on the periphery of the village to be unsuitable for development.

Question 5 asks three sub questions & our response to these is:

**Should the Core Strategy retain the current policy approach to Riding Mill and Broomhaugh of insetting the settlements within the Green Belt to allow limited development or limited expansion?**

Yes agreed but Map 4 on page 37 which is headed Broomhaugh & Riding Mill only seems to show Riding Mill as part of the settlement. The Broomhaugh part of the settlement is shaded & included within LPA BHRL02. This appears to be an inconsistent anomaly

**Is the assessment of the contribution that the land around the settlement makes to Green Belt purposes appropriate?**

Broadly agree

**Is the constraints assessment and conclusions appropriate?**

Broadly agree