**Northumberland Local Plan**

**Small Settlements and the Green Belt**

Response from Broomhaugh & Riding Mill Parish Council

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