

Written responses to Pre-Submission Draft Plan and proposed response (16/01/2023)

Responses received from 11 **consultation bodies**: Ian Dickinson Trust (Hedley Planning Services), Mr & Mrs Wallis and Mr & Mrs Dixon (landowners), Stocksfield Parish Council, National Highways, The Coal Authority, Historic England, Northumberland County Council, Natural England, National Grid, Northumberland Wildlife Trust and the Environment Agency

Responses were received from 15 residents by email/ letter: Mr & Mrs March, Jean Blair, Angie Estyn-Jones, Claire Irving, Dr Kevin Charman, Judith and Julian Menes, Tom Charman, Dr Elisabeth Charman, Martin Baird, Neil Turner, Neville Furness, June Newton, Pamela Niven, Margaret and Ren Reed and one anonymous response.

The online response form was completed by 13 residents and one response that did not include contact details: Michael Pritchard, David McKenzie, Barbara Thompson, Ian Greener, Rod Padgett, Simon Probyn, Sally Rogers, Phil Hancock, Hannah Thorpe, Denise Adams, Sheila Longo, Matthew Thorpe and Pat Caine

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
General		
Mr & Mrs Marsh (residents)	We accept generally the aspirations expressed in the Draft Plan, but Object to its provisions in two respects. [two points are captured below]	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required in response to this element of the representation.
Jean Blair (resident)	I appreciate how much research and hard work has gone into the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. I also realise there will be countywide requirements of which I have no knowledge. I only wish to make a couple of comments. [two points are captured below] Thank you for all the work you and the councillors do for the village, “above and beyond”.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required in response to this element of the representation.
Angie Estyn-Jones (resident)	I realise I haven’t yet responded, but generally I agree with all the proposals, especially with the need for more affordable housing so we keep young families moving in to keep the school numbers up. All new houses should have to have solar panels. Our other concern is saving energy, so do we really need four (plus one on Church Lane at the end	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It would not be possible for the neighbourhood plan to require all new housing to have solar panels as this would need to be subject to viability testing to understand the cost implications of doing so. However, policy BR1 does

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>of Church Close) street lights on all night for just 13 houses? It's almost like daylight!</p> <p>We must also protect the green belt, the bus service and the train service too.</p>	<p>provide support for new developments which embed sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>Community action NE2 is to work with the county council to remove poorly designed street lighting with improved 'dark sky compatible' luminaires.</p> <p>Both national and Northumberland planning policies will protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. Community action T4 commits the parish council to working with transport providers and the regional transport authority to seek to protect and enhance the current level of public transport provision.</p>
Anonymous (resident)	<p>Thank you for making the neighbourhood plans available to me. I have done my best to read and understand what it all means for the village. I think I have grasped the essence of all intended by I am not ashamed to admit that parts of the fine detail have beaten me. My understanding is that the committee is intent on keeping the feeling of this village intact. It is a lovely place to live and all seem to be happy in this friendly and vibrant village. We do lack certain facilities but our excellent transport services mean that we can reach surgeries, shopping etc easily.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.</p>
Stocksfield Parish Council	<p>The Council considered the draft plan at its meeting on 6 December and has decided to make no comment.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required.</p>
National Highways	<p>National Highways welcomes the opportunity to comment on the submission of the Broomhaugh and Riding Neighbourhood Draft Plan (the Neighbourhood Plan). This letter provides an overview of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in Northumberland, the background to National Highways' engagement in relation to the adopted Northumberland Local Plan and our formal response to this public consultation.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p><u>Strategic Road Network Context</u> The SRN within Northumberland is represented by the A69, A1 and the A19. Any proposal that has the potential to influence the operation or safety of the SRN are of interest to National Highways.</p> <p><u>Background</u> The strategic road network - <i>Planning for the future: A guide to working with Highways England on planning matters</i>, details the approach we take to engaging in the planning system. It identifies that as a statutory consultee in the planning system, we are under a regulatory duty to cooperate and aim to give consideration to all proposals received and to provide appropriate, timely, substantive responses when consulted. We seek to be a proactive planning partner, supporting local and national economic growth and regeneration and aim to actively engage at an early stage on all planning matters that could impact the SRN. It builds on DfT Circular 02/2013 The Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development, which sets out the way in which National Highways will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and economic growth, whilst maintaining the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p><u>Review</u> We have been actively involved throughout the preparation and development of Northumberland County Council's Local Plan and we have committed to continue to work with the Council and has agreed a Joint Position Statement (JPS) prior to the Plan's Examination in Public (EIP).</p> <p>National Highway's consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan is within the context of the county's future planning proposals and the potential impact this has on the operation and safety of the SRN.</p>	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>Having considered the Neighbourhood Plan, <i>it is deemed that there is no negative consequence to the SRN associated with the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p> <p>In light of the above, we offer no further comment.</p>	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Submission Draft. I did have a rapid look at an earlier draft in June this year and made some initial comments, which do not seem to have been considered in any redrafting of the current version. Having now given further consideration to the current draft I would like to make some further comments and observations.</p> <p>I have three major points to make and then some specific comments on individual paragraphs. [captured in the relevant section below]</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required in response to this element of the representation.
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	I still find some of the figures in the document extremely difficult to interpret. They do not always have clear, or indeed any legends in some cases.	Noted, amend figures to ensure that they are easier to understand.
The Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for your notification received on the 31st October 2022 in respect of the above consultation.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, The Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.</p> <p>Our records indicate that within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including: mine entries and shallow coal workings. These features pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.</p>	Noted, no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>The Coal Authority's records also indicate that surface coal resource is present in the area, although this should not be taken to imply that mineral extraction would be economically viable, technically feasible or environmentally acceptable. As you will be aware those authorities with responsibility for minerals planning and safeguarding will have identified where they consider minerals of national importance are present in your area and related policy considerations. As part of the planning process consideration should be given to such advice in respect of the indicated surface coal resource.</p> <p>We note that the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate two sites for new residential development. I have reviewed these sites against the data we hold and neither site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area. On this basis we have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the pre-submission draft of the above neighbourhood plan. As the public body that advises on England's historic environment, we are pleased to offer our comments.</p> <p>Historic England is keen to ensure protection of the historic environment is appropriately taken into account in neighbourhood plans. Having reviewed the information provided in correspondence of 31 October 2022, we do not consider there is a need for us to be involved in development of the plan.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the plan area does contain a number of designated heritage assets (being listed buildings) as well as the potential for non-designated heritage assets. I therefore have some comments to make, followed by setting out some general advice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I welcome the content of the draft plan so far as it affects our interests. - Bearing in mind the two proposed housing allocations have recently been the subject of planning applications for housing on which 	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>Historic England chose not to comment, I have no comment to make on the proposed allocation of those sites for housing.</p>	
<p>Judith and Julian Menes (residents)</p>	<p>This is just to say that we have looked at the Neighbourhood Plan and are very impressed at its quality and the hard work that has gone into it. We have no issues to raise regarding the proposals.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.</p>
<p>Northumberland County Council</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting the County Council on the Pre-Submission Draft Broomhaugh & Riding Neighbourhood Plan. I have consulted colleagues throughout the County Council on the draft plan and have received a number of comments from various service areas. The County Council's comments are presented in the schedule that follows this letter.</p> <p>Comments have been made about both the supporting text, which sets the context for the policies, and on the policies proposed for inclusion in the Plan. There are a number of areas where we have identified concerns in terms of how well the Plan currently meets the 'basic conditions'. We would hope that you will see these comments as critical support. They are intended to inform modification to the Plan so that it best meets the expectations of the Parish Council in terms of the future determination of development proposals, and, crucially, that the Plan can proceed to independent examination once it has been submitted, with a greater expectation of a positive outcome.</p> <p>I hope the comments made by the County Council are helpful in reaching a conclusion to plan preparation. We will, of course, continue to support the Parish Council and the Steering Group with advice as necessary and with practical support on any modifications required to the Plan once you have had a chance to review all of the representations received in response to the current consultation.</p> <p>Finally, I would advise that the comments made by the County Council in response to this consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Plan do</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required in response to this element of the representation.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	not constitute a formal opinion about whether the Plan as currently drafted meets the 'basic conditions'. The County Council is not required to issue a decision statement in respect of that matter until the independent examination has been completed. We would therefore reserve the right to make further representations as necessary following the submission of the Plan to the County Council.	
Northumberland County Council	For clarity, we would suggest numbering the paragraphs in each policy.	Comments noted, amend as suggested where there is more than one paragraph in the policy.
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted, no amendments required.
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	Monitoring and review should be seen as critical and planned into the document so the progress and effectiveness of the Plan can be measured.	Noted, no amendments required. Paragraph 1.13 of the plan explains that during the plan period the neighbourhood plan will be reviewed and updated where required.
Martin Baird (resident)	I moved here because it was a lovely quiet village with dark skies, nice but few people, lots of wildlife. A lovely sought after village. Please don't ruin it.	Noted, no amendments required. The plan is proposing planning policies and community actions to support a positive future for the parish.
National Grid	Following a review of the above document we have identified the following National Grid assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: Gas Transmission Pipeline, route: CORBRIDGE TO BISHOP AUCKLAND Please see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.	Noted, no amendments required.
Neil Turner (resident)	Could I offer my comments on the local plan as indicated in the October newsletter (issue 8). There has been a lot of work done by many parties to get this far and I appreciate the complexity of the process.	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Northumberland Wildlife Trust	The Trust welcomes the commitment to the natural environment within the neighbourhood plan.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Neville Furness (resident)	<p>I have tried to use the reply form in your email, but it sent me to Google, and I could not progress.</p> <p>I have found the plan extensive & complex, and difficult to get my head round. Undoubtedly the result of a huge amount of effort on many parts.</p> <p>I have picked out certain points below: [points are captured below]</p>	Support welcomed; no amendments required in response to this element of the representation. As neighbourhood plan is required to meet legal requirements, unfortunately some elements can appear complicated.
Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above Neighbourhood Plan. We are a statutory consultee in the planning process providing advice to Local Authorities and developers on pre-application enquiries, planning applications, appeals and strategic plans.</p> <p>Based on the environmental constraints within the area, we have no detailed comments to make in relation to your plan at this stage. However, together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at:</p> <p>We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. We have had to focus our detailed engagement to those areas where the environmental risks are greatest. We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1.</p>	Noted, no amendments required.
Foreword		

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	The Forward helpfully lists the challenges and opportunities raised by the 2021 survey. Whilst a similar structure is adopted for the development of the Plan's Objectives the Policies, which presumably are aimed at delivering the objectives, adopt a rather different structure. I do not believe this is logical and will not help in the future if the plan's effectiveness in relation to the delivery of objectives is examined and reviewed.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend supporting text to add reference to the relevant plan objective before each policy.
Section 1 – Introduction		
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 1.12	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Paragraph 1.12 sets out the linear progression from identifying the opportunities and challenges the Parish faces and how the Neighbourhood Plan addresses these by identifying a future Vision and specific Objectives, which are then delivered through Policies and Actions. However, there is no mention of the Objectives in the section and this is potentially important in relation to paragraph 1.13 which states that the Plan will be reviewed and updated. Unfortunately, there appears to be no future mention of reviewing the effectiveness of Policies and Actions in delivering the Objectives which will hopefully contribute to the realisation of the Vision. There should surely be a specific section in the plan to Monitoring and Review. In my experience unless this is given consideration at the outset, and factors to be monitored identified, reviewing progress will be hampered, if not impossible because of lack of relevant data.	Comments noted, amend to include reference to objectives in paragraph 1.12 and add reference to monitoring of the effectiveness of the planning policies and community actions.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 1.13	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Reference is made to reviewing and monitoring progress on delivering the Plan and updating the document. However, there is no further mention in the rest of the Plan as to how this will be achieved. This is a major omission.	Comments noted, amend to add reference to monitoring of the effectiveness of the planning policies and community actions.
Section 2 – Background to Broomhaugh and Riding Parish		
Policy/ paragraph	A brief history of the parish	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Para 2.1 to 2.6 provide a very useful and interesting background to the Parish. However, it excludes any physical description of the lie of the land, it's geology and biological features which are major contributors to the character of the area and significant factors in the development of the village. The Natural Environment is highly valued by parishioners, as shown by the Parish Survey, and needs to be given more prominence in this background section.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend to add further detail.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 2.7	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	States that the village has a lower percentage of residents below 25 compared with Northumberland and England. This is also true for 25-44 (and by a larger margin!) and needs to be corrected as it reflects families with young children and therefore a factor in the viability of the school.	Comments noted, amend as suggested
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	Figure 2 The Parish also features fewer residents in the 25-44 age bracket compared to Northumberland and England figures but this is not referenced in the text.	Comments noted, amend as suggested
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 2.13	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	The results of the Parish Survey appear twice in the paragraph. The last sentence should read '...more than half...'	Comments noted, amend as suggested and remove duplication.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 2.17	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Given the importance of the natural environment identified in the Forward and Parish Survey and the detail in the History of the Parish this section needs significant revision and substantial correction. Perhaps some background information should be included in Section 1 and these paragraphs limited to the identification of issues, challenges and opportunities.	Comments noted; amend to add further detail to section 2 and add an annex on the natural environment.
Tom Charman (resident)	The description of the natural environment is very brief and some bits are incorrect. I provided a Parish description for the Nat Env group back in March. I've updated it a bit since then – latest draft attached.	Comments noted; amend to add further detail to section 2 and add an annex on the natural environment.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	This section on the natural environment is disappointingly brief and incomplete. It would be excellent to see (or append to the main document) a more detailed account of the features of interest within our Parish. Additionally, the species listed as being important in the Parish include at least two which do not occur and have not been present for a considerable time, if ever (black grouse and turtle dove).	Comments noted; amend to add further detail to section 2 and add an annex on the natural environment.
Policy/ paragraph	Figure 3	
Tom Charman (resident)	It would be great to include some more detail on Figure 3. For example, Plantations on Ancient Woodlands could also be mapped (there are some quite large areas in the Parish). It would also be great to include Priority Habitats (the current published Priority Habitat layer available on MAGIC is incomplete, but I can map out additional areas on GIS easily enough).	Comments noted; amend figure 3 to add further detail
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	This map should also map Priority Habitats and Plantations on Ancient Woodland sites (PAWS), and could consider using the peat depth information to identify potential restoration areas currently under commercial forestry plantations.	Comments noted; amend figure 3 to add further detail
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 2.18	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Is there an England and UK figure for tree cover.	Comments noted; amend to add further details as suggested.
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	Whilst expanding (native) tree cover is a policy which I support, the statistics here are misleading as they only compare the Parish to Europe and the World. The England average tree cover is 10% https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/ , so the Parish is in fact significantly higher in tree cover in an English perspective.	Comments noted; amend to add further details as suggested.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 2.19	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Should the 56 entries in the Northumberland Historic Environmental Record be listed in an appendix?	Comments noted; amend to include link to the HER and also a summary of the types of sites included. It is not considered

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		appropriate to include the entries as an appendix to the plan as the HER is regularly updated.
Policy/ paragraph	Key issues for our plan – paragraph 2.20	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Are the key issues listed in priority order? If not why not?	Comments noted, amend to explain that the key issues are not in priority order and that they came directly from the parish survey.
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Agree on traffic issues, light pollution, litter, good design. Missing is cycling routes, safety and security of residents, aesthetics of the streetscape, and future proofing for transport changes. Who are we asking the question about affordable housing for ? If it is for society at large, then yes, but the need is for this in the SE primarily. If it is for the village, then no. i.e. we need to be clear whether the viewpoint is from what residents want vs what we want for all of society (in which case where do we stop?)	Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required. The issues identified came directly from the parish survey. With regard affordable housing, a need was highlighted through the housing needs assessment.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Agree - Litter includes dog waste?(which remains a increasing problem)	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Sally Rogers (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sheila Longo (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Agree. Footpaths to Corbridge and safe crossing of A68 are very much needed.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Pat Caine (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Section 3 - Vision and objectives		
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 3.1 (vision)	
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Ian Greener (resident)	Agree - Would like to hear how we become carbon neutral by 2035	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend to say 'working towards' being carbon neutral by 2035
Rod Padgett (resident)	Agree. Safe cycle link to Stocksfield is great, once there you can get all the way to Newcastle. With the rise of electric bikes, this could be an important link for the future.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sheila Longo (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Pat Caine (resident)	Agree	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Policy/ paragraph	Objective 2: Natural environment	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	I think the word 'optimal' is meaningless unless some criteria are associated with it. How could the achievement of this objective be monitored with this wording?	Comments noted, amend objective.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Tom Charman (resident)	With the Natural Environment objective I think that the lighting bit might fit better in the streetscapes objective – I think the intention is for lighting to be taken account of more widely for aesthetics, not just wildlife? Also, health is dealt with by a later objective. So it could be simplified to something like: “To maintain and enhance a thriving natural environment that can be enjoyed by the Parish both now and in the future”	Comments noted, amend objective.
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	I would suggest removing ‘ <i>the health of people</i> ’ from this objective since this is already covered in Objective 5. Objective 2 should be a standalone policy delivering on the natural environment for its own intrinsic value. People of course have a place here but should arguably not be the primary focus.	Comments noted, amend objective.
Northumberland Wildlife Trust	Whilst the Trust understands that many people would appreciate a natural world that is aesthetically pleasing, this is a very subjective view. For instance, a standing dead tree can provide habitat for many invertebrates, fungi, birds and bats, but may be deemed not aesthetically pleasing. The same may be said for an uncut grassland that may provide wintering habitat for invertebrates and small mammals. We would therefore suggest that after the section “optimise aesthetics” the following is included - <i>where this does not have a negative impact on the nature conservation interest.</i>	Comments noted, amend objective.
Policy/ paragraph	Objective 3: Transport	
Anonymous – no contact details provided	I'd change transport objective from being a more attractive place to live and visit, to a place where any age can walk and cycle to/from and around safely, thus reducing the demand on cars, and also supporting wellbeing and connectivity of the elderly. Also, could be more explicit in saying want to stop the A695 being the main route for through traffic from the east to Hexham, changing this to the A69.	Noted, no amendments required. As currently drafted the objective applies to all residents and visitors, it is not considered necessary to refer to older people. Reference to the A695 and A69 is considered to be too detailed to include within an objective.
Policy/ paragraph	Objective 5: Health and well-being	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	What is a 'lovely and friendly environment'? How would I recognise it if I saw it?	Noted, no amendments required. The term 'lovely and friendly' environment was felt to be understood by most people and therefore appropriate.
Section 4 – Planning policies		
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.12	
Northumberland County Council	In the first sentence, “deign” should read “ <u>design</u> ”.	Comments noted, amend as suggested
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR1 – Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	
Northumberland County Council	<p>Housing and Public Protection welcomes this policy which aims to make both new and existing buildings more energy efficient and less reliable on fossil fuels. This will reduce running costs for occupants and therefore reduce the incidence of fuel poverty.</p> <p>For clarity, we suggest referring to ‘<u>All development</u>’ rather than ‘Developments’.</p> <p>The first sentence is overly permissive. We would suggest adding the caveat ‘<u>subject to compliance with other relevant policies in the development plan.</u>’</p> <p>In the first sentence it is not clear to a decision-maker or applicant what is meant by ‘reducing the need for reliance on carbon.’ We would suggest this is deleted from the policy. Alternatively, this could be reworded to refer to the reduction of carbon emissions from both the supply chain and the use of the proposed development.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend as suggested.
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Anonymous – no contact details provided	what is policy BR1 ? How can we meaningfully comment if it is not linked ? What discussions are there on tradeoffs ? Does that mean that other aspects will be trimmed to keep within a sustainable construction envelope ? (otherwise if there are no downsides to the policy, why would anyone object, and I assume in the form the question is presented everyone will indeed say yes). If there was discussion on tradeoffs, I'd rank aesthetics ahead of sustainable construction.	Noted, no amendments required. As explained in all of the consultation material, the draft plan and supporting documents were available online. At the referendum the local community will be asked if they support the policies in the plan, it will be a simple yes/ no question. This is why the questionnaire asked, in turn, if each policy was supported.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sheila Longo (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR2 – Design	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Isn't 'location' the first stage of design? Section l and Section p duplicate each other.	Comments noted. The management of the location of new development is addressed through local plan policy STP1. Amend to remove duplication between criteria 'i' and 'p'.
Historic England	In Policy BR2, I recommend using "conservation" instead of "preservation" as it signifies a more positive approach to managing change in the historic environment (by balancing significance and harm) rather than signifying prevention of change. "Conservation" is defined in the NPPF and thus brings certainty to your plan. On locating new development to protect heritage assets and their settings, you have given some detail on the expected scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend as suggested.
Northumberland County Council	Bullet point p should read: "...appropriately sited car parking..."	Comments noted, amend as suggested
Northumberland County Council	Housing and Public Protection support the need to conserve and enhance local distinctiveness through high quality design. The requirement to achieve low carbon sustainable design with the use of renewable energy sources and correct orientation of new development will improve the health and wellbeing of residents, reduce housing costs for occupants and reduce the incidence of fuel poverty. It is not clear what is meant by 'modern design' in bullet point a. Does it mean 'not pastiche'? Generally, the juxtaposition of support for 'modern design' in the context of the historic environment could be	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend as suggested. Although reference to retaining views to be kept within the policy – the right to a view may not be a material planning consideration but the impact of a development on a view which is important to landscape character is.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>problematic . A better word would be ‘innovative’, but still with the caveat of ‘as appropriate’ or ‘as relevant to the building’.</p> <p>To better align with NPPF, we would suggest using the words ‘<u>Sustaining</u> and enhancing the....’ In bullet point b.</p> <p>Bullet point k. states: ‘<i>Including the facility for electric vehicle charging in proposals where relevant to the development proposal.</i>’ It would be more effective if it were phrased as: <u>‘being designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.’</u></p> <p>Bullet point l states: ‘<i>Valuing the landscape proposals of development which should enhance and add to the green nature of the parish with a preference for the retention of trees, planting, meadows and wildlife.</i>’ This does not make full sense and could be improved by something along the following lines: <u>‘Placing emphasis on the impact of development on the landscape, in the context of the green nature of the parish, seeking to retain and enhance tree and shrub cover and meadows, considering their value as wildlife habitats, and through landscaping schemes associated with development proposals.’</u></p> <p>Bullet point m refers to ‘<i>retaining views</i>’. We would suggest deleting this bullet point as the loss of a view is not a material consideration in planning decisions.</p>	
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Support. I assume not enforceable, but can there be advisory, or design template encouragement, for a general uplifting of quality of existing housing stock too. Also, is there any scope for conservation zone status for any parts of the village?	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. All planning applications would be assessed against the requirements within this policy, including alterations to existing housing (where planning permission is required). The neighbourhood plan cannot designate conservation areas, it could however identify non-designated heritage assets.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.21	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	This would imply that there would be merit in attaching the 'local listing' to the Plan.	Noted, no amendments required. Neighbourhood plans can identify non-designated heritage assets. The historic environment record is maintained by Northumberland County Council. The impact of development on any assets on the HER are considered as part of the development management process (see local plan policy ENV7)
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.22	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	<p>In a number of sections (e.g., 4.22, 4.27 & 4.28) the wording implies that National and County policies are sufficient to deliver our vision and objectives. Having worked with Government Departments and Statutory Bodies throughout my working career my experience is that they will only consider nationally and regionally significant features (and then if only pressed to do so) and local (i.e. Parish level) will always be ignored unless given strong voice by the local populations. I therefore feel very strongly that the Neighbourhood Plan is missing a very significant opportunity if it does not state explicitly objectives, policies, and actions in support of features of Local and Parish significance.</p> <p>I would give as two examples the Corbridge to Stocksfield Local Wildlife and Geological Site and the 56 entries in the Northumberland Historic Environmental Record. Should not the Plan specifically state that it wishes to promote the maintenance, management and enhancement of these features and that the Parish Council will actively consider these features in its future deliberations. The wording of the Objectives for the Built environment and Climate change and energy (and their related Actions) reflect this approach but those for the Natural environment and Health and wellbeing do not. Why?</p>	Comments noted, amend to include policy on the natural environment. Neighbourhood plans can add detail to national and local policies where they are supported by evidence. For example, the plan could identify non-designated heritage assets however the identification would need to follow a robust methodology.
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	The end of this paragraph states it is not necessary to repeat (and by implication expand) existing protection. But this is exactly what Policy BR 2 does for Design, so why not for other areas?	Noted, no amendments required. It is considered that policy BR2 provides locally specific criteria.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Tom Charman (resident)	It would be great to have two similar policies for the Historic Environment as well – recognising local interest in decisions and supporting projects that enhance historic features.	Comments noted, amend to include policy on the natural environment.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.23	
Tom Charman (resident)	<p>I think it is important to include a policy that recognises that natural environment features that are important at the Parish scale should also be taken into account of in any decisions (the Northumberland Local Plan has a range of natural environment policies, but these are focussed on higher levels of designation). For example, the Natural Environment’s group input to the early proposed housing allocation sites included consideration of local features.</p> <p>I also think it would be great to include a policy that supports projects that benefit the natural environment. For example, projects that improve connectivity between sites (e.g. the wildlife corridor of woodlands along the March Burn), projects that restore Priority Habitat, projects that enhance Local Wildlife Sites, projects that restore Plantations on Ancient Woodlands.</p>	Comments noted, amend to include policy on the natural environment. Projects that are referred to would not need planning permission.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.26	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	I was not convinced that the criteria used in the assessment were consistently applied. For example, ownership and area were used as reasons for site rejection when other sites of similar status were included.	Noted, no amendments required. Land ownership is not a reason not to identify a site as a local green space. Ownership was identified on the assessment form to ensure owners were notified in advance of the proposed designation.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.27	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	Para 4.27 and Para 4.28. Another example of a missed opportunity.	Noted, no amendments required. All the sites put forward through early engagement were considered for allocation.
Policy/ paragraph	Figure 5	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	No legend so how can this be interpreted? Surely the Riverside Local Wildlife and Geological Site and South Close Reserve should be included.	Comments noted , the title of figure 5 clearly states that it is showing sites allocated as protected open space within the local plan amend to explain these are the shaded areas. All the sites put forward through early engagement were considered for allocation.
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR3 – Local green space	
Mr & Mrs Marsh (residents)	Firstly, we propose that the open land immediately to the east of Broomhaugh should be included in the list of protected local green space in Policy BR3. This land is of great ecological value and significant visual importance to the margin of the village, more so than other land proposed to be included in that Policy, such as the grazed land to the south.	Noted, no amendments required. The site referred to was included within the housing site assessment process and considered suitable for housing. Initial investigations have been undertaken to consider the ecological value of the site, but this did not identify anything significant regarding the flora and fauna on the site.
Historic England	We welcome that you have proposed Local Green Space important to the community for its historical significance.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Northumberland County Council	<p>Housing and Public Protection note that having green spaces close to homes is important for the health and wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>We note that the following proposed LGS sites are in the Green Belt: LGS02, LGS03, LGS04 and LGS06 but acknowledge that the Local Green Space designation helps to identify areas that are of particular importance to the local community.</p> <p>The LGS Background Paper (October 2022) provides strong and varied reasons to support the proposed Local Green Spaces.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Having contributed to the Green Spaces and Natural Environment section, I would like to re-iterate my support for the sites included in the Plan. I am still worried that the footpath along the Tyne to Farnley from the start at Broomhaugh is not mentioned. Whilst the wildlife areas status gives it protection, erosion by flooding may put the existence of the footpath in jeopardy. Inclusion in the Plan as a valued Village asset could allow for a stronger response in restoring access.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The identification of land as a local green space is only relevant to the assessment of planning applications in that area.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Clare Irving (resident)	<p>I've just received the Parish Council Newsletter. There's one comment I want to make straightaway on the neighbourhood plan – Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Land adjacent to East View is listed – I'm guessing this will be the fields looking to the east from that property to the roundabout for A68/A695. I would recommend having the fields on the opposite side of the A695 added. These are the fields between the cricket field to the roundabout. It's a big concern not having this area protected from development. I understand that a few years ago it was earmarked for a housing estate. This area is a beautiful location with unspoilt views to the east from the cricket field. Please don't let it be spoilt by future development.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The site referred to was included within the housing site assessment process and considered suitable for housing, however, as it lies within the Green Belt it is not possible for the neighbourhood plan to identify it for development.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.35	
Mr & Mrs Wallis and Mr & Mrs Dixon	<p>It is not the purpose of these representations to repeat the submissions previously put forward on behalf of the Landowners but rather to supplement their previous comments. They would however like to reiterate their strong support for the intentions of the Neighbourhood Plan in proposing to allocate sites for future housing development as a direct response to the housing needs of the Parish.</p> <p>In their view this is essential in the context of the Northumberland Local Plan which has defined Riding Mill and Broomhaugh as a service village but without identifying any need to provide additional land for housing development. The Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity to bridge that gap through the allocation of land for housing that otherwise cannot be met due to Green Belt constraints.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. Amendments to Green Belt boundaries can be made through neighbourhood plans where a need for changes has been established through strategic policies. The Northumberland Local Plan has not identified a need for an amendment, therefore the neighbourhood plan cannot do this.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>In this context it is disappointing to see in the Neighbourhood Plan that the land to the east of Ford Terrace which has been actively promoted as a housing development opportunity by the Landowners throughout the Neighbourhood Plan process is no longer proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt for allocation despite extensive support from the local community and Parish Council.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.35 of the Pre-Submission Draft document attempts to explain the reason for the removal of the proposed allocation of the site in the latest version of the Plan and this advises that <i>“The parish council consider the site would be appropriate for housing development, subject to details regarding the type, mix and design of the development.”</i></p> <p>The fact that the Parish Council consider the land to be appropriate for housing development and that this has been recognised in the text of the draft Neighbourhood Plan is of course welcomed by the Landowners. This is especially the case given that the Housing Background Paper dated October 2022 looks positively upon the potential future development of the site in principle and concludes that the Green Belt assessment of the site <i>“illustrated that as a result of the location of the site and its relationship with existing built development, it has a low contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt”</i>. Paragraph 4.35 goes on to advise that it is not possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify the site for housing <i>“because the Local Plan does not identify a need for changes to the Green Belt in Riding Mill”</i>. This simply is not the case however as paragraph 140 of the NPPF makes clear that amendments to Green Belt boundaries can be made through Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The consequence of the site remaining in the Green Belt is that any future development proposal for housing would fall to be assessed against restrictive policies contained in the NPPF and the</p>	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>Northumberland Local Plan. Both of these documents are clear that housing in the Green Belt should only be allowed in cases where this would involve the provision of affordable housing for local community needs i.e. as a rural exception site. It is noted that Policy BR6 of the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to adopt the same level of control meaning that the land to the east of Ford Terrace could only ever be brought forward as a rural exception site. This is simply not a viable proposition.</p>	
<p>Anonymous (resident)</p>	<p>There are small pieces of land in the Green Belt which add to the character of the village and are vital to our flora and fauna for food, homes and shelter, not to mention the role of trees in our aims to effect climate change before it is too late. As you have probably gathered I am particularly concerned with the piece of land behind the Methodist Church, which teems with wildlife and wonderful plants. If this was taken out of the Green Belt to be built upon, it would be totally opposite to what we are trying to achieve in regard to climate change. We need to be careful and respect these little bits of natural world. I therefore wish to propose that the Green Belt should be protected and that I am opposed to development in these areas.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The neighbourhood plan does not propose to allocate the site for development.</p>
<p>Sally Rogers (resident)</p>	<p>Possible housing development at Broomhaugh was given considerable time during the Consultation period making it a real possibility in the minds of residents. The current Plan seems to dismiss this as the area is in Green Belt. If I'm correct what is the attitude of the PC to future pressure for development? I would be against this. Could the owners be persuaded to allow for a nature reserve on the site?</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The neighbourhood plan does not propose to allocate the site for development.</p>
<p>Sheila Longo (resident)</p>	<p>I live in xxx. I wish to comment on the study of Mark Ketley of Bradley Hall Planning & Design. With regard to The Site & Surroundings. I do NOT agree with the last paragraph which talks about MODERN design, this is NOT in keeping with the surrounding buildings in Broomhaugh.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The neighbourhood plan does not propose to allocate the site for development.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>Regarding Materials Study: I do not think that TIMBER CLADDING is suitable or in keeping. Wood does not last in our damp climate, especially being near to the river. Furthermore it is flammable. Take a look at the Old Orchard flats on the corner, it is a mix of stone and pebble dash. More in keeping, and sustainable. Even the archway is in keeping with other buildings in Broomhaugh. I am favourable to tree planting, however it is extremely important to choose the right tree.</p> <p>I see no provision for cars, where are they to go, are there any garages?</p> <p>Regarding Locality Study: O1 Yew Tree Cottage. That is NOT Yew Tree Cottage. It is 1 The Square.</p>	
Neil Turner (resident)	<p>I am concerned at the connection of a commercial proposal (Broomhaugh and Bradley Hall site) with the local plan proposal. The local plan reporting should be independent and informative of the progress on the plan. In the newsletter (opening page - yearly review by the Chair) progress on the plan and the specific site proposal is in the same paragraph and implies a direct connection, as if support for the local plan is a tacit support for the housing site. I think this is an unwise connection.</p> <p>The recording of the proposal as 'well supported' is subjective and a personal opinion of the writer. Is this the official view of the council on all elements of the housing proposal, prior to a formal planning application? Again I think there needs to be more considered reporting on the site.</p> <p>Could I suggest that the two matters are reported separately as it would be unwise to give the impression of a corporate sponsor to the local plan. For example other developments are listed in the newsletter with negative comments attached in the newsletter. Yet the Broomhaugh is not reported in the same way. I think there is potential duality in the reporting.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The neighbourhood plan does not propose to allocate the site for development.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Neville Furness (resident)	<p>Development of land at Broomhaugh</p> <p>1 There is a reference to good public transport links. The bus service may be reliable, I have no recent experience, but the rail service certainly is not. Strikes apart, many trains have been cancelled in the recent past during the day without warning, resulting in travellers having to wait over 2 hours for a train to appear</p> <p>2 There is a reference to Ford Terrace. This is incorrect. Ford Terrace refers only to the Edwardian brick terrace in Broomhaugh. The rest is known locally as 'The Street', though never named by the council.</p> <p>3 Elsewhere in the Plan, it is stated that the village is not suitable for new housing for the elderly, due to the lack of shops and services. Why, then, is the village deemed suitable for low cost housing?</p> <p>4 Access of the proposed development is planned to be directly onto the A695, via a new entrance. Anyone living in Broomhaugh knows how difficult it can be to get access to the A695 already. A new entrance will create new potential hazards, There are already two access points from Broomhaugh Street, and Osbit, with a bus stop in the middle.</p> <p>5 The land is Green Belt – recently revised. What is the point of Green Belt, if it is to be ignored every time a developer appears?</p> <p>6 The concept plan shows no car parking, and no garages. A number of the planned properties are overlooking long existing properties to the west, depriving them of privacy.</p> <p>7 It is stated that the design enhances the village, but does not explain how. I do not see how these houses enhance the village.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The neighbourhood plan does not propose to allocate the site for development.</p>
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR4 – Land south east of Manor House	
Ian Dickinson Trust (Hedley Planning Services)	The Manor House falls within the boundary for the Broomhaugh and Riding Neighbourhood Plan area, the location plan is included within Appendix 1. The area shown in blue in Figure 1, Land South East of the Manor House has been considered within the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2021. It demonstrates	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>that the site has a developable area of 0.9ha with an estimated yield of 12 dwellings.</p> <p>The site is identified as suitable, available and achievable within the SHLAA. The SHLAA states that at the time of writing, the detailed application (ref: 21/02077/FUL) was pending consideration. However, the application for 12no dwellings was refused by NCC on 26 October 2022.</p> <p>The landowner supports the inclusion of the site for housing allocation within the Parish. However, there are several matters which we believe should be brought to the attention of the Parish when considering the site for housing allocation.</p> <p>As set out above, the site is allocated for housing within the BRNP. The landowner is supportive of this site being allocated for housing within the draft BRNP. However, Northumberland CC have recently refused the application on technical matters. The principle of housing in this location is supported by NCC, as demonstrated by the Officer Report.</p> <p>In accordance with Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act, all Neighbourhood Plans must be prepared against 'basic conditions' and must have regard to national policy and strategic policies contained within the Development Plan, in this case, the recently adopted Northumberland Local Plan (2022).</p> <p>We have reviewed the wording of the draft policy in relation to the basic conditions and confirm that we do believe the policy has been prepared with regard to national policy and strategic policies within the development plan.</p> <p>The application submitted to NCC was supported by several technical reports which demonstrates that all of the above criteria in Policy BR4 can be met. Therefore, we <u>support</u> the allocation of Land to the South East of the Manor House for housing within the Broomhaugh and</p>	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>Riding Neighbourhood Plan and confirm that the principle of development in this location is supported by the Northumberland Local Plan. All technical matters can be overcome with a redesign and additional supporting information provided to NCC.</p>	
<p>Northumberland County Council</p>	<p>We recognise that this policy seeks to allocate land for housing development to meet the need identified in the Broomhaugh and Riding Housing Needs Assessment, however, we would question the deliverability of this site and therefore its suitability for inclusion in the plan.</p> <p>A planning application for the development of 13 dwellings on the site (reference 21/02077/FUL) has been recently refused. The reasons for refusal are that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, heritage assets and the amenity of adjacent residents. With regard to effects on heritage assets, it was not felt that there were public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm.</p> <p>It may be that some form of development on this site <i>may</i> be acceptable in planning terms, however, given the constraints on the site, that is a decision that could only be made through the development management process. On that basis, we would advise that the site is not suitable to be allocated for housing in the neighbourhood plan, because it is not deliverable.</p>	<p>Comments noted; amend to include revised criteria regarding the issues identified in the recently refused planning application and add further details regarding overcoming constraints within the housing background paper. Disagree with the suggestion that the acceptability of the site for housing can only be made through the development management process. The case officers report is clear that the principle of the residential redevelopment of the site is acceptable, the reasons for refusal were regarding the impacts on heritage assets (with lack of public benefits). The impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Loss of trees and impact on amenity and living conditions of adjacent residents. Lack of sufficient provision of affordable housing and open space. As well as a lack of information regarding ecology and biodiversity. It is considered that these reasons for refusal could be overcome with the development of an appropriately designed scheme which included an appropriate mix of housing.</p>
<p>Michael Pritchard (resident)</p>	<p>Support the draft policy</p>	<p>Support welcomed; no amendments required.</p>
<p>David McKenzie (resident)</p>	<p>Do not support the draft policy</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy. Make the entrance via the Hollis Hill entrance by widening it to accommodate both which will make the existing entrance far safer! Do not make an entrance at the manor as this will adversely affect the integrity of this listed building.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The policy refers to the need for an appropriate access and potential options.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Do not support the draft policy	Noted, no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy as long as access into the main road doesn't impact safety at the narrowest part of the A695 through the village AND there are affordable houses built here, not more 4/5 bed houses affordable only to wealthy people, this has my support.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The policy refers to the need for an appropriate access and affordable housing.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Do not support the draft policy. Original plan had houses that were too large.	Noted, no amendments required. The plan does not support the proposals contained within the planning application (see housing background paper).
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
June Newton (resident)	<p>I have looked at the draft housing plans and would like to add an additional comment about the land to the west of Station Close.</p> <p>Any further housing would need to be accessed purely from the A695 to the west of the farm. There is no capacity for any further traffic on Station Close. There are over 50 houses using the entrance at the street beside the old post office. The whole road is narrow and difficult with parked cars as many houses now have three cars per household and no additional parking. At times it would be impossible for emergency vehicles to get up the street.</p> <p>Any additional housing with a through road would create a rat run with possible accidents as there are many young children now live on the street and play outside as it is a cul-de-sac with no through traffic.</p> <p>Access from the farm would increase traffic on the main road for the school run and access to the A69, especially as the road narrows beside Riding Cottages, etc and there are still plans outstanding for further traffic from the possible development at the Manor House</p>	<p>Comments noted; no amendments required. The policy refers to the need for an appropriate access and potential options.</p>
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR5 – Riding Farm	
Northumberland County Council	<p>It is noted that this site currently has planning permission for the change of use of existing agricultural buildings to two dwellings and construction of a 1.5 storey extension to the footprint of the existing building (reference 19/01947/FUL).</p> <p>As written the policy does not reflect the significant heritage constraints of the site. Support for residential development must be qualified with reference to the listed structures present on the site and the requirement for any proposal to seek to preserve the listed buildings, their settings and any features of special architectural or historic interest they possess. This is to align with the NPPF and Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p>	<p>Comments noted, amend to remove proposed allocation as planning permission granted on 22 December 2022.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	Given the heritage constraints of the site, we would advise replacing 'of around 3 homes' in the first sentence with 'of 2 homes', as the existing permission has proved this can be acceptable in planning terms.	
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy. Encourage the hasty commencement of this site to prevent further dilapidation of the property.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not possible for the neighbourhood plan to require the commencement of the development.
Sally Rogers (resident)	I hope the character of the existing buildings at the West end of the Village will be retained in any housing developments there.	Comments noted, amend to remove proposed allocation as planning permission granted on 22 December 2022.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Do not support the draft policy. It seems a very small space to crowbar in 3 houses here. Not only that but the attractive farm buildings and gingham are one of the first things you see as you approach RM. First World problems and all that...	Comments noted, amend to remove proposed allocation as planning permission granted on 22 December 2022.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy as long as access to properties from A695 can be done safely	Comments noted, amend to remove proposed allocation as planning permission granted on 22 December 2022.
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.36	
Mr & Mrs Wallis and Mr & Mrs Dixon	<p>It is recognised that in the supporting text to Policy BR6 of the Pre-Submission Draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 4.36 it is stated that <i>“Some market homes may be allowed on rural exception sites where it is clearly shown to be essential to support and facilitate the delivery of the predominant affordable element”</i>. Naturally, this element of flexibility is welcomed and supported by the Landowners. However, it would remain the case that the land to the east of Ford Terrace would be unlikely to come forward due to the high level of affordable housing required.</p> <p>Key to this issue and the Green Belt constraints facing the future development of a site that the local community has wholeheartedly supported throughout the Neighbourhood Plan process so far is the resultant inability to deliver exactly the type of new housing that has been identified as being needed. Paragraph 4.37 of the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out clearly that the evidence at both County and Parish levels highlights the need to support the provision of smaller homes to support young families whilst also meeting the needs of an ageing population. Development of the land to the east of Ford Terrace can help address these local housing requirements but will be prevented from doing so under the rural exception policy currently drafted.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR6 – Housing development on unallocated sites	
Mr & Mrs Marsh (residents)	Paragraphs 4.36 and 4.37 and the second part of Policy BR6 should be amended properly to reflect the provisions of Local Plan Policy HOU7 with respect to small Rural Exception Sites. The provisions of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan as proposed can be seen as encouraging housing development in the Green Belt around the village envelope, thereby fettering the discretion of future parish councils to respond to development proposals on their merits.	Noted, no amendments required. It is considered that paragraphs 4.36 and 4.37 do reflect the provisions of the local plan. Also, that the text does not fetter the discretion of future parish councils to respond to development proposals on their merits. The text is informed by the outcome of the site assessment process and other evidence work.
Mr & Mrs Wallis and Mr & Mrs Dixon	<p>The Landowners remain committed to working with the Parish Council as the Neighbourhood Plan evolves and progresses towards independent examination. To this end it is submitted that a re-wording of Policy BR6 would be appropriate to ensure that the land to the east of Ford Terrace could still be brought forward for development without it needing to be a rural exception site. The specific changes to the wording of the policy are shown as tracked changes below.</p> <p>Policy BR6: Housing Development on Unallocated Sites</p> <p><i>The development of housing on sites which are not allocated in the development plan which are within the Green Belt inset boundary, as defined on the policies map, will be supported provided the proposal accords with all relevant development plan policies particularly those on design, amenity, highway safety, accessibility and the protection of valued services and facilities.</i></p> <p><i>Within the Green Belt, on sites that are immediately adjacent to and relate well to the built form of the settlement, proposals for housing development must meet the requirements of national planning policy. The provision of limited affordable housing for local community needs, where it is adjacent to or wellrelated to Riding Mill, will be supported where it meets the requirements of Northumberland Local Plan Policy HOU7(2, 3 and 4) be able to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impacts on the openness of the wider Green Belt beyond the</i></p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend policy to refer to the site being immediately adjacent to and well related to the settlement. However, in accordance with paragraph 149 of the NPPF there is not a requirement for rural exception sites to demonstrate no adverse impacts on the openness of the Green Belt.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p><u>proposed development site, and that the type and extent of housing being proposed responds specifically to the needs of the local community.</u></p> <p><u>The mix of housing types and tenures on all housing sites, regardless of whether they are in the Green Belt or not, should have regard to and be informed by evidence of housing needs including that contained within the Broomhaugh and Riding Housing Needs Assessment (2021) and the Northumberland Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2018) and any subsequent updates.</u></p> <p><u>All new housing development should contribute to meeting identified needs particularly through the provision of one, two and three bedroom homes for small families and those wishing to downsize.</u></p> <p>It is hoped that the comments provided in these representations are helpful in the further preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan ahead of it being submitted for independent examination. It is also hoped that the suggested changes to the wording of Policy BR6 are helpful and can be supported moving forward in the interests of ensuring delivery of housing that is required by the local community. The suggested changes to the wording of Policy BR6 would provide for flexibility and additionality in supply and, if they can be incorporated into the final version of the policy, then the Landowners would be prepared to express their full support for the Plan at the examination stage.</p>	
Northumberland County Council	<p>Housing and Public Protection welcome a policy that accommodates the delivery of homes to support young families and meet the needs of an ageing population.</p> <p>For clarity, the wording of the second paragraph could include 'rural exception sites'.</p> <p>The supporting text outlines the process that to assess potential housing sites, which concluded that 3 were potentially suitable but one</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted; amend policy to only apply to applications for rural exceptions sites.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	of these is in the Green Belt. It would make sense to say something here about the Ford Terrace site (Green Belt) being the preferred site for a small rural exception site in accordance with NLP Policy HOU 7.	
Tom Charman (resident)	I think it is important that impacts on the natural and historic environment should be included in Policy BR6. This should include features that are important at a Parish scale, not just the higher level designations that the Northumberland Local Plan focusses on (see above suggestions for a natural and historic environment policies).	Comments noted, amend as suggested to include reference to the impacts on the natural and historic environment.
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Anonymous – no contact details provided	<p>The trade offs are not being presented here. The word need is potentially a green light for anything, as there will always be a stated need. Consider instead allowing conversion of existing properties into (for example) higher density retirement units.</p> <p>The main genuine need for the village is for units allowing downsizing of retirees and supportive living. For the broader population at a strategic level they should be accommodated where economic agglomeration is most effective and where travel is minimised, i.e. the cities. Therefore we should support city and in particular brownfield densification.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The need for new housing development is a relevant planning consideration. There are policies within the local plan that support conversion of buildings to provide residential accommodation, it seeks to focus the most development in sustainable locations and also the provision of specialist accommodation. Policy BR6 does refer to the need to provide properties for people looking to downsize.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy. This is the fundamental policy which will benefit the future of our lovely village as it is currently becoming an old peoples centre!	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	I support it in the existing sites cited for development but not as a Policy which gives added pressure for development in other places. There are many smaller properties in surrounding areas where families or older people could find more affordable housing within easy reach of Riding Mill.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The policy does not result in additional pressure for development.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Neil Turner (resident)	The village contains a large range of houses , styles and types . The plan reporting seems to be focussed on affordable housing , again implying an agenda running through commentary on other development proposals . I would suggest a more thorough explanation of this position, so that the wider population can decide if that is the view of all the majority of villagers . Riding mill is by its nature a village	Noted, no amendments required. The housing needs assessment identified a need for the provision of affordable homes, as well as smaller homes more generally. This is explained within the housing background paper which also provides details of the housing site assessment process. The plan does not propose allocations of sites within the Green Belt, it does however include a policy that could see

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>consisting of larger properties, but does that make it wrong ? or in need of alternative accommodation.</p> <p>The Council has been against any development in the Green Belt on recent planning applications so to support green belt development is a change of position that needs further explanation . There are other sites in the village that dont need to expand into the green belt . Again I would suggest that the plan should show what sites have been considered and why one site is preferred over others .</p>	<p>affordable homes supported in the Green Belt, in accordance with national and local planning policies.</p>
Policy/ paragraph	Paragraph 4.39	
Neville Furness (resident)	<p>A statement that local development will support local shops & services, What shops, what services. We have a coffee shop, no main grocer butcher, baker or source of fruit & Veg. No PO, doctor, dentist, pharmacy or any other retail outlet. For the record, when we moved to Riding Mill, there was a doctor, butcher, PO, 2 general stores and a newsagents.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The plan refers to national and local planning policy and summarises the current level of provision.</p>
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR7 – Accessibility	
Dr Kevin Charman (resident)	<p>In this area the Policy states ‘Support will be given...’. Why then is this not the case for other subject areas?</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. Policy BR1, criterion ‘e’ states that energy saving and installation of micro-renewables will be supported. Policies BR4 and BR5 supports residential development on identified sites. Policy BR6 supports housing elsewhere where specific requirements can be met. Policy BR8 supports development which maximises the use of sustainable transport modes.</p>
Michael Pritchard (resident)	<p>Support the draft policy</p>	<p>Support welcomed; no amendments required.</p>
David McKenzie (resident)	<p>Support the draft policy</p>	<p>Support welcomed; no amendments required.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Support. would put route into plural. New routes.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend as suggested.
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Support the draft policy. There is a need for educating users on the difference between bridleways and footpaths. Cyclists are using the footpath along the River now.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. This matter is not something which could be influenced through a planning policy.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy. As a keen walker and runner, I would love to be able to safely walk/run to Hexham and Corbridge. The main road simply isn't safe for pedestrians or cyclists, especially in the winter months.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy. Very important.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Policy/ paragraph	Policy BR8 – Sustainable transport and new development	
Northumberland County Council	<p>Housing and Public Protection note that the provision of new cycle and pedestrian routes will improve accessibility to housing and residents' health and wellbeing. They point out that ensuring that all new developments have access to EV charging is a key part of the North East Transport Plan.</p> <p>Strategic Transport welcomes and supports this policy. For clarify, they have suggested that bullet point a should read: <i>'Promote cycling and walking, in particular by giving priority to the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, whilst reducing the need to travel <u>by private motorised vehicle</u> and increasing access to public transport'</i></p> <p>Bullet point e. seeks to ensure that the cumulative impact on traffic flows on the highway network will not be 'severe'. It is suggested that '<u>significant</u>' could be a more effective term to use as it may be easier to demonstrate.</p> <p>It is noted that bullet point g is a differently worded repeat of bullet point k in policy BR2. We would question if this bullet point is needed.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend to include reference to private motorised vehicle. The reference to impacts being 'severe' reflects the NPPF.
Michael Pritchard (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David McKenzie (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Bringing in new residents goes against this of course !	Noted, no amendments required. Disagree that new development would conflict with the provisions of this policy.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Barbara Thompson (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian Greener (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Rod Padgett (resident)	Support the draft policy. Many older properties may not have a good enough electrical supply to sustain fast charge systems for cars. Has this, and the overall power supply to the village been considered, as it may hinder uptake of electric vehicles in the future?	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. Overall the power supply to the village is poor, and is beyond our control, but we agreed that the PC would write to Northern Powergrid, asking them the question as to what they have in place to cope with possible increased supply need when more EV points are needed and electric heating is more prevalent.
Simon Probyn (resident)	Support the draft policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Sally Rogers (resident)	Support the draft policy. Careful consideration of the siting of public Recharging Points will be needed.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Phil Hancock (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Denise Adams (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Matthew Thorpe (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Pat Caine (resident)	Support the draft policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Section 5 – Community actions		
General		
Northumberland County Council	Housing and Public Protection Policy think the community actions are a great idea. It could be a useful tool to motivate and empower the local community to drive forward actions to improve Riding Mill and its surrounding area.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Anonymous – no contact details provided	Very supportive and indeed think this is the most important part of the overall plan. Would like to see a general streetscape aesthetic developed, including for lampposts, signage and lighting, rather than the current 'we'll shove in whatever we have in the yard' approach.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. For development that requires planning permission this will be assessed against policy BR1.
Built environment		
Northumberland Wildlife Trust	Community Action BE1: Townscapes and Streetscapes We would suggest a sentence that includes enhancements for biodiversity e.g. locally native tree planting and nectar-rich planting schemes for flower displays.	Comments noted, amend to add further natural environment actions.
Historic England	We welcome that you have identified some heritage-related community actions or aspirations on topics beyond land use and development.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Natural environment		
Northumberland Wildlife Trust	Community Action NE4: Tree Planting The Trust would request that the word 'locally' is inserted within the sentence especially (locally) native trees. Species that are native to the UK may not be present naturally in Northumberland. Our local woodlands will have naturally developed with a specific mix of tree, shrub and groundflora species, which in turn support our local invertebrates, birds, mammals etc. Using locally native species such as pedunculate oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>) as opposed to beech (<i>Fagus</i>	Comments noted, amend as suggested.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	sylvatica), for instance, can have a much greater benefit to biodiversity in a local area.	
Dr Elisabeth Charman (resident)	Additional actions should be considered under Objective 2. For example, invasive species eradication and control; wild flower promotion on roadside verges and community spaces through initiatives such as ‘No Mow May’; promotion of initiatives Parish members could do to maximise biodiversity in their own gardens e.g. installation of swift bricks or insect habitats; a goal to achieve ‘Bee Friendly Town’ status https://beefriendlytrust.org/bee-friendly-towns/ ; further promotion and interpretation of the natural heritage which makes our Parish special.	Comments noted, amend to add further natural environment actions.
Transport		
Jean Blair (resident)	I appreciate that footpaths are to be maintained and improved. The footpath from the bottom of Whiteside Bank up onto the Wentworth field, a few years ago, had the broken stile replaced with a special gate that lets people through and not animals. It would be very helpful for older walkers if more stiles could be replaced in this way. It is unadvisable for older people to use stiles. But it is encouraged that they still walk the footpaths in safety.	Noted, no amendments required. The plan includes several community actions to improve the network of footpaths.
Northumberland Wildlife Trust	Community Action H2: Extending the footpath network Add within this action ‘where these will not cause disturbance to or impact on the nature conservation interest of the identified areas.	Comments noted, amend as suggested.
Sustainable development and climate change		
Jean Blair (resident)	I can not support the installation of charging points in the Old Play ground which is part of our heritage. There are regularly 6 to 8 cars parked there during the day(I’m not talking about school drop off times). Plus currently a skip and frequently work vans are parked. There are never many spaces Charging points would be intrusive and also have a permanent blue light on. We don’t need to encourage more cars into the village.	Noted, no amendments required. The plan is not proposing the installation of EV charging points in the old playground.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Pamela Niven (resident)	<p>The Old Playground is used by many groups: buses pick up for school in the morning; parents deliver and pick up children for pre-school and primary; attendees of regular church services and weddings and funerals; those attending functions in the Millennium Hall and the Parish Hall; visitors of local residents; and it is also used for picking up Xmas trees. In addition it is a passing place on Church Lane. To have two dedicated parking spaces would reduce the space for others and would restrict the Church's parking arrangements. It is already a nightmare having to negotiate my way through the parking, and I think it is not the place for these charging points. Most people in our area have driveways. I can only think of one person who does not in our area. Charging points would be more appropriate in an area such as Broomhaugh where people have to park on the road. I strongly disagree with the location of these in the Old Playground.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The plan is not proposing the installation of EV charging points in the old playground.</p>
Margaret and Ren Reed (residents)	<p>As residents of the old playground, we were very surprised and shocked that the Parish Council is proposing the installation of electric vehicle charging points in the old playground. This area is not a designated car park, although an attempt was made recently to have it marked as such. Residents around the playground were unanimously against this, as this area is situated in one of the oldest parts of the village and is therefore an integral part of its history.</p> <p>Introducing charging points will inevitably increase traffic to an area which already has restricted access. As you must be aware, traffic is unable to pass easily in Church Lane because of the narrowness, thus forcing vehicles to reverse into a wider point, which is the playground.</p> <p>Consideration should surely be given to the needs of the residents of this area to park their cars as the area is also needed to allow for parking when events are held in the Millennium Hall, Sunday services, weddings, funerals etc. As it stands, at the moment, there is just enough space for it to be used as a pick up point for the school children.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The plan is not proposing the installation of EV charging points in the old playground.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<p>We would expect that the Parish Council will be taking into account the criteria set out by the installers of the charging points which says "Electric charging points require two parking spaces per charging point. High daily traffic is vital as well as access to amenities - for example, retail shops, restaurants or customer facilities." The old playground does not meet any of these criteria. Surely electric charge points would be more suitable at the Parish Hall where bays are already marked.</p> <p>We are all aware that charging points need to be installed, but careful consideration must be given to their positioning and very importantly, consultation made with any residents in the vicinity of the installations.</p> <p>Hopefully you will give due consideration to these points.</p>	
Hannah Thorpe (resident)	Pedestrian crossing over A68 would be amazing. As a walker in the village you are hemmed in by restrictions on private land and stretches of main road that make walking unsafe. So pleased to see this in the plan.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Neville Furness (resident)	Planned Cycle route to Stocksfield – strongly supported.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Neville Furness (resident)	The council might like to consider formalising the name 'The Street' Currently even NCC Planning Dept are misusing Ford Terrace. Delivery drivers are frequently confused to have a street with no name.	Noted, no amendments required. The naming of streets is not within the remit of the parish council.
Housing Background Paper		
Mr & Mrs Marsh (residents)	<p>The Paper seems to be constructed on the premise that land must be taken out of the Green Belt adjacent to Broomhaugh to provide for the housing needs of the village.</p> <p>I contend that this is unnecessary, inappropriate, and contrary to established planning policy, because:</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The background paper was prepared to present the evidence base for housing, particularly the future needs for housing development and consider the availability and suitability of land for development. The plan does not propose to allocate land within the Green Belt for housing.

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has always been a steady stream of new homes being provided within the village envelope, and there is scope for this to continue • There are substantial numbers of smaller properties, including The Old Orchard at Broomhaugh, which is specifically designed to provide for older residents wishing to ‘downsize’, and where there is a steady turnover. • The site being promoted for a new housing estate is currently a valuable haven for wildlife. Adjacent areas are ecologically sterile, being either close-mown, grazed or ploughed. Mature trees on the site have recently been felled, and those remaining on the site are likely to be lost to development Has an ecological survey been carried out? .It appears that the site has not even been considered as a Local Green Space in that paper, even though it meets at least one of the criteria. One of the reasons for rejecting the site at the western end of the village was that “the village should not be losing any further green areas”; why does this not apply at the eastern end? • In terms of planning policy, the newly adopted Local Plan provides a new settlement envelope around Riding and Broomhaugh, with land outside that envelope being designated Green Belt. Built development on the site being promoted does not comply with any of the ‘exceptional circumstances’ needed for development to be allowed in the Green Belt. There are no other policies in the new Local Plan which would support built development on this site [see para 2.12 of the Aecom report]. • Were the site to secure planning permission for development, that would set a precedent for residential development on the Broomhaugh House site. • The existing vehicle access routes onto the north side of the A695 are about 100 metres apart. The introduction of a further 	

Consultee	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	access within that stretch of the Principal Traffic Route would be contrary to Local Plan policy TRA2.	

DRAFT