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1. **Introduction and context of this report**

1.1. Northumberland National Park Authority (NNPA) is in the process of reviewing its Local Plan. A lot has changed since the current Local Plan was adopted (2009) and the Authority is now assessing the extent to which the extant policies remain relevant. Further information on the review process can be found in the authority’s “What is the Local Plan?” leaflet.

1.2. Local planning authorities are required to undertake effective discussion and consultation with local communities, businesses and other interested parties to inform key stages of the Local Plan preparation.

1.3. In the spring of 2017 an Issues Paper was consulted on in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, hereinafter Regulation 18. This represented the first formal consultation stage in the development of the Local Plan. A Feedback Report was prepared to summarise the level of response to the Issues Paper consultation and the comments received.

1.4. Over the same period of consultation on the Issues Paper, the authority also consulted on a draft Infrastructure Plan. Representations on this draft document were taken into account where appropriate to produce a final Infrastructure Plan which was adopted by the Authority in September 2017.

1.5. Responses to the Issues Paper consultation together with emerging evidence, such as the Infrastructure Plan and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (May 2017), informed the production of a Policy Options Paper. NNPA consulted on this document for an eight week period from 16th October 2017 until 11th December 2017. This was also a formal consultation stage that met the requirements of Regulation 18.

1.6. Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) at key stages of Local Plan preparation. An Interim Sustainability Statement (October 2017) accompanied the Policy Options Paper progressing the overall SA process. This followed on from a Preliminary Sustainability Statement (Spring 2017) which was prepared to support the Issues Paper consultation.

1.7. A Preliminary ‘Checking’ of the Policy Options Paper (September 2017) was also prepared to inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) work that will be required in respect of the Local Plan. This work supplemented the earlier HRA Preliminary Report prepared in February 2017 to support the Issues Paper.

1.8. This report provides analysis of the response to the Policy Options consultation, including how this relates to the outcomes of the Issues Paper public consultation. It also sets out the next stages in the preparation of the Local Plan.

2. **Policy Options Consultation Methodology**

2.1. The purpose of the Issues Paper consultation was to establish the key planning issues affecting local residents, businesses, visitors and other interested parties. The main aim of the Policy Options consultation was to take forward the outcomes from the Issues Paper consultation, the Strategic Environmental Assessment reports and relevant evidence studies and use them to prepare a document that set out a number of potential future options using the same broad policy themes set out in the Issues Paper. Where possible the Policy Options Paper also
began to express a preferred policy approach whilst asking for views on a range of alternative options.

2.2. A total of eight drop-in consultation events\(^1\) were held over the eight week consultation period in locations inside\(^2\) or bordering\(^3\) the National Park.

2.3. In order to ensure that the public consultation engaged as wide an audience as possible, in addition to the main technical Policy Options Paper, two shorter guidance documents were produced as follows:
- A generic “What is the Local Plan?” leaflet to set out a brief overview of the Local Plan and the process of reviewing it.
- A frequently asked questions (FAQs) and Policy Options Consultation Summary guide.

2.4. NNPA also provided for reference at the consultation events a Good Practice Guide for Outside Lighting in the Dark Sky Park which summarised the guidance as set out in the Exterior Lighting Master Plan. This document generated interest among many attendees, notably in Falstone.

2.5. Consultees were also encouraged to make a written representation. A questionnaire was available to download from the NNPA website in both an MS Word and PDF version, or could be completed online via Survey Monkey. Although the questionnaire sought to establish the level of agreement with the specific potential policy options, flexibility was afforded to respondents in how they provided their feedback. Letters and emails received during the consultation period were also accepted.

3. Publicity

3.1. The lead-in to the Policy Options consultation period coincided with a review of NNPA’s Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system. Progress made through the CRM review enabled the authority to be confident that the database of consultees was largely relevant and up to date. In total over one thousand letters and around five hundred emails were sent out to publicise the consultation.

3.2. In accordance with the NNPA Statement of Community Involvement adopted in September 2017 recipients included:
- all of the National Park’s households and those in parishes overlapping the National Park boundary;
- businesses (including farmers and land owners);
- parish councils;
- statutory consultation bodies;
- general consultation bodies; and
- other relevant stakeholders.

3.3. To comply with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and Regulation 18, public notices were published in local press including The Journal (11/10/17), The Hexham Courant (13/10/17) and the Northumberland Gazette (12/10/17). Publicity was also directed down to a local community level through notifications on the relevant village hall websites, the Hexham Courant “Village Notes” section and direct Officer / Member engagement with communities.

---

\(^1\) From 4:30pm – 8:30pm
\(^2\) Harbottle Village Hall, Elsdon Village Hall, Matthew Ridley Memorial Hall at Falstone, The Sill: National Landscape Discovery Centre
\(^3\) Bardon Mill and Henshaw Village Hall, Cheviot Centre at Wooler, Bellingham Town Hall, Otterburn Memorial Hall
Posters listing each event were also put up in prominent public places in settlements across the National Park.

3.4. The consultation was also publicised online, with all relevant information and consultation documents being made available to view on the authority’s website. Regular posts were also published on the authority’s Twitter and “What’s on?” pages (see appendix 2).

3.5. As required by Regulation 18 hard-copies of consultation documents were also available to view at NNPA Headquarters, The Sill National Landscape Discovery Centre, and a number of local libraries for the duration of the consultation period. Alternative versions of each document (such as large print, translated etc.) could be requested.

4. Level of response

4.1. In comparison to the attendance at the Issues Paper consultation events (a total of 98 attendees), the level of attendance at the Policy Options events was lower with a total of 44 attendees as shown in table 1.

4.2. Correspondingly, the level of written response was also lower. The Policy Options consultation saw a total of 18 representations received compared to 27 written representations made during the earlier Issues Paper consultation.

Table 1 – Level of consultation response comparison between Issues Paper and Policy Options consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total no. of attendees</th>
<th>Average per event</th>
<th>No. of written representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues Paper consultation</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options Paper consultation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Given that the Authority publicised both consultations as widely as possible, the lower levels of response could be due to a number of potential factors:
- Individuals/organisations were involved in the previous consultation and had no further contributions to make.
- Individuals/organisations were on a whole satisfied with the Authority’s approach.
- Individuals/organisations not being inclined to take the time required to examine the consultation documents.
- Individuals/organisations did not feel like the consultation was relevant to them.

4.4. Despite the lower response rate, the Authority did receive a number of detailed written representations and engaged in several very interesting discussions with event attendees. The following section of the report presents an analysis of the representations received. In order to facilitate a combined analysis of both the Issues Paper and Policy Options consultations, the thematic headings running through both consultation documents have been used in this report.

---

4 Bellingham, Haltwhistle, Haydon Bridge, Hexham, Kielder, Rothbury and Wooler

5 Note that the Policy Options Paper introduced a number of proposed spatial objectives and therefore the thematic heading covering “Vision and Strategic Priorities” now incorporates feedback in relation to the spatial objectives.
5. Policy Options Feedback

5.1. Approximately three hundred individual comments were made through written representations and discussions between event attendees and officers. Figure 1 below shows the percentages of comments made in relation to each of the key Local Plan emerging policy themes.

Figure 1 - Proportion of comments by policy theme

5.2. Whereas during the Issues Paper consultation issues relating to ‘Community Facilities and Infrastructure’ were most commonly raised (21%), the largest proportion (17%) of comments made by respondents to the Policy Options consultation related to ‘Housing and Employment’. Comments relating to the ‘Natural Environment’ made up 15% of the Policy Options consultation response which was the next most common topic raised. In general, the Policy Options paper responses provided a more even range of comments than the Issues Paper consultation.

5.3. An additional 10% of comments were fairly generic / related to the entire document (4%), related to the introductory Policy Options text (1%) or not directly relevant to the Policy Options consultation (5%).

5.4. The following paragraphs conclude the feedback received in relation to each policy theme. The National Park Authority’s response to the feedback and suggested potential policy implications are provided in appendix 1.

Vision, Strategic Priorities and Spatial Objectives
5.5. Whereas only 2% of comments made during the Issues Paper consultation related to the Vision and Strategic Priorities, 8% of the Policy Options consultation comments related to these proposals, with the additional of the proposed spatial objectives. During the Issues Paper consultation, 50% of survey respondents agreed with all of the strategic priorities and a further 38% agreed with some but not all. Of the consultees who responded to the Policy Options consultation survey, 75% agreed with the strategic priorities demonstrating further general agreement.

5.6. Comments in relation to specific strategic priorities included suggestions of minor wording changes or the need to clearly define particular phrases, such as ‘cultural qualities’ and ‘thriving’. Further feedback received included a number of suggestions for other issues or potential implications which needed to be considered.

5.7. 56% said that they agreed with the proposed spatial objectives however 22% skipped this question. A variety of positive and constructive comments were also received regarding the proposed spatial objectives.

5.8. A couple of general comments relating to the spatial priorities and spatial objectives section of the Policy Options paper were received including concern over the order of importance and the extent to which the two lists overlapped.

**Spatial Strategy**

5.9. This theme represented 6% of Policy Options consultation comments a smaller proportion than the 10% that related to the spatial strategy during the Issues Paper consultation. Respondents of the Issues Paper consultation had recognised the need for the Local Plan to address the ageing population of the National Park. Consequently the Policy Options Paper set out a proposed approach of planning for a dwelling-led scenario that could reverse this trend. 50% of survey respondents said that they supported this approach with 20% saying they did not agree. The remainder did not answer this question.

5.10. It was generally considered that the Local Plan should support the provision of a wide range of housing options which meet the needs of older residents. Respondents generally agreed that extra-care accommodation is becoming increasingly important. Examples for how this may be realised included ‘co-housing’ schemes or encouraging ‘multi-generational’. The importance of retaining local facilities that the elderly particularly rely on was also broadly emphasised. It was however advised that the Lifetime Homes Standard is no longer applicable.

5.11. The Policy Options Paper also introduced a proposed definition of ‘Sustainable Development’ to be carried through the Local Plan. A small number of comments were made in relation to the need to ensure this reflects national policy.

5.12. A general agreement for continuing the spatial strategy to ensure new development is primarily directed to existing settlements was continued through the Policy Options consultation. The Policy Options Paper went on to explore a potential policy approach to the conversion of buildings (notably barns and other traditional buildings) outside of settlements. 30% of survey respondents were silent on this issue, however 40% were in agreement of pursuing a criteria-based policy allowing the change of use of buildings outside of settlements to low intensity uses. This was considered important to avoid potentially harmful impacts on the landscape. There were however concerns in relation to specifying the exact type of
developments that would constitute ‘low-intensity’ and ‘high-density’ and that this should still be considered on a case by case basis.

5.13. The Issues Paper consultation broadly endorsed continuing with the current policy approach to assessing major development in the National Park. The Policy Options consultation generated more of a mixed response. Of the individuals/organisations who responded to the survey, the same proportion (30%) of respondents said they agreed continuing the approach as set out by extant policy 4 as those who disagreed. 30% however did not answer the question and 10% did not know. Among those who did not agree with continuing the approach most did not give a reason however one individual who did thought that the approach was too restrictive.

**Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

5.14. As previously mentioned, community facilities and infrastructure was the most common topic raised during the Issues Paper consultation (21%). In comparison, only 10% of the Policy Options comments were in relation to this theme. However, the Policy Options consultation feedback did demonstrate further support for the protection of local facilities and many respondents raised the issue of the loss of particular facilities in their locality that had been lost, or were at threat of being lost.

5.15. Not one survey respondent disagreed with the proposal to continue to support and facilitate the provision of new and improved infrastructure (including mobile phone and broadband). Some respondents recognised that advocacy through the National Park Authority’s Local Plan, Infrastructure Plan and other strategies cannot in itself provide improved infrastructure. However, the high-speed broadband roll out planned to reach more settlements in the National Park was welcomed.

5.16. As was the case among respondents to the Issues Paper consultation, the potential policy approach in relation to renewable energy infrastructure was broadly supported. 64% agreed with an approach that would continue to support small-scale renewables whilst restricting large-scale renewables. It was suggested however, that what is considered small or large scale needed to be clearly defined. A handful of consultees were given confirmation that the National Park would be unlikely to be affected by fracking.

5.17. The feedback received largely endorsed the potential approach that would ensure development in the National Park is adequately supported by the necessary infrastructure (either by requiring the developer to demonstrate that there is already sufficient infrastructure, or to be obligated to ensure its provision).
**Housing and Employment**

5.18. The highest proportion of comments (17%) received through the Policy Options consultation related to the policy theme of Housing and Employment. This was also well responded to during the Issues Paper consultation (18% of comments). Overall respondents indicated that the level of need for housing in the National Park would need to be reviewed in further detail. However, the majority of them were supportive of a policy approach that would help to provide more affordable housing in suitable locations (60% of survey respondents in agreement). However, one respondent disagreed with this policy option citing concerns over affordable housing viability.

5.19. Respondents broadly supported the provision of housing through community-led and self-build/custom housebuilding schemes with only one respondent disagreeing without providing any reasoning as to why.

5.20. Similar feedback to that which was received during the Issues Paper consultation in relation to the restriction of the occupancy of new housing in the National Park to households that are in local need was also given by respondents of the Policy Options consultation. The general consensus of respondents to both consultations was that it is important to have a local needs occupancy clause for new housing with the proviso that this should potentially be more flexible.

5.21. Respondents also supported continuing the policy approach to restrict the amount of new housing that could be used as second/holiday homes as this would be crucial to the retention of local services. One respondent questioned the ability to enforce this. The role of the gateway settlements in supporting village services within the National Park was also recognised by respondents to both public consultations.

5.22. The responses received to both the Issues Paper and Policy Options public consultations were generally supportive of the local plan helping businesses in the Park to thrive and grow. Respondents to both consultations emphasised the need to address housing, employment and infrastructure issues simultaneously. In particular, it was considered important for planning policies to support an increase in the working-age population.

5.23. Consequently respondents were generally in agreement with future planning policies being more flexible for the provision of housing that would enable an employee of a business to live locally to their place of work (rural workers’ housing). This would suggest that there could be support for potentially relaxing the current approach which restricts the conversion of buildings outside of settlements to residential use.

5.24. In general, respondents to the Issues Paper consultation were also supportive of making it easier for residents to work from home and the feedback from both consultations emphasised the need for better broadband and mobile provision to support such an approach. The Policy Options paper tested the support for an approach that would allow for the potential provision of ‘live/work’ units in suitable locations. 60% of survey respondents supported this option.
One respondent thought that such units should not be restricted to existing settlements citing the reduction of the need to travel as their rationale.

5.25. The Issues consultation feedback generated support for the development of rural enterprise hubs in suitable locations. Although fewer respondents to the Policy Options consultation commented on this, 60% supported the option of a criteria-based policy to promote the provision of land-based rural enterprises.

Transport and Access

5.26. Comments relating to the transport and access policy theme accounted for 8% of the Issues Paper responses and 3% of the Policy Options consultation responses. Most respondents to both consultations were in agreement that future planning policies should where possible seek to reduce the amount of trips made by the private car. A handful of individuals also thought that the private car would nevertheless remain a preferred travel option given the sparse and highly dispersed population pattern of the National Park.

5.27. Respondents to the Issues Paper consultation generally agreed that the Local Plan should support more widely available public transport services. Following-on from this, respondents to the Policy Options Paper consultation have suggested other potential solutions to this issue such as car sharing schemes or community-led transport projects. The potential option to continue to pursue a spatial strategy focussing new development within existing settlements was also generally supported with one individual disagreeing with this approach citing the increased availability of delivery services, for example for groceries as their reasoning.

5.28. In relation to potentially supporting the improved public access on existing tracks used for agriculture / forestry, the response to the Issues consultation had been mixed. Only one respondent to the Policy Options consultation provided comments regarding this issue and raised similar concerns as previously identified in that there could potentially be adverse landscape impacts. It was also thought to be crucial that any such development has wider public benefit.

Farming and Estates

5.29. A similar proportion of respondents’ comments for both consultations related to farming and estates (7% of Issues Paper feedback and 8% of Policy Options feedback). As reported above there was indication from each of the consultations that respondents generally recognised the importance of supporting sustainable rural economic growth.

5.30. The feedback received through both consultations demonstrated a broad endorsement of continuing to support farm businesses to diversify, through for example permitting the conversion of suitable buildings. Most respondents did however also recognise the need to manage diversification carefully to ensure there would be no harmful impact on the special qualities of the National Park with one individual suggesting that tourism would be the easiest sector for farms and estates to diversify into.

5.31. It follows then, that there was broad support from respondents to both consultations for greater flexibility in allowing the conversion of redundant farm buildings to more viable uses. Feedback from the Policy Options consultation also demonstrated that 50% of respondents supported the potential policy option allowing greater flexibility for the conversion of farm buildings to residential use, where appropriate.
Natural Environment

5.32. A higher proportion of comments relating to the natural environment were received in relation to the Policy Options paper (15%) than for the Issues Paper consultation (8%). 70% of respondents to the Policy Options survey supported the introduction of a potential criteria-based policy to protect wildlife, species and habitat networks where appropriate. Further, responses received to both consultations show a clear recognition for the importance of protecting the natural environment and special qualities of the National Park overall.

5.33. Responses to the Issues Paper consultation showed strong support for the continued protection of tranquillity and dark skies which was further endorsed by the Policy Options consultation responses received. 50% of respondents agreed with a potential policy option to protect the Dark Sky Park designation from inappropriate development.

5.34. The Issues Paper consultation introduced the idea of encouraging and supporting the uptake of sustainable land management practices by contributing to ecosystem services. Most of the Issues Paper respondents did not make a comment in relation to this however those who did were supportive of the proposed approach (31%). Subsequently the Policy Options paper tested support for a potential new policy option that would promote the use of natural capital assets in the Park and make the most of the associated ecosystem services benefits. 50% of survey respondents endorsed this approach. Further detailed comments provided constructive feedback in relation to particular aspects of taking an ecosystems services approach, for example the need to consider: the roles of ground water and the health, social and cultural wellbeing of local communities.

5.35. The positive role that forestry and woodland plays socially, environmentally and economically was recognised by a small number of respondents to the Issues Paper consultation. However, a small number of respondents to the Policy Options consultation highlighted some of the negative impacts that afforestation can have on the natural environment. Nevertheless, while half of the Policy Options survey respondents did not comment on the proposal to continue the approach to woodland creation and protection as set out in policy 22, most of those who did respond (40%) supported the preferred approach as set out.

5.36. With regards to flood risk, the majority (70%) of respondents to the Policy Options consultation supported the preferred approach to amend the existing policy approach to reflect updated national policy and guidance which would potentially promote the use of sustainable rural drainage schemes (RSUDS). This reiterated the broad support for policies that would reduce/mitigate downstream and other potential flood risk, including RSUDS, which was demonstrated through the previous consultation. There were also a couple of comments received supporting the potential opportunities that sustainable rural drainage schemes could provide for habitat and species network creation.

Historic Environment

5.37. A similar proportion of comments relating to the historic environment were made during both consultations (6% of Issues Paper feedback and 7% of Policy Options feedback). Respondents to both consultations generally endorsed an approach that could potentially be more flexible in enabling the re-development and re-use of heritage assets (including Listed Buildings). One other respondent thought that restriction in terms of location may not be necessary and also that policy may need to be more prescriptive to set out what would be defined as “isolated”.
5.38. The Issues Paper consultation feedback demonstrated some agreement (44%) that conversions of Listed Buildings should be allowed but any such development would need to be sensitive to the character of the building. A small number of people thought a more restrictive approach was needed.

5.39. Following on from this, the Policy Options Paper sought feedback in relation to a few different options. 60% of survey respondents said that they would support a criteria-based policy that would enable the re-development and re-use of heritage assets where appropriate and a further 60% said they would be supportive a policy approach which encourages the re-use of buildings at risk with a more flexible approach to new uses.

5.40. However, more of a mixed response was received in relation to the potential option of policy being more permissive in allowing a change to other uses (including residential). Only 40% of those who responded to the survey said they would support this approach. A particular concern included the potential risk of “eye sores”. 70% however, agreed with including a potential policy that would secure the optimum viable use for historic/traditional farm buildings. Further, half of respondents agreed with a potential policy to permit and encourage work to improve the energy performance of heritage assets. Again, it was largely emphasised that any such conversion work would need to be consistent with, or least harmful to, the character and appearance of the buildings affected and their wider setting.

5.41. The Policy Options consultation also introduced an option around a specific criteria-based policy that would protect non-designated heritage assets as well as those that are designated. This proposal was generally well received (50% of survey respondents supporting and only 10% not supporting). One individual raised particular concerns in that non-designated assets should not be afforded the same level of protection as those designated.

5.42. 40% of the Policy Options survey respondents agreed with the proposed preferred option of following Historic England’s guidance when assessing proposals for enabling development. Whereas a further 40% did not provide an answer for this/did not know, a couple of respondents disagreed. The main reason for disagreement was that it was not considered appropriate that this should be incorporated into planning policy as such, given that enabling development principles should only be applied on exception, where a proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan. The redevelopment / reuse of heritage assets may consequently only be allowed if they met an identified local need.

5.43. The feedback received through both consultations demonstrated broad support for continuing a policy approach that ensures all development in the National Park, including conversions, would be sympathetic to the local character and vernacular. A couple of respondents thought that providing examples of good design was important, and with another respondent particularly emphasising the need to ensure that traditional materials, such as timber window frames were used. This opinion was contradicted by another respondent that commented that the additional costs involved in using traditional building materials could significantly raise development costs thereby negatively affecting the viability of a scheme. A handful of respondents to the Issues Paper consultation demonstrated some support for more innovative design with the caveat that this would need to be rigorously assessed on a case-by-case basis.
**Leisure and Tourism**

5.44. 6% of the Issues Paper consultation comments raised issues regarding leisure and tourism but for the Policy Options consultation this was a higher proportion of the overall comments received (11%).

5.45. Both consultations demonstrated broad support for the conversion of under-used or redundant buildings to holiday accommodation in suitable locations (60% of the respondents to the Policy Options survey agreed with this potential policy option). Respondents to the Policy Options survey also demonstrated strong support for the proposals that would seek to support the provision and retention of tourism accommodation in the National Park. 60% of survey respondents agreed with a potential criteria-based policy that would allow the provision of new sustainable self-catering visitor accommodation in suitable locations where appropriate. A further 60% supported the option of a criteria based policy to allow camping in suitable locations where appropriate.

5.46. Nevertheless, some more detailed feedback on the Policy Options Paper included the following concerns. A couple of respondents identified a potential need to monitor cumulative impacts over time of allowing development in the open countryside, one of which did not support any more tourism development. Further, although one respondent thought that the types of activities and accommodation which are encouraged would need to contribute to the conserving and enhancing of the special qualities, another respondent thought that a wider variety of accommodation types should be supported.

**Minerals and Waste**

5.47. 4% of the Issues Paper consultation comments and a similarly small proportion (5%) of the Policy Options Paper feedback received related to the theme of minerals and waste.

5.48. Respondents of both consultations were largely in support of continuing a policy that would safeguard minerals supplies by restricting development in appropriate locations so that the land is not sterilised by other potential development. Arguments for the creation of jobs and the benefits of providing local building materials for local developments were made however there were also concerns of potential traffic, noise and other environmental impacts.

5.49. Feedback received in relation to waste management largely endorsed the proposed approach of continuing to restrict large-scale waste facilities in the National Park whilst supporting the provision of smaller scale local recycling facilities.
Appendix 1: Broad Conclusions

**Vision, Strategic Priorities and Spatial Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominant support for using the same vision as the National Park Management Plan 2016-2021. 10 respondents agreed (63%), 5 agreed but with some comments for amendment (31%), 6% made no comment.</td>
<td>Further general agreement with the strategic priorities (75%) with some comments in relation to wording, definitions, order of importance and the need to consider other issues/potential implications.</td>
<td>Support noted. There is intentionally some overlapping between the strategic priorities and spatial objectives as the achievement of each of these is interdependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A general agreement with the strategic priorities. 10 respondents in support of all + 5 only agreeing with some but not one respondent disagreed.</td>
<td>One individual thought there was too much overlapping between the strategic priorities and spatial objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments have been noted and will inform policy development of the correspondent themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A variety of positive and constructive comments in relation to the proposed spatial objectives. 56% of respondents in agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spatial Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New development should still be focused towards existing settlements that are served by community facilities and public transport. Among survey respondents 38% skipped the question, 38% agreed, 13% agreed but with some relaxation, 6% disagreed and 6% suggested another approach. Overall, 21 respondents were supportive of the approach while 2 were not supportive and a further 2 mentioned the declining</td>
<td>Some indication that more flexibility could be afforded to the provision of new development outside of settlements. For example for housing: While 4 respondents agreed with continuing to focus housing provision in existing settlements, 2 disagreed one of which felt very strongly about being more flexible. 1 respondent questioned why extant policy 8</td>
<td>NNPA notes that respondents have broadly been in favour of retaining a policy approach that focuses new development to locations best served by facilities and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responses indicate that managing the location of development is to some extent still necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community facilities in the named settlements. However there could be more flexibility for developing existing buildings outside of settlements provided there is sufficient infrastructure in place to support this. Among survey respondents 38% skipped the question, 31% agreed, 19% agreed with proviso, 13% thought a case by case basis was necessary.

In relation to farm steadings being defined as a settlement, most survey respondents (38%) did not have an opinion on this however there was an equal proportion (25%) of those who agreed and those who did not agree (25%).

- The current approach to Major Development in the National Park is generally considered appropriate, with some support for a more restrictive approach. Majority skipped this question but 2 respondents agreed and 3 thought more restriction was needed.

- Less of a general consensus on the proposal to continue the approach to assess major development as set out in extant policy. (30% agreed with continuing approach as per policy 4. 30% disagreed. 30% skipped the question. 10% did not know). Fewer respondents offered a reason, however some extent of suggestion that the approach is too restrictive. 1 individual said this.

- Wide-ranging discussions regarding potential approaches to planning for an ageing population. Recognition that some people as they get older will wish to remain at home or in close proximity to their local community (1

- Emerging policy could potentially introduce physical settlement boundaries.

- Policy is likely to need to remain supportive of conversions outside of settlements to employment use but could explore extending this to residential with potential criteria.

- It may be that more flexibility for new build development outside of settlements is afforded subject to criteria such as the need to provide extra business space; housing for rural workers or people in local affordable housing need; or succession farm dwellings.

- For other potential changes of use of buildings outside of settlements, NNPA may need to review what is considered to be low intensity or high intensity.

- General agreement with a potential criteria-based policy that allows the change of use of buildings outside of settlements to low intensity uses whilst restricting high intensity uses. Enough flexibility should be afforded, and the particular location should be considered, when determining what constitutes low/high intensity. Broadly the opinion of 3 respondents. 2 respondents demonstrated support for allowing farm steadings to be considered a settlement.

- With quite a mix in response to the issue of major development, NNPA may need to look to other National Park Authorities to help inform a judgement as to how restrictive to be when determining what would be considered major and how this should be assessed.

- NNPA needs to continue to work closely with Northumberland County Council to develop policies that will ensure the housing and social care needs of the older population are met as well as
Community Facilities and Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The vast majority of respondents agreed that, together with the provision of housing and employment opportunities, community facilities are vital to sustain local communities within the National Park.</td>
<td>• The importance of community facilities and local services was further emphasised and concern expressed regarding the loss of particular local facilities. (11 individuals – comments received regarding infrastructure such as broadband/mobile reception/electricity etc. are counted in conclusions below)</td>
<td>• NNPA recognises that this continues to be of importance to local residents and businesses. See further comments below regarding potential means of addressing this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The role of visitors and tourism in helping to support some local facilities such as cafes and churches was also recognised. 3 individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General support for encouraging small scale renewable energy generation which would not adversely affect the National Park's special qualities, and which could provide electricity to off-grid properties. 75% of survey respondents thought that policies should support micro-renewable energy generation in suitable locations to connect off-grid properties.</td>
<td>• Further agreement with supporting small-scale renewables whilst restricting large-scale renewables. 64% agreed with potential for revising current policy as set out in question 14. 9% disagreed, 27% did not answer. 74% agreed with a proposed policy relating to schemes generating energy from renewables as set out in question 15. 27% skipped the</td>
<td>• NNPA recognises that the current policy approach is broadly considered appropriate. Feedback in relation to the potential approach to particular technologies will be considered, together with further consideration on the distinction between small- and large-scale renewable energy developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a concurrent need to improve the energy efficiency of buildings, particularly of housing, in the National Park. (3 respondents)

- A general agreement that both broadband and mobile reception coverage is variable but in some locations inadequate and this should be a key priority for the National Park Authority to address through the Local Plan and other means. 31 related comments with an additional 12 respondents providing suggestions for how this could be addressed (see full Consultation Feedback Report, Spring 2017 for more details)

- The provision of better mobile and broadband services remained an important issue. (8+ respondents) The need for a joined up approach, through advocating and partnership working with the county council and infrastructure providers, was recognised. 3 respondents. Avoidance of adverse landscape impact of new and improved telecommunications infrastructure also deemed important. 3 comments. Suggestion that providing mains electricity to properties not connected should be prioritised (3 respondents).

- General support for using a more explicit planning obligation-based approach, as necessary to gain infrastructure provision needed to support new developments. 44% development outside of the National Park which has an impact within the Park – developer should be expected to pay for works to reduce that impact (6% - no another approach is need, 50% skipped). Also the opinion of 5 respondents that more funding should be provided by the government.

- Respondents mostly supportive of an approach which requires proposals to demonstrate that there would be adequate infrastructure in place to support the development. 50% agreed, 10% disagreed, 10% did not know, 30% skipped question. The need to take into account viability was recognised. 1 individual. Further liaison with the County Council in respect of potentially gaining infrastructure provision in the National Park through obligations of developments permitted in gateway settlements and adjoining parishes.

- Some more specific comments were made by statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency/Natural England, regarding how specific infrastructure (e.g. foul drainage/ground water) could be ensured.

- NNPA recognises that our planning policies will need to be supportive of the provision of telecommunications infrastructure.

- NNPA will also need to continue to work closely with the County Council and the relevant infrastructure providers.

- Potential approaches to ensuring development proposals would be served by adequate infrastructure could include requiring this is provided as part of the development or securing this provision through a financial agreement via section 106.

- Northumberland County Council’s response on this matter was welcomed. It is noted that the council is not currently pursuing CIL but were happy to have further discussion on infrastructure provision and maintenance.

- All comments made by statutory consultees will be taken into account when formulating the draft policies.
**Housing and Employment**

**Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation**
- There is not considered to be much local ‘pressure’/demand for housing, with some respondents stating that they thought there was no pressure for any development in their local area.
- Pressure for productive forestry / woodland (x2 respondents)
- Housing (1), Affordable housing (1)
- No pressure (4)

**Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation**
- Mixed response with regards to the perceived level of demand for housing in various locations throughout the National Park.
  - Rochester PC – there could be capacity for more family housing (2 more additional families)
  - Alwinton PC (+ 1 other individual) – no local demand for housing.
  - One other respondent believed there is a greater housing need than the 29 households as

**NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications**
- During the Policy Options consultation NNPA also invited nominations for areas of local green space and one submission was received.
- The North York Moors NPA has recognised that having a single Local Green Space designation may not be appropriate in a National Park. NNPA may wish to take a similar approach to the North York Moors in identifying Important Undeveloped Spaces and Community Spaces. This approach seeks to avoid duplicate protection of spaces such as areas of common land and designated village greens however is pro-active in steering development away from more sensitive undeveloped spaces considered inappropriate for development.

- The Objectively Assessed Need figure as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment produced in May 2017 was informed by 2014 based Sub-National Population Projections. Whilst this remains the most up to date data set and can be considered a robust evidence base for housing need in the National Park, the government is proposing to
| • There is general support for provision of a range of small-scale affordable housing (14 respondents) for local people that meet a local need (8 respondents). | • A potential criteria-based policy to provide affordable housing in suitable locations where appropriate and viable was largely endorsed. 60% agreed, 10% disagreed, 30% skipped question. General support for a potential policy that supports the provision of community-led housing/ self-build and custom housebuilding in suitable locations. 50% agreed, 10% disagreed, 10% did not know and 30% did not answer. | • The need for affordable housing that meets local needs has been evidenced through the SHMA / Housing Needs Survey and the provision of which is a key objective of the National Park Management Plan. Nevertheless, current policy which requires all housing sites of at least 2 units / 0.1ha to provide 50% of the units as affordable housing has not delivered any affordable housing over the current plan period. Consequently policy may need to be more flexible with potentially supporting development that proposes to provide affordable housing off-site, perhaps in a neighbouring gateway settlement. A viability assessment will be required to further inform emerging policy. Potentially less restrictive as regards to the location of self-build or custom housebuilding schemes in line with the emerging spatial strategy and where need for this is evidenced through for example the Self and Custom Housebuilding Register. Continue to support existing, and the establishment of new, Community Land Trusts which could deliver small schemes |

identified in the SHMA. | change the means by which O.A.N is assessed for Local Plans and therefore it may be that an updated SHMA is required. |
• Approach to providing local needs housing is generally considered about right (6 respondents), with more indication that the criteria may be too restrictive rather than not restrictive enough (6 respondents).

• Support for ensuring the permanent occupation of housing stock where necessary to keep a critical mass of a year-round community, crucial to the retention of community facilities and services. (7 respondents)

• Some concern over the number of holiday homes being too high in particular locations (5 respondents) with a support for a principal occupancy clause being applied if holiday homes were permitted to change their use to become permanent residences.

• Recognition and support for gateway settlements helping to meet the identified housing need provided that this development helped to fund the provision of infrastructure and services in settlements within the National Park. 5 respondents

• The Local Plan should be supportive of increasing employment opportunities /

• Further support for more flexibility in respect of a local needs occupancy clause on new housing. 70% agreed with proposal to revise local needs criteria as set out in question 23 (remainder skipped the question).

• Further support for this approach. 3 respondents with one questioning how continual occupation could be enforced)

• The role of the gateway settlements to the National Park was again recognised. 3 respondents

• Potential to have a more flexible local needs connection test which includes the rest of parishes split by the National Park boundary and in exceptional circumstances gateway settlements.

• Continue current approach to new housing development which ensures these are not available for second or holiday homes.

• NNPA will continue to work with the County Council to explore how some of the housing need of the National Park could potentially be delivered in the gateway settlements.

• The socio-economic links between the gateway settlements and communities in the National Park is recognised and could provide strong reasoning for a relaxed local needs occupancy which supports residents of gateway settlements to move into the National Park.

• Potential to be supportive new build ‘live-work’ units within local centres and
sustainable economic development within the National Park. At least 23 comments to this effect.

- Sustainable land use sectors i.e. forestry, farming and tourism have the most capacity to influence the special qualities of the National Park and therefore should be adequately supported where possible through the Local Plan. (23 respondents)

- Need to explore new ways of supporting businesses and provide more jobs (e.g. supporting rural enterprise hubs or other shared infrastructure for small to medium sized enterprises). (4 respondents)

- Recognition of the inter-relationship between the provision of infrastructure, housing and employment opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable economic development that will support sustainable economic growth. Also further recognition of the need to simultaneously address housing, employment and infrastructure to achieve this. Potential criteria-based policies that would support the provision of both rural workers’ housing (50% agreed/30% skipped question/20% disagreed – one of which claimed the approach was not aligned with NPPF, rather PPS7 and PPG7) and live/work units (60% agreed/30% skipped question and 1 respondent disagreed) in suitable locations were largely endorsed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smaller villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to provide more support for rural land based businesses to convert buildings outside of settlements to housing where there is a need for a worker to live closer to the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further criteria for such a policy will need to be explored in more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Although forestry practice is not directly controlled through the planning system, there is a potential to be more flexible in supporting farm-based businesses to diversify (see Farming and Estates section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy should be supportive of proposals for rural enterprise hubs in locations within, or on the edge of, local centres. Potential for such premises outside of settlements may need to be subject to there being sufficient infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See potential policy implications of an ageing population on page 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additionally being more supportive business needs (in terms of tied housing, enterprise hubs, diversification) should contribute to supporting a potential increase of a working-age population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recognition of the need to boost the number of working-age residents within the National Park in order to address the issue of an ageing population and that this would be difficult to achieve. 10 comments

- Further recognition of the need to address the issue of an ageing population was continued through the Policy Options consultation. As set out in the broad conclusions of the spatial strategy feedback, it was recognised that an approach that supports the provision of a wide range of housing options for the older population was needed. Respondents showed strong support (70%) for a criteria-based policy that would support the provision of elderly accommodation, and particularly “extra-care” options.
**Transport and Access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Effort should be made to reduce dependence on the private car / encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport. <em>(18 comments)</em></td>
<td>• Further agreement with supporting more options which would reduce trips made by the private car, particularly among visitors. <em>(4 respondents)</em> 1 individual thought that this would not be possible.</td>
<td>• NNPA recognises that public transport options in the National Park are somewhat limited, and private car usage is high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The provision of a better and more widely available public transport service should be supported through the Local Plan. <em>(11 respondents)</em></td>
<td>• With public transport recognised as becoming increasingly viable, discussions and written feedback started to centre on the need to move towards more innovative solutions for example, community-led transport / car sharing. <em>(4 respondents)</em>. Policy should also reflect matters such as electric vehicle charging. <em>(1 respondent)</em>.</td>
<td>• Continuing with a broad approach that encourages development to occur within settlements could in part address these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spatial strategy and transport policy should be linked to ensure development is focused in locations accessible to local facilities <em>(3 respondents)</em>, whilst restricting development that would generate excessive traffic on quiet rural roads <em>(1 respondent)</em>. 1 individual disagreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• However continued work with the county council, as the Local Transport Authority, is necessary to advocate for improved transport infrastructure, including public transport. This will require a holistic approach which considers the role of the wider transport network and access to and from the larger towns in the county and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for the upgrading and maintenance of existing access tracks to improve public access <em>(38% of survey respondents)</em>, however some concern that this could potentially impact on the landscape and that some of the tracks could potentially be unsuitable for walkers as they were originally designed for</td>
<td>• Similar concern expressed but generally supported if in the wider public interest. <em>(1 respondent)</em></td>
<td>• NNPA will also work closely with local communities, for example through Parish Councils, to explore how it can support the promotion of community-led transport solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NNPA could either explore a potential criteria-based policy for assessing proposed works to existing tracks or assess such proposals on a case by case basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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vehicular use. (5 respondents)

- Support for policies that would potentially increase opportunities for people to participate in cycling activity. (4 respondents)

- Further support for maximising opportunities for encouraging walking and cycling. (3 respondents) Suggestion of an opportunity to support a new cycling route in Redesdale (1 respondent).

- The NNPA Infrastructure Plan recognises that there is already good capacity in terms of public rights of way and open countryside. Nevertheless policy should continue to protect such amenity and encourage the creation of new access routes, especially to support the objective to increase the number of trips made by walking and cycling.

- Potential impacts (positive and negative) of development on the public rights of way network should continue to be considered.

**Farming and Estates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - General support for the Local Plan enabling agricultural businesses to diversify more easily. (9 respondents + 5 who agreed but specifically mentioned that strict controls will be need) | - Significant further support for ensuring that planning policies remain flexible in enabling farms to diversify (60% agreed, 40% skipped question) but that consideration must be given to conserving and enhancing the special qualities of the National Park. (5 respondents) Tourism is likely to be one of the most appropriate sectors to diversify into. 1 respondent. | - It is recognised that the National Park has already seen an extent of diversification of local agricultural businesses. In the current economic climate this is considered a positive means to support businesses in realising extra funding streams.  
- Nevertheless diversification needs to be carefully managed, to ensure that the expansion of businesses ideally contributes further to the conserving and enhancing of the landscape and environment, but most importantly does not have a damaging effect.  
- Potential policy could require a legal |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some comments received regarding the potential to explore different management regimes such as removing stock and allowing vegetation to develop without grazing (re-wilding).</strong></td>
<td><strong>No further comments.</strong></td>
<td><strong>It should be noted that this is an issue that is outside the control of the planning system.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The impact of Brexit is uncertain - mixed response as to whether this could be positive or negative for the agricultural sector. (3 respondents made mention)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential impacts of Brexit were also raised in this round of consultation. 5 respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>At the current stage of Brexit negotiations the extent of influence on emerging planning policies is limited.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong support for allowing change of use of redundant farm buildings. (10 respondents + see detailed comments in Consultation Feedback Report)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supporting the conversions of agricultural buildings, particularly for holiday accommodation, was also generally supported through the Policy Options consultation. 3 respondents (1 of which thought that such accommodation should be near to existing services).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current policy already provides support for the conversion of farm buildings outside of settlements to employment use. Potential to continue this approach.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Some indication of support for more flexibility in allowing the change of use of farm buildings to residential. 5 respondents agreed. Suggested caveats: only if affordable and meet a local need (1); be less restrictive in terms of location (1); enabling development reference not required (1).</strong></td>
<td><strong>In terms of allowing more flexibility for the change of use of redundant farm buildings to residential, potential landscape impacts will need to be considered. Policy could potentially continue to restrict such development in isolated locations but be more flexible if the development formed part of a group of existing buildings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support for a criteria-based policy to promote the provision of land-based rural enterprises in suitable locations where appropriate. 60% agreed, 40% skipped the question.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement which ensures the new business activity is tied to the agricultural operation. Ideally the agriculture element of the business will remain the predominant enterprise.
### Natural Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Strong support for greater protection of areas of tranquillity and dark skies. *(17 respondents)* | • Support was continued through the Policy Options Consultation with recognition of the positive link between dark skies and year-round tourism. 50% agreed with a policy to protect the designation from inappropriate development. 20% disagreed. 30% skipped the question. 2 respondents with specific comments. Some concern over additional costs to ensure developments meet Dark Skies requirements. *1 respondent* | • Extant policy 19 is currently used regularly by DM Officers. It requires proposals to be assessed in terms of the impact on; levels of noise, traffic and light generated as a result of the development; the sense of openness of the NP; and the quiet enjoyment of the landscape.  
• Potential to continue this approach but also provide further support for development that would enhance particularly dark skies and tranquillity. |
| • General support for a high level of environmental protection including taking an ecosystems approach in planning policies *(10 comments)*, however some uncertainty around what this means *(2 individuals)*. | • Further support with some specific feedback related to ensuring policy incorporates every aspect of the ecosystem approach. *4 respondents*  
This is a potentially unattainable objective *(1 respondent)* | • This feedback will be taken into account when developing how an ecosystems approach will be embedded into the Local Plan.  
• NNPA is currently working with Alistair Scott Northumbria University and this academic research is likely to further inform policy development.  
• Also take into account the proposed approach in chapter 8 of the county council’s plan (however now withdrawn) |
| • Recognition for the role that forestry and woodland, in appropriate locations, takes in assisting in flood control and generally improving the environment *(7 comments, including representations from ConFor and Egger)*. | • Some extent of negativity in relation to the impact of forestry on the natural environment, e.g. on the landscape, wildlife habitats etc. *(3 respondents)* 40% of survey respondents said that they agreed with continuing the approach set out in policy 22 while only 10% disagreed. | • Potential to retain approach to assessing development in relation to forestry and woodland. However it should be noted that forestry practice itself is not within the control of the planning system.  
• Continue working in partnership with the |
Half of respondents either did not know or did not answer this question.

- Support for policies that would reduce/mitigate downstream and other potential flood risk *(20 comments)* including the encouragement of using Rural Sustainable Drainage Systems (RSuDS) *(4 respondents).*

- Significant support for revising or replacing extant policy 27 with a criteria based policy that reflects updated national policy and guidance (including sustainable rural drainage systems) *(70% of respondents agreed with the remainder having skipped the question).*

Some location specific comments made relating to impact of / potential for flooding. *(2 respondents)*

Potential emphasised for encouraging opportunities to enhance the habitat and species network / green infrastructure alongside incorporating such schemes into new developments. *(2 respondents)*

- Support for incorporating an eco-system services approach in managing future development within the National Park. *(10 comments)*

- Further support. *(4 respondents).*

- See relevant comments in row 2 above.

### Historic Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of the National Park's historic environment should remain a key element of the Local Plan.</td>
<td>Continued emphasis on this importance. <em>(1)</em></td>
<td>Support noted. See particular policy implications in rows below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed response as to whether the Local Plan should be more, or less, flexible in enabling heritage assets, such as Listed buildings, to be developed for other uses in the future. <em>(Only 6% of survey respondents (8 individuals))</em></td>
<td>Although the enabling development principles as set out by Historic England were generally supported, it was broadly considered that this should not be a component of local plan policy given that enabling development is</td>
<td>NNPA welcomes the feedback from Historic England in relation to ‘Enabling Development’. As advised by Historic England, the authority will need to be aware of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
said they agreed with allowing listed buildings to be converted in order to prevent their loss. A further 38% agreed but with some proviso (predominantly relating to making sure such works are done sensitively). The remainder 56% skipped the question or made no comment however 4 individuals demonstrated support for a generally more restrictive approach.

development that is not otherwise in accordance with policy. (2 respondents including Historic England)

Mixed response in relation to a potential approach that is more permissive of new uses of heritage assets, including residential. 40% agreed, 20% did not agree however 30% did not answer this question and 10% did not know. With regards to affording non-designated assets protection under a criteria-based policy, 50% of survey respondents agreed with this approach, however specific comments made by Historic England suggest how the proposed policy approach should align with NPPF Para 139. One individual thought that reasoning and evidence on which the basis to extend protection to non-designated assets should be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure and Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- General consensus that design of development should respond to local vernacular (8 respondents) whilst allowing for some innovation which would be rigorously assessed on a case by case basis (7 respondents).

- This remains important. 6 respondents. Suggestion for the need to provide definition / examples of ‘good design’. 2 respondents.

- NNPA will continue to use the Design Guide SPD and consider its review if necessary.

- Wider promotion of the SPD may be necessary.

- Potential to revert to enabling development principles in exceptional cases, however this does not need to be a component of Local Plan policy.

- Develop a suitably worded policy that gives some extent of flexibility for the development of listed buildings and other designated assets in line with national policy. See also Historic England’s Good Practice Advice.

- Look to national policy and guidance together with other NPA approaches to determine the most appropriate approach to non-designated assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General support for ensuring policies make it more difficult to permit the loss of visitor accommodation (44% agreed, 19% of these</td>
<td>Broad support for including a criteria-based policy to allow the conversion of under-used or redundant buildings to holiday accommodation</td>
<td>Potential to continue approach which supports the conversion of existing buildings to tourism accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with proviso, the remainder did not answer this question) (including support generally for a more flexible approach to allowing under-used agricultural buildings to be converted to holiday accommodation) (6 respondents).

- Importance of increasing visitors to the National Park and support for having provision in the Local Plan which can help to make the Park an all-year-round destination.

- Mixed response to a plan approach that would make provision for Sill 'satellite' developments. 3 individuals disagreed, 2 respondents agreed (1 of which mentioned viability), 1 further individual thought that this was something that had already been promised.

- No further comments.

- This is currently being explored by NNPA.

- Fairly strong support for including a criteria-based policy that would allow camping in suitable locations where appropriate. (60% agreed, 10% disagreed, 30% did not answer the question)

- A potential new policy could be introduced that supports small-scale tented camp sites, in locations well related to settlements.

Minerals and Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Issues Paper Consultation</th>
<th>Broad conclusions from the Policy Options Consultation</th>
<th>NNPA response / Potential Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Generally supportive response to encouraging nature conservation as an appropriate after-use for restored quarries. Although the majority of respondents did not answer the question 19% agreed as opposed to 13% who disagreed.</td>
<td>• No further comments.</td>
<td>• The Local Plan could require proposals for restored to be assessed on a case by case basis or provide a criteria-based policy that would support nature conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safeguarding future minerals supplies in the</td>
<td>• Largely supportive response to including a policy</td>
<td>• Potential to continue policy approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Park is considered appropriate, particularly when it would cover minerals needed to conserving and enhancing the local built environment. (6 respondents agreed, 1 disagreed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to safeguard mineral supplies by restricting development in appropriate locations so that the land is not sterilised by other potential development. 55% agreed, 9% disagreed, 9% did not know and 27% did not answer the question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• However there was a mixed response to including a criteria-based policy which could potentially allow for new quarries or the extension of existing quarries (45% agreed, 18% disagreed while 9% did not know and the remainder 27% skipped the question) Concerns of increased traffic / noise / environmental impacts (2 respondents) were argued to be offset by the creation of jobs (1 respondent) / provision of local building materials to conserve and enhance the local built environment. (3 respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for easily accessible local recycling sites. (7 comments broadly in line with this conclusion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is recognised that naturally as a result of the sparse population of the National Park there will be a continued reliance on larger waste sites outside of the Park with continued support for smaller local recycling sites. 2 respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which other types of waste, e.g. farm waste, could be managed through the Local Plan would be limited. (6 comments to this effect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One comment in support of a potential policy which supports small scale development for the management of agricultural waste. Subsequent contribution towards the National Park being self-sufficient and communities taking responsibility for the waste they produce. No additional comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continue with policy approach that supports the provision of local recycling sites. Any larger scale facilities would be assessed under a major development policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Such proposals could potentially be assessed under a policy as set out in the row above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Consultation publicity

Local Plan Policy Options Consultation Event

Consultation on Local Plan consultation event at Hartley Village Hall.

Have your say on planning and development goals

Consultation on Local Plan consultation event at Hartley Village Hall.

Local Plan event

Come along to our drop-in consultation event where you can have your say on how future development should be managed in the National Park.

Our aim is to produce a new Local Plan that will guide development and land use across Northumberland National Park, including how the environment will be conserved and protected over the next twenty years until 2037. You now have the opportunity to shape how the Park is going to evolve.

The event will run from 4.30pm until 8.30pm.

Northumberland National Park Authority sets the policies which control the future of development within the National Park, one of England’s finest landscapes.

It’s holding eight consultation events throughout the Park to discuss these policies and ensure the public has the opportunity to leave their views on how the Park should develop next.

Following an extensive consultation with over 100 people who have worked and visited the Park earlier this year, the National Park Authority has prepared draft policy options. For the duration of the consultation period, you can view these options online.

The public is encouraged to review the policies and make their views known. The consultation period will run until 29th October 2020.

Local plan consultation events

Northumberland National Park Authority is planning to consult on the new Local Plan in the autumn of 2020. The public is invited to comment on the proposals and make suggestions for improvement.

The consultation will run from 4.30pm until 8.30pm.

To do this effectively, it is crucial to have a Local Plan in place that will ensure all future development and land use decisions are aligned with the objectives of the National Park and its communities.

Thank you for your support in the development of the new Local Plan.

Sign up to our newsletter

Stay up to date with the latest news and events in Northumberland National Park.
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Appendix 3 – Consultation Event Photos