

For Office Use Only
Consultee ID:
Agent ID:
Received:
Acknowledged:
Processed:

Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy Pre Submission Draft: Proposed Major Modifications (June 2016)

Representation Form

This is the form for making representations on the Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy Pre Submission Draft: Schedule of Proposed Major Modifications.

Consultation will begin on **15th June 2016 for 6 weeks and end at 4pm on 27th July 2016.**

Representations received after this date cannot be considered. Only representations received within this period have the statutory right to be considered by the Inspector at the subsequent examination.

Representations submitted online are preferable; however forms can be submitted by email or post to the address below. If you wish to submit a representation on a Proposed Major Modification, please either complete a form at http://northumberland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/core_strategy/csmm or complete and return to either the postal or email address given at the end of this form.

Please note:

1. All respondents need to provide their personal details.
2. The Council are only inviting comments on the Proposed Major Modifications to the Plan, which are shown in red within the consultation document. Representations must reference the modification to which the comments relate and comments must be on the basis of the 'soundness' or legal compliance of the Proposed Major Modification. Please read the guidance note before completing this representation form.
3. It is recommended that groups that share a common view send a single representation rather than multiple copies. Please attach a list of the contact details of each person (include names, addresses, emails, telephone numbers and signatures) who supports the representation.
4. Separate forms should be completed for each representation.
5. By completing this form you agree to your details being shared and your name and comment (but not your address or other personal details) will be made available for public viewing. These representations cannot be treated as confidential.

Please expand the boxes as necessary or attach additional sheets. If attaching additional sheets, please clearly mark these with the part of the document the representation relates to and your name.

Section 1: Personal Details

	1. Personal Details	2. Agent Details (if applicable)
Title		
Name		
Organisation/ group	Northumberland & Newcastle Society and the CPRE	
Address 1	c/o Jesmond Methodist Church	
Address 2	St Georges Terrace	
Address 3	Jesmond	
Address 4	Newcastle on Tyne	
Post Code	NE2 2DL	
Telephone number	0191 2816266	
E-mail address		

If you are replying on behalf of a group, how many people does it represent?

1800

(Where applicable, see point 3 above)

Section 2: Consultation Questions

Question 1. Which Proposed Major Modification of the Plan does your representation relate to?

Change Reference (MAJ/XX/XX)	MAJ/11/18-24
------------------------------	--------------

Question 2. Do you consider that this Proposed Major Modification meets the legal and procedural requirements?

Yes No

Question 3. Local Planning Authorities should submit a plan for examination which is considered to be 'sound'. To be sound, the plan must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Do you consider that this Proposed Major Modification has met these tests?

Yes No

If you have entered 'no' to Question 2 or 3, please continue to Question 4. In all other circumstances, please go to Question 5.

Question 4. Do you consider this part of the Plan to be unsound because it is not:

Positively prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consistent with national policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Question 5. Please give details of why you consider this Proposed Major Modification is not legally compliant or sound or if you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Proposed Major Modification please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Society's and CPRE's concerns are substantially limited to Chapter 11 of the Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy Pre Submission Draft Proposed Major Modifications.

In House of Commons Written Statement HCWS40, on 18th June 2015, the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change (Amber Rudd) said:

"We now have enough onshore wind in the pipeline, to be subsidised by bill payers through the Renewable Obligation or Contracts for Difference, for onshore wind to play a significant part in meeting our renewable energy commitments. The Government was elected with a commitment to end new subsidies for onshore wind and to change the law so that local people have the final say on onshore windfarm applications". She continued: *"My Rt Hon Friend the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government is today making a statement on onshore wind development and local planning in England. This will set out new considerations to be applied to proposed wind energy development so that local people have the final say on wind farm applications" [emphasis added]¹.*

Accordingly, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) issued his contemporaneous Written Statement HCWS42 confirming:

*"When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should **only** grant planning permission if:*

- *the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; **and***
- *following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.*

*In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a **Local or Neighbourhood Plan**. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority"* [again, emphasis added]².

The latter Ministerial Statement has been fully reflected in changes to Planning Practice Guidance. If support is needed for our view that the Ministerial Statements represent "policy", the clue is in the fact that this "guidance" relates to "policy" and, specifically, the NPPF:

"Do local people have the final say on wind farm applications?"

*The **Written Ministerial Statement** made on 18 June 2015 is quite clear that when considering applications for wind energy development, local planning authorities should (subject to the transitional*

¹ House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS40), Written Statement made by: Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change (Amber Rudd) on 18 Jun 2015 (PDF download): <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-vote-office/June%202015/18%20June/2-DECC-Wind.pdf>

² House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS42), Written Statement made by: Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18 Jun 2015 (PDF download): <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-vote-office/June%202015/18%20June/1-DCLG-Planning.pdf>

arrangement) only grant planning permission if:

- the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and
- following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.

Whether the proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority.

Revision date: 18 1506

Since the December 2015 consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft, the Society and CPRE (“we”/“us” etc.) have attended several meetings with officers focusing on NCC’s understanding of and reaction to the above Ministerial Statements.

Discussions have been against the background of the following areas of common ground (as we understand them) between the Society, CPRE and NCC:

1. The earlier identified “Areas of Least Constraint” or “W Areas” had proved an unsatisfactory approach to wind turbine development in Northumberland.
2. That was why NCC had proposed (and continues to propose) a criteria based approach to renewable energy development overall and to wind turbine development in particular.
3. Landscape and visual impact assessments for some of the major wind turbine developments had been misleading, underestimating the impact of such schemes and establishing the difficulty in anticipating it.
4. Most if not all communities within or adjacent to the former “Areas of Least Constraint”/“W Areas” have recognized, in the words of para 97 of the NPPF, their “*responsibility ... to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources*”. Indeed, that could be said of the whole county. NCC has permitted more onshore wind than any other planning authority. In addition DECC has approved (under S36) a further 136MW in Northumberland - more than double that in any other County. The true total for Northumberland is therefore over 280 MW³.
5. Northumberland’s “wind resource” is unexceptional⁴.

However, we have been very concerned at the refusal of the principal officer responsible for this area of policy to accept that the above Ministerial Statements represent “policy”⁵ or, if that is now accepted, the significance of the change. We are concerned that Members appear to have been misled as to the importance and impact of those Statements, leading in turn to amended policies that are inflected to counter the objectives of national policy and to undermine the role of local communities intended to be enhanced.

We are also concerned at NCC’s apparent confusion, or at least confusing statements, as to the role of future documents in relation to the “Identification of Suitable Areas” (e.g. the proposed SPD and whatever may follow it) and whether they are to form part of the Development Plan. This confusion is evident from both the Major Modifications and SPD consultations and from comments made by officers both to us and to the press⁶.

³ Discounting Humberside (which is a region rather than a Planning Authority) based on data by MWe approved, NCC has approved more Onshore wind than any other PA: NCC - 144.2MW; Fenland (for Cambridgeshire) - 132.8MW; Durham - 130MW; Cornwall - 110.5MW; Allerdale(Cumbria) 90.9MW; East Lindsey (Lincolnshire) - 70.2MW.

⁴ <http://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/regional-renewable-statistics>

⁵ That stance has been repeated at each of at least three of our meetings with officers.

⁶ “However, a county council spokeswoman said: “There are no proposals to identify suitable areas for wind-turbine development in the proposed SPD. The purpose of the SPD is to provide further detail on the policy criteria in the core strategy. The current consultation is on a scoping document which seeks feedback on what the SPD should cover. It is proposed that work is done to assess whether there are any suitable areas for wind-turbine development in Northumberland. This area of work would be addressed through a separate development plan document and not an SPD and would be subject to public consultation.” Northumberland Gazette 8th July.

For instance, MAJ/11/22 makes it abundantly clear that NCC will “*seek to identify suitable areas...*” yet we have repeatedly been told that no decision has been made to do so. If, as is probable, any such exercise *would* identify ostensibly “suitable” areas, why have officers been so reticent in admitting their objective? Alternatively, the enormous costs and resources involved in such a county-wide exercise would be unjustified if no such areas were to emerge.

In terms of the proposed SPD (and noting that it is the subject of a separate consultation) we draw attention to para 153 of the NPPF: “*Any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified. Supplementary planning documents should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development*”.

First, for the reasons we explain below, the renewable energy policies of the draft Core Strategy, absent their current references to NCC’s desire to “Identify Suitable Areas”, stand on their own, particularly if, as we further explain below, any identification exercise is, as it should be, left to local communities through Neighbourhood Plans. If that were to occur, no further development plan document would be necessary, let alone justified.

The NPPF makes it abundantly clear that planning authorities may review all or parts of their local plans – much better to do that in relation to wind turbines if and when national policy changes rather than, in effect, to leave matters in the air for several years while an almost inevitably flawed assessment of the whole county is made.

As things stand, the identification exercise, in the hands of NCC, is unnecessary and inappropriate for the reasons, following. By the same token, the SPD is inappropriate. It will have a huge impact on the application of the policies themselves, assuming they survive examination, yet it will not be subject to scrutiny at a public examination. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that NCC, or its officers, are determined to encourage wind turbine development against the wishes of “local people”, despite the Ministerial Statements.

The overall result is that while NCC continues to insist that no decision has yet been made as to whether “Suitable Areas” will be identified, it is abundantly clear that officers intend them to be, giving rise to the concerns listed below. Overall, the effect is to make the Major Modifications mentioned below unsound in that they are unjustified; ineffective; and inconsistent with national policy. To the extent that they distract attention from other forms of renewable energy, they also fail the test of “positive preparation”:

1. Prior to the Ministerial Statements and with our support and approval, NCC had decided to adopt a criteria-based approach in the Core Strategy, abandoning the problematic “Areas of Least Constraint”/“W areas” in the former Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). These caused serious problems for local communities and planners, acting as honeypots for turbine developers and placing local communities under years of development stress;
2. As before, the proposed renewable energy policies now comprise policies 65 (an overarching policy relating to all sources of renewable energy), 66 (relating only to “Onshore wind energy” and, ostensibly, having as its main purpose the addition of criteria additional to those in policy 65) and 67 (relating only to “Solar photovoltaic farms”);
3. They continue the criteria-based approach which, as is common ground, is appropriate to Northumberland, given past problems, and preferable to an “identification of suitable areas”/“areas of least constraint”/“W Areas” approach. This is generally endorsed by MAJ/11/18, introducing policy 65. However, the Modification goes on: “*A different approach is proposed for wind to reflect the Written Ministerial Statement issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local*

Government on 18th June 2015 and the changes to planning Practice Guidance.....”;

4. The Major Modifications, while plainly recognising that national policy requires a distinction to be made between wind turbines and other renewable energy sources, fail to properly apply that distinction;
5. As a result, they undermine the criteria-based approach agreed as appropriate to all renewable energy developments in Northumberland;
6. They fail to acknowledge that the DCLG’s Ministerial Statement and the revised Planning Practice Guidance, in referring to the question of whether *“the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan”*, use the present tense. They neither impose nor suggest any obligation on planning authorities to identify such areas in a Local Plan, any more than that obligation is imposed on those preparing Neighbourhood Plans;
7. Rather, instead of acknowledging the absence of such a duty, Major Modification MAJ/11/21 asserts that the Ministerial Statement *“...also sets out that such areas need to be identified in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan”*. There is no such need. The need only arises if the planning authority wishes to encourage wind turbine development in its area and is unwilling to leave the matter to “local people” and their Neighbourhood Plans. It would need good and clearly expressed reasons for such an approach;
8. MAJ/11/20, introducing policy 66, makes clear that NCC has already decided, itself, *“to seek to identify suitable areas for wind energy development in order to ‘have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources’ as required by the NPPF”*. This makes nonsense of repeated assurances we have received from officers that no decision to seek to “identify” has yet been made. It is therefore clear that despite accepting, firstly, that there is no legal duty for it to do so and, secondly, that the exercise could properly be left to the communities likely to be affected by such development through Neighbourhood Plans, NCC believes the NPPF *“requires”* NCC to have a *“positive strategy to promote...”* the development of wind turbines as a *“renewable and low carbon source”*.
9. MAJ/11/21 appears to place reliance on the assertion that *“No changes have been made to the NPPF as a consequence of the Written Ministerial Statement being issued.”* (Although, the changes to the PPG are noted). This clearly ignores or at the least heavily and unjustifiably downgrades the importance of the distinction that the “policy” expressed through the Ministerial Statements was intended to make between wind turbine and other sorts of renewable energy and fails to accept that the NPPF’s support for renewable energy developments, overall, is now to be applied recognising that distinction. That NCC has fallen into this trap is further evidenced by the latest suggestion to extend the proposed SPD beyond wind turbines to other renewable energy sources;
10. MAJ/11/22 then both illustrates and compounds NCC’s error in the way in which it seeks to justify its apparent determination to “identify suitable areas”. It states: *“It is considered to be appropriate to seek to identify suitable areas for wind energy development in order to ‘have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources as required by the NPPF. If suitable areas are not identified it would in the context of the Written Ministerial Statement unnecessarily limit opportunities for community-led initiatives and proposals of a smaller scale-scale that would help individual homes or business to meet their energy needs”*:
 - a. First, the NPPF⁷ must be read as nuanced and/or clarified by the Written Ministerial Statements. Accordingly, *“a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low*

• ⁷ Para 97. *To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources. They should:* • *have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources;* • *design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts;* • *consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources;* • *support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside such areas being taken forward through neighbourhood planning;* and • *identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers.*

carbon sources as required by the NPPF” can and, in the wake of the Ministerial Statements, should be focused on sources other than wind turbines. Indeed, by adopting the approach it does, NCC is at risk of devoting too much time, resource and attention on “wind” to the exclusion of other renewable sources less well represented in Northumberland;

- b. Put another way, by recognising that there is no need for *it* to “identify suitable areas”, NCC would better leave “local people” to take the initiative through their Neighbourhood Plans; avoid the waste, in difficult economic times, of very substantial direct expense and officers’ time involved in the proposed SPD and subsequent identification work; and avoid the risk, inevitable in such an exercise, of making judgements about landscape capacity in a vacuum, i.e. on generalised assumptions, with no specific scheme in mind and without the ability to take account of possible cumulative and other impacts;
- c. NCC’s ultimate justification for its approach - the risk that failure to identify suitable areas would “*unnecessarily limit opportunities for community-led initiatives and proposals of a smaller scale-scale that would help individual homes or business to meet their energy needs*”, is also flawed because “community-led initiatives” are better promoted through Neighbourhood Plans, within the spirit of “localism”, while, in terms of the reference to “*individual homes and businesses*”, most are covered by permitted development rights for installations of micro-generation equipment on domestic and non-domestic premises. To that extent, the absence of an “identification of suitable areas” would be no impediment. So far as commercial agriculture is concerned, renewable energy needs are now more usually served by bio-mass or bio-gas (anaerobic digestion) which would be covered by the otherwise applicable criteria-based approach. It would be absurd to carry out an otherwise unnecessary county-wide identification exercise for a tiny number of farmers who might conceivably prefer to explore “wind” rather than other technologies.

11. Meanwhile, the arguments against NCC seeking to “identify suitable areas” on a county-wide area appear not to have been confronted:

- a. The fresh identification of “suitable areas”, far from encouraging “community-led initiatives”, would actually conflict with the principle of “localism” which envisages that local communities should be allowed to identify and take forward such initiatives in Neighbourhood Plans;
- b. In Northumberland, previous attempts to identify “suitable areas for wind energy development” through capacity studies resulted in “Areas of Least Constraint”/“W Areas” that the wind industry successfully treated as “areas of presumed consent”. Many parish and town councils see this as mirroring previous attempts by NCC to centralise planning control and weaken local input;
- c. In any event, there are enormous and obvious difficulties in assessing the whole county in terms of “identifying suitable areas” within it: one would have to assume an almost infinite variety of potential schemes – how many turbines; of what height; located in what juxtaposition; and with the whole exercise being upset if a particular scheme came to fruition altering the cumulative impact assumptions? That is why a criteria based approach was chosen in the first place;
- d. Given that the Ministerial Statements have reduced pressure for onshore wind development, which already exceeds 2020 fiscal and capacity targets, there is the risk that if NCC proceeds as it obviously intends, it is likely to re-awaken development pressure from speculators who have given up on other areas of England where ministerial guidance has been interpreted differently. This occurred when RSS policies were developed under the influence of wind industry consultants;
- e. Given the controversy surrounding wind turbine development and the substantial

opposition to it in communities that have faced, in some cases, over fifteen years of turbine-development pressure and uncertainty, it would be quite wrong to progress any part of policy preparation or implementation concerning NCC's "identification of suitable areas" other than through the scrutiny of the local plan process. By proceeding as planned, with a SPD scoping exercise, that principle risks being seriously undermined;

- f. Finally but by no means of least relevance, the cost of such an exercise would be enormous both in terms of direct cost paid to consultants but in terms of the NCC's officer resource (officers profess to have no idea as to the professional costs involved but a fair guess would surely far exceed £500,000). To ignore or downplay that cost for no or little apparent benefit and absent any obligation to incur it is unsustainable and profligate.

The Society is regrettably forced to the conclusion that NCC or some of its officers may have an agenda unduly supportive of wind turbine development, to the possible detriment of other forms of renewable energy, and in conflict with the objectives of current national policy on wind turbines. In the manner above explained, the effect is to make unsound the proposed policies as altered by the Major Modifications to which the Society objects.

This in turn gives rise to the serious risk that adoption of the new local plan will be delayed as a result of an unduly extended public examination, a reference to the Secretary of State or a judicial challenge. That would have adverse consequences that would be avoided by NCC acknowledging that any "identification of suitable areas" should be left to local communities through their Neighbourhood Plans.

In summary, the major modifications referred to are unsound for the following reasons:

1. They are likely to be ineffective because:

- a. The proposed "identification" process will undoubtedly be extremely complex; take some years to complete; and, on the basis of past experience in Northumberland, is highly unlikely to be safe. It would guide developments without knowing their scale, composition, height, density or the relationship of their components to important heritage or landscape assets. The "identification" would comprise guidance prepared essentially in a vacuum such that it would either be largely useless or, more likely, serve as a "presumption in favour of development" as did the ill-fated "Areas of least Constraint"/"W Areas";
- b. In being likely to so serve, the "identification" process and outcome would undermine the criteria-based approach that the council has for long (and correctly) identified as appropriate to Northumberland, very much for the reasons articulated at 1.a. above; and
- c. At a time of economic austerity, the identification process would be hugely expensive in terms of both direct costs and officers' time. The expense and resources would be better deployed on other council priorities.

2. They are inconsistent with national policy in that they:

- a. Fail to acknowledge, properly or at all, the distinction that is now required to be drawn, in applying the NPPF, between wind turbines and other forms of renewable energy;
- b. Detract from rather than adopt the principles of "localism". Far from encouraging "community backed projects" and encouraging neighbourhood plans as the means by which to deliver them (in addition to development rights), the major modifications seek to centralise "identification" leaving local communities in trepidation that, as in the past, they will thereby face years of development pressure and uncertainty as developers assert that, because the area in question has been "identified", "local concerns" have, in effect, been either largely if not "fully addressed" (the de facto "presumption in favour" of grant).

3. Given:

- a. The extent of the contribution to wind energy targets that Northumberland has already made (in particular noting the contribution that communities within or adjacent to areas at risk of being further “identified”);
- b. The county’s capacity to contribute in terms of other renewable sources;
- c. The potential for better use of the funds and resources that the identification process would entail; and
- d. The risks of further delays to the adoption of the core strategy policies, overall,

the “identification of suitable areas” would be wholly unjustified.

4. In so far as the major modifications encourage on-shore wind turbine development (other than in the form of community based projects) for which the government has confirmed there is no further need, there would be a propensity for wind turbine development to diminish the focus of developers and the council, alike, on other forms of renewable energy less well represented in Northumberland. In that way, it may be said that the policies are not positively drawn.

(Please continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Question 6. Have you raised this issue during previous consultation on the Core Strategy?

Yes

No

If you have answered 'no' please explain why this issue has not been raised before:

Because the issues giving rise to our concerns post-date the last round of consultations.

(Please continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Question 7. Please set out what change(s) to the Proposed Major Modification you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

We attach a version of the relevant part of Chapter 11 with our suggested amendments shown. The reasons for them are explained in answer to question 5.

(Please continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover all the information evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

Question 8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Independent Examination? (Please note that the Planning Inspector will make the final decision on who will be invited to attend individual sessions at the Examination)

Yes

No

Question 9. If you wish to participate in the Independent Examination, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

Due to the serious nature of our concerns and their importance to landscape and heritage interests in Northumberland.

(Please continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Section 3: Declaration

Please tick the box if you would like to be notified at an address/email address of the following:

- The submission of the Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy for Independent Examination;
- The publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an Independent Examination of the Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy (the Inspector's Report); and
- The adoption of Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy.

How we will use your personal information

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 and the County Council's Data Protection Policy. The information you provide will only be used for the purposes of the preparation of the Local Plan as required by the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004, and may be used by the County Council to contact you if necessary regarding your submission. Your name, organisation and comments will be made available for public inspection when displaying and reporting the outcome of the statutory consultation stage, and cannot be treated as confidential. You will not be asked for any unnecessary information, and in order to protect personal data, we will not publish signatures, telephone numbers, addresses or e-mail addresses on the internet.

We will not keep your personal information longer than is required by legislation. We will process your personal data in accordance with the rights of data subjects under the Data Protection Act. We will take all reasonable precautions to protect your personal data from accidental or deliberate loss or unauthorised disclosure.

You can access the personal data that Northumberland County Council holds about you by contacting the Council's Information Governance Officer. If you have any concerns about information placed on the internet by Northumberland County, or if you wish at any time you wish to have your details removed from the Council's online planning portal, please contact the Planning and Housing Policy Team at PlanningStrategy@northumberland.gov.uk

Please sign and date this form. Electronic signatures will be accepted.

Declaration:

By completing and signing this form, I agree to my name, organisation and representations being made available for public inspection on the internet.

Signature:

Date:

The Council would prefer it if you made your representation online, via the interactive website at:
http://northumberland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/core_strategy/csmm

An electronic version of the representation form can also be found at the above address. Hard copies of the representation form are also available from Council Offices, Information Centres, libraries and the drop in events. Details of the drop in events are available on the Council's website at:
corestrategy.northumberland.gov.uk

Representation forms submitted by e-mail or post should be directed to:

Email to: PlanningStrategy@northumberland.gov.uk

Or post to: Planning and Housing Policy Team
Planning and Economy
Northumberland County Council
County Hall
Morpeth
Northumberland
NE61 2EF

Closing date for responses – 4pm on 27 July 2016