



Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 18 March 2014

Accompanied site visit made on 28 March 2014

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 July 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/A/12/2170840 **Land at South Loansdean, Morpeth NE61 2DR.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Bellway Home (North East) Ltd against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref: 11/02454/FUL, dated 9 September 2011, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2012.
 - The development proposed is a hybrid application comprising a full application for residential development of 200 dwellings (Use Class C3) incorporating landscaping, open space, access and highway works, and an outline application for up to 465 square metres of ancillary commercial development (Use Classes A1/A2/A4/D1).
 - This decision supersedes that issued on 29 August 2012. That decision on the appeal was quashed by order of the High Court.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/A/13/2208237 **Land at South Loansdean, Morpeth NE61 2DR.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Bellway Home (North East) Ltd against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref: 13/00073/FUL, dated 14 January 2013, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2013.
 - The development proposed is a hybrid application for full planning permission for residential development of 186 dwellings (Use Class C3) incorporating landscaping, open space, access and highway works, and outline consent for up to 465 square metres of ancillary commercial development (Use Classes A1/A2/A4/D1).
-

Preliminary Matters

1. Each of these applications relates to the same site on the southern side of Morpeth. In this decision I will refer to the first appeal as Appeal A (2170840) and the second appeal as Appeal B (2208237).
2. As I explained in opening the inquiry the fact that Appeal A is being redetermined means that the previous 'decision' has no status in law. I must determine the case again on the basis of the evidence before me, and the previous decision can play no part in my consideration of the cases.

3. Each of the proposals was initially refused planning permission by the Council. However, on each occasion, between the lodging of the appeal and the inquiry taking place, the Council withdrew its opposition on the basis of further advice and information made available.
4. There are many similarities between the cases and at the inquiry it was not necessary in the main to differentiate between the 2 schemes, other than in detailed matters. I follow a similar approach in this decision.

Decisions

Appeal A

5. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development of 200 dwellings (Use Class C3) incorporating landscaping, open space, access and highway works, and up to 465 square metres of ancillary commercial development (Use Classes A1/A2/A4/D1) at land at South Loansdean, Morpeth NE61 2DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 11/02454/FUL, dated 9 September 2011, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Appeal B

6. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development of 186 dwellings (Use Class C3) incorporating landscaping, open space, access and highway works, and up to 465 square metres of ancillary commercial development (Use Classes A1/A2/A4/D1) at land at South Loansdean, Morpeth NE61 2DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 13/00073/FUL, dated 14 January 2013, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for Costs

7. An application for costs was made by Bellway Homes (North East) Ltd against Northumberland County Council. This application will be the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

8. Although each proposal was refused for slightly different reasons, the opposition to each was maintained by the South Morpeth Coalition (SMC) rather than by the Council. The SMC objections go wider than the reasons for refusal originally given by the Council. The main issues to be determined are therefore the same in both appeals. They are:
 - (a) Whether the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and if not whether the appeal site is an appropriate location for development;
 - (b) Whether the mix of affordable housing proposed is acceptable;
 - (c) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locality;
 - (d) Whether the proposed development would exacerbate flood risk for dwellings or areas adjacent to or downstream of the site;
 - (e) The effect of the proposed development on traffic flows and highway safety.

Reasons

Housing Supply and the Proposed Location

9. The starting point here is the fact that the Council (albeit that it took no formal part in the appeals) accepts that it cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Officer report to Committee dated 19 September 2013 makes this clear¹. The conclusions of that report are, however, disputed by the SMC.
10. There has been debate about the appropriate area to assess in these cases. The NPPF indicates that local planning authorities should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area. Northumberland covers a wide geographical area, and it is clearly logical to seek to identify functional housing market areas so far as is possible.
11. The concept of the City Region Commuter Area (CRCA) encompassing the former district council areas of Castle Morpeth and Tynedale has been adopted by the Appellant. The Council has also adopted this area in its own calculation of housing land supply. But there is some acknowledged 'blurring' of the boundaries of appropriate housing market areas, and the SMC prefers to use the former Castle Morpeth Borough area, which it sees as being more relevant.
12. What appears clear to me is that there is real difficulty in identifying a housing market area which would be agreed by all. But I am satisfied that there is logic in taking the areas encompassing the former districts of Castle Morpeth and Tynedale, but accepting that the boundaries will be open to interpretation, and are unlikely to exactly mirror former local authority areas. In any event, what is crucial is what the housing need and supply figures show once any assessment area has been determined. Helpfully, both the Appellant and SMC have provided assessments based on the CRCA.
13. Housing need has historically been set by the now revoked Regional Strategy (RS). However, the assessment within the RS is based on relatively old data, and it is appropriate to approach such data with caution. Recent case law confirms as much. The NPPF clearly requires that need should be objectively assessed, and the assessment is bound to change over time. There are 2 assessments before me which supersede the RS figures. The first is that included in the emerging Core Strategy documents of the Council; the second is that carried out on behalf of Barton Willmore. It is worth noting that housing needs assessments are not an exact exercise, and this is confirmed by the recently published Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In this case it is not necessary to take a forensic approach to need and supply, the reasons for which will become clear below, and I therefore deal with broad numbers based on the latest evidence.
14. The emerging Core Strategy assessment does not exactly equate to the CRCA, but extracted figures show a housing requirement for that area of some 427 dwellings per annum (dpa). This is significantly more than would have been required under the RS assessment. The assessment for Barton Willmore, on a 'jobs fixed' basis, assesses need at a slightly higher level again. Jobs fixed

¹ Mr Hall's Proof of evidence Appendix 10

assumes housing needs to meet a situation of no jobs growth, but with all current jobs retained.

15. Set against this is the analysis of the SMC. This analysis primarily relies on the RS assessment to match need with supply, and suggests that the emerging Core Strategy requirement is controversial and in conflict with the aspirations of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Nonetheless SMC maintains that Morpeth has sufficient supply to meet the draft proposal of 1500 homes in the town in the next 20 years.
16. There is, though, a difficulty in accepting the SMC assessment. First, it seeks to take a baseline need figure, and adjust the 5 year supply calculation on a rolling basis, dependant upon identified completions, both actual and expected. This is an unorthodox methodology which does not give clear reference points, and housing supply is more usually assessed on an annual basis with additions and subtractions based on data at a point in time. I agree with the Appellant that the SMC methodology risks introducing inaccuracies and loss of clarity. What is important is that the need should be established, and that an annual assessment be made of whether the need can be satisfied – that is, whether a 5 year supply exists.
17. The second problem with the SMC assessment is that the requirement for Morpeth set out in the RS represents a constrained figure which reflects the priorities for housing at that time. The correct approach now is to objectively assess first, and then to introduce any policies which reflect constraints. That process must follow the Local Plan procedure. Although the emerging Local Plan is at an early stage, its direction of travel accords with the thrust of the work carried out for Barton Willmore – that a significantly increased housing supply for the CRCA, and for Morpeth, will be required.
18. As I have noted, the RS assessment is now of some age and open to doubt and criticism. I therefore place greater weight on the subsequent work carried out both by the Council and for Barton Willmore, that housing need is likely to be significantly higher. That may, as indicated by SMC, be controversial, but the more recent assessments are based on the latest available data, and therefore have more credence. On that basis I accept that the housing need for the CRCA is likely to be in the range of 430 to 480 dpa. To that must be added any previous undersupply, and an allowance for a buffer as required by the NPPF.
19. Against the RS figures there is a net oversupply of 90 dwellings in the CRCA since 2004/05. Against the emerging CS or jobs fixed scenarios there would be undersupply of about 470 or 580 dwellings since 2011/12. But these latter figures are not measured against an adopted need target at that time, and it could be seen as being unduly harsh to seek to add those figures to future need at this stage. I therefore treat, conservatively, undersupply as being in neither positive nor negative figures at present.
20. In relation to a buffer, NPPF makes it clear that there should be a 20% buffer if there has been persistent undersupply. This is a difficult area as there have been years when supply has exceeded target, and years when it has not. On the basis of the figures presented I am not satisfied that it has been shown that undersupply has been persistent. Supply has been above and below target on occasion, but to reach a position of a net oversupply in the CRCA (albeit over a period from 2004/05) does not seem to me to equate to a persistent issue even

if most years recently have shown some undersupply. I therefore conclude, on the basis of the evidence, that a 5% buffer would be appropriate here.

21. So on the basis of an annual need of 430 to 480 plus a 5% buffer, housing need in the CRCA can be conservatively assessed as being around 2250 to 2525 over 5 years. I stress that these are likely to be conservative figures. I also stress that this is not the place to seek to set the housing needs for the market area – that is the job of the Local Plan. But what I can conclude is that the RS requirement is out of date, and that future housing need is likely to be at least in the vicinity of the figures above.
22. I turn then to supply. The evidence is that the Council has identified a deliverable supply of 838 dwellings in the 5 year period, including an element of windfall provision. The Barton Willmore assessment is less optimistic, and finds that supply is likely to be in the region of 755 dwellings. There is no allowance for windfalls. In either case it is abundantly clear that on those figures there is a serious shortfall against the likely need.
23. The SMC position is a great deal more optimistic and relies on some completions coming forward in the north of Morpeth which rely on the completion of the Morpeth Northern Bypass. I do not agree that these figures are sufficiently robust to meet the definition of deliverable in the NPPF. The St George's Hospital site, for example, has no planning permission, and lead times even following the completion of the bypass (which is not yet approved) are likely to take delivery well beyond the five year period. I can also give little weight to the suggestion that the potential closure of County Hall would alter the dynamic of the supply situation. That eventuality would seem to be some way in the future in any event, if it happens at all. But even were I to accept the SMC calculations for the CRCA of something approaching 1500 delivered dwellings in the 5 year period, this would still be well short of the assessed need. Completions on small sites and for windfalls are a smaller part of the variability in forecast, but would not in any event alter the likely outcome to any material degree.
24. To sum up here, I find that the RS data is now too old to be reliable, and I give more weight to housing need assessments carried out for the emerging Core Strategy and for Barton Willmore. These are the best evidence of objectively assessed need that I have. I have been conservative in dealing with any past undersupply and in applying a buffer, but this should not be taken as definitive in any future assessments for other cases or Local Plan purposes. It reflects the evidence before me. So supply on any reliable measure in this case is well below objectively assessed need and it is worth remembering that Morpeth is proposed to be a main town and location for significant growth in the future. Unless rates of provision are stepped up then achievement of the growth envisaged must be in doubt. The only reasonable conclusion which can be reached is that there is no demonstrated 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
25. In accordance with the advice of the NPPF the housing supply policies of the Local Plan cannot be considered to be up to date in these circumstances. This includes those policies which seek to restrict housing by identifying settlement limits, as in this case. These are Policy MC1, which sets the settlement boundary for Morpeth in accordance with Policy C1. Policy C1 itself seeks to restrict development in the countryside beyond settlement boundaries. As time

has moved on since the submission of the first scheme it is indisputable that the relevance and weight of saved Local Plan policies which impact on housing supply have reduced significantly in weight.

26. Before considering other discrete issues I consider the evidence presented relating to the location of the appeals site. There has been a clear preference expressed by SMC and in the draft Neighbourhood Plan for development to take place in the northern part of Morpeth. Development there has long been an aspiration, but to date a limited outcome has been achieved. It is clear to me that the housing supply shortfall is likely to become more severe in Morpeth and the CRCA if sites are not brought forward quickly, and I have no reason to believe that a site providing the levels of housing in these appeals would have any effect on future supply in the northern part of the town.
27. The provision of about 200 dwellings at South Loansdean would not materially impact upon the emerging Core Strategy (a fact which must be implicit in the Council's decision not to contest the appeal). In addition, given that the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to follow the Local Plan I can see no reason to find that the Neighbourhood Plan itself would be prejudiced. The general preferences of local people for development to the north of the town would still remain and be capable of being progressed through future procedures. Hence there would be no significant or demonstrable harm to the emerging Core Strategy or the emerging Neighbourhood Plan if either of the appeal proposals were to be permitted.
28. I note in passing here that there is no current proposal in the emerging Local Plan to include the site of the appeals in the Green Belt, the proposed boundary of which lies immediately to the south. Indeed there is recognition of the likelihood of housing being provided in this locality given the identification of land at South Loansdean within the preferred options for some development during the plan period. The Green Belt boundary as proposed means that this could only realistically be applicable to the appeals site². I recognise that this is a proposal only, and that there is opposition to it, but it does indicate that there is currently no 'embargo' on development in the south of the town as a matter of principle.
29. SMC has concerns that the site is in the wrong place because facilities in Morpeth tend to be located to the north of the River Wansbeck. That is so, but it does not make the appeals site inappropriate. I have walked to and from the town centre from the site, and although I would regard it as at the limit of comfortable walking for many, it is certainly possible. I am also mindful of the frequent bus service which passes by the site, and which would allow good public transport accessibility to the town and to Newcastle to the south. It is also the case that the proposed development could, in a small way, address the current imbalance by having the potential to provide local facilities which SMC note are lacking in this part of the town.
30. A number of studies have been conducted which have considered options for growth of Morpeth. There is an undoubted tendency to identify the northern part of the town as a major contributor to growth. But there is no exclusion per se of some expansion in the south, as I have noted above. I do not

² Core Document 10 – Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy, Strategic Land Review October 2013
www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate

consider that the development of the appeals site would materially unbalance the town.

31. The preference for the use of previously developed land is well documented, and the northern part of the town includes significant elements of such land. However, the development of Greenfield sites cannot be ruled out if the overarching aim of the NPPF "to boost significantly the supply of housing" is to be met. The availability of previously developed land in Morpeth for many years has not achieved that aim, and as I note above, I do not accept that it will do so in the next 5 years.
32. To sum up on this issue, I find that there is no demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. The policies of the Local Plan in this respect are out of date. There is no 'in principle' objection to a development of the sizes proposed in the south of Morpeth at this time on the grounds of prematurity, and nor can the use of greenfield land be ruled out.

Affordable Housing

33. There is no dispute that affordable housing is required in Northumberland, but SMC has submitted evidence which indicates that the need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of 2013 will be met without the homes proposed on the appeals site. In addition SMC contends that the proposed provision would not meet the identified requirements, especially for social rented homes (particularly in Appeal A) and in any event that affordable housing could be provided on other sites. Similarly it is pointed out that the size of dwellings proposed does not meet the identified need in the SHMA.
34. It is undeniable that the mix of tenure and sizes in both appeals falls outside the preferences in the SHMA. But the SHMA is a local authority wide document, and I would expect there to be variations between different locations. It has been accepted that provision in the wider area would not meet needs in Morpeth. The relevance of the proposed affordable dwellings seems to be borne out by the evidence of interest from a provider of affordable homes which was submitted by the Appellant³. I have no reason to doubt that the proposed affordable housing would meet needs as identified by that organisation.
35. The Council did provide some information to the parties at the inquiry which shows that there is demand for affordable homes in Morpeth, with some 18 applicants for every vacancy. The information was explained as being reflective of those currently with a Morpeth address, and therefore likely to be an under reflection of true demand. Indeed of properties becoming available 27% were subject to bids from those in Morpeth. This suggests a much wider demand for affordable homes there.
36. I do accept some of the criticism of the mix and sizes of dwellings proposed when considered against the preferences noted in the SHMA. But there is in any case no relevant development plan policy in place which requires the provision of any affordable housing at all in this location. On that basis, and notwithstanding the reservations expressed about tenure, size and affordability, it seems self evident to me that the provision of any affordable housing should

³ Inquiry Document 13

be supported; the more so when it attracts the interest of an affordable housing provider.

37. There is a S106 Obligation in place which would ensure the delivery of affordable housing, and I deal with that later.

Character and Appearance

38. The appeals site is a field in agricultural use. It has been described as being a shallow bowl. That has a degree of accuracy. What is certain is that the open part of the site proposed for building has strong boundaries which give it a self contained character. There are strong boundaries to the north (Loansdean housing) south (woodland) and east (the main road). The western and south-western corner is slightly more open, but here the land rises, adding a further element of enclosure.
39. There is no doubt about the value attributed to the land by local residents, and I understand why that should be. Residents of some properties to the north enjoy a pleasant open outlook over the field.
40. However, the field has no designation which offers it any special protection, and nor does it enjoy any ecological benefits which render it unusual. In my judgement it can be characterised as an edge of settlement field which has no remarkable or special distinguishing properties. I do not entirely agree with the assessment in the Council's landscape character assessment that it is a landscape in need of restoration (that seems to apply to a wider area more readily) but I do accept that it is not of the highest quality. It has a pleasant but unexceptional agricultural character. In my judgement it has a moderate sensitivity to change.
41. The eastern boundary includes a belt of trees, mainly Scots Pine, alongside it (within the site) which is subject to an area Tree Preservation Area (TPO) made in 1969. This adds something to the character of this localised site and is a notable feature at the entry to Morpeth from the south. It has been described as a landscape corridor. An area TPO is intended for short term protection until trees can be properly assessed, but this latter step does not appear to have been done. Notwithstanding that, the trees and their contribution to the area have been assessed.
42. Policy MC4 of the existing Local Plan identifies landscape corridors, and the appeal site lies adjacent to that identified alongside the A197. These corridors do not preclude development, but require a landscaped zone for the frontage of any development site, with no development in the landscaped zone. That is a component part of the proposals in that the tree belt, where retained, would be widened and enhanced. It cannot be that Policy MC4 envisages no change or alteration to landscaped corridors, but that any changes are properly considered and implemented. I therefore see no material conflict with Policy MC4.
43. Some of the protected trees would be lost, but it is apparent from my site visits that some of the trees are now of poor quality. It is not in any event certain what trees were present when the order was made – some of the younger ones would certainly not have been. The proposals each involve vehicular access resulting in the loss of a significant part of the tree belt. On the other hand new planting would refresh and supplement that which remains, including

turning the corner into the site itself. Open views would be afforded into the site at the access point but the landscape corridor effect would substantially remain. In fact I consider that the forward views of the approach into the town (and its reverse journey out) would be little changed in reality, and could well be enhanced by the supplemented tree belt. The proposed new roundabout would of course interrupt forward views, but not so significantly as to affect the tree lined nature of this approach to Morpeth.

44. Within the 'interior' of the site there would be built development where none existed before. This would, of course, be a change to character. On any reasonable assessment the change from agricultural land to built development is likely to be adverse in its impact on character, and that is the case here. Each of the proposed schemes would result in dwellings, roads and the area of commercial development (with details not yet determined) being the predominant features. However, each of the schemes would also include significant areas of open space and landscaping. This would mitigate the impact to a degree, and I agree with the Appellant that the built edge of Morpeth would become more attractive than that which currently exists, especially over time.
45. The urban design elements of the schemes have not been criticised other than by reference to impacts on specific properties, and I am satisfied that the design and layout is generally well tuned to the location. My consideration does not extend to being a choice between either of the schemes, but is a consideration of each on its merits. In either case I have no grounds for criticising the urban design of the proposals such that it should weigh against permission being granted.
46. The site currently contributes to the character of this part of the edge of Morpeth, but my observations indicated that it is a fleeting contribution. The edge of the town becomes apparent when approaching from Clifton and before the woodland on site is reached. The surrounding countryside at that point, before the appeal site is reached, has a far more important impact on the setting and character of Morpeth.
47. Taken in the round, and including the tree belt alongside the A197 and the woodland at the southern side of the site, it is my judgement that the proposed development would introduce a moderate change to character in an area of moderate sensitivity. However, the self contained nature of the site would mitigate the impact of the change to the wider landscape character area. The resultant impact on landscape character would therefore be moderate at worst, and adverse.
48. Visual impact would vary depending on the sensitivity of the receptor (or viewer). Those passing by on the A197 can be regarded as being of moderate to low sensitivity, whilst those living alongside the site can be regarded as being of high sensitivity.
49. The magnitude of change would, in my judgement, be moderate to slight for those passing by, but major for those with direct residential views into the site. Again, it is fair to regard the impact as adverse in that views would take in built development where none existed before. So the visual impact of the proposed development would vary from moderate to slight and adverse, to major and adverse.

50. The commercial element of the schemes would be likely to be the most prominent, though no details are available of this part of the proposals. Any visual impact would be the subject of assessment at the time of future detailed submissions. However, I have no reason to believe that it would not be possible to produce a scheme which was of attractive design, and well assimilated into the existing built and landscaped framework of the area.
51. I note here that the adverse nature of the impact would reduce over time with the establishment of new landscaping within the site, reducing the longer term visual impacts.
52. Taken overall I am in no doubt that either of the proposed developments would introduce adverse impacts to landscape character and visual appreciation of the site. These impacts would range from slight to moderate, to major. The major impacts would be of restricted extent and would largely incorporate private views, which themselves are of limited weight. Impacts would be mitigated over time by the establishment of the proposed new landscaping within the site.
53. Notwithstanding the lack of conflict with Local Plan Policy MC4, there would be harm to the character and appearance resulting from the development, and breach of the settlement limit in saved Policy MC1 (following C1). But I have already determined that that policy cannot now be regarded as up to date, and it can be afforded little weight. In my judgement, the overall impact on character and appearance would be of moderate magnitude. It would be correct to describe it as not unduly significant. Nonetheless the harm must be weighed against the benefits of the schemes.

Flood Risk

54. There is no dispute that Morpeth and its environs are susceptible to flooding, having experienced difficult episodes in recent years. In this case there are 2 main components to the flood risk question – fluvial flooding and foul/surface water drain flooding.
55. Dealing first with fluvial flooding, there are 2 watercourses to consider. The first is that to the south-east of the site, Catch Burn. This flows towards and through the village of Hepscoth, which has been subjected to serious flooding in recent years⁴. There is understandable concern that any flows generated by the proposed development might exacerbate the situation downstream.
56. I have, however, been provided with a significant amount of information and modelling which indicates that the surface water drainage from the site could and would be controlled by the introduction of attenuation ponds. These would be designed to gradually release water in periods of heavy rain, thereby avoiding downstream problems being caused or worsened by site runoff. The Environment Agency (EA) has seen the modelling and information and has resolved to withdraw its initial objection. In fact I am told that modelling has allowed for almost double the existing greenfield runoff rate, plus a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change. Whilst some doubt was brought to bear on the information which the EA has seen, on the balance of probabilities I am satisfied that the evidence indicates that the EA is content with the proposals, and that they form a robust approach to dealing with flood risk.

⁴ See for example Inquiry Document 28

57. I do not take the evidence given by local people who have direct experience of the situation lightly, and recognise their worries about the effectiveness of the proposed sustainable drainage system (SUDS). Indeed in many ways their evidence is the best source of information. But the expert evidence which deals with modelling of flows and attenuation has not been shown to be unreliable and it has followed accepted and tried methodology. I cannot agree that the suggestion that attenuation ponds should be expanded greatly has been justified by substantive and credible evidence and measurement.
58. The second watercourse is the 'unnamed tributary' to Church Burn, on the north-western side of the site. This is a relatively small ditch like watercourse which gathers water from the area around that side of the appeals site. This tributary was apparently diverted in the past to skirt around the existing Loansdean development, having previously run into and across the appeals site. I have seen the clear evidence of flooding which has subsequently occurred at properties close to the tributary, on Fairway, in the submitted photographs⁵.
59. The treatment of surface water here is less clear cut in the appeals proposals. I heard that the north-western part of the site, which is an existing landscaped area scheduled for retention, could be used for the siting of attenuation for any water running along the tributary. I also heard that development of the site will in any event reduce flows into the combined drains at The Chip and Fairway, thus reducing surface water reaching the tributary.
60. On balance I am satisfied that it would be possible to ensure that surface water is intercepted and attenuated in such a way that flows from the site are controlled and downstream conditions are, at worst not made more difficult, but at best are improved. This could be ensured by the imposition of appropriate conditions, which I deal with below.
61. Turning now to flows through drainage pipes I first note that Northumbrian Water (NW) has offered 2 alternative connections to the foul sewer. But again local residents are concerned that the system, as it flows towards the recently upgraded treatment works in Morpeth, would have the potential to overload existing infrastructure.
62. Expert evidence does not support the residents' position. Calculations made indicate that existing sewers can accept the likely flows from either of the proposals for the site. The on site pumping station would, I am told, be likely to be in use at times of lower flow downstream (where gravity systems take immediate and direct flows) because of the time delay in the pumps initiating.
63. The pumping station lower down the system, at Salisbury Street, has been known to overflow, but this is much further down the system, where many outlets have converged shortly before the treatment works. I am therefore not persuaded that flows from the appeals site would have any material impact on flows through the Salisbury Street pumping station.
64. My conclusion on this issue must realistically follow the fact that the authorities charged with 'overseeing' both fluvial flooding matters (EA) and sewerage concerns (NW) have agreed the approach taken by the Appellants. Despite the concerns of local people I do not have substantive evidence that either of the

⁵ See for example Inquiry Documents 26 and 32
www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate

proposed developments would in any way exacerbate the existing situation, and may in fact offer opportunities which would be of benefit. I therefore find no conflict with the objectives of Local Plan Policy RE5 which, in the round, seek to ensure that development does not cause or exacerbate flooding, and makes appropriate arrangements to deal with runoff from the site.

65. The proposal also satisfies the advice of the NPPF in this respect, and adheres to the principles published in Planning Practice Guidance.

Traffic Flows and Highway Safety

66. It is beyond dispute that either of the proposed developments would generate traffic flows which would impact upon the local highway network. No issue is taken by the Highway Authority, which is content with the proposals and the associated mitigation in the form of, for example, lane alterations on the approach to roundabouts.

67. My own observations before, during and after the sitting period of the inquiry, at various times of day, including peak times, suggest that the network is likely to be able to cope with the extra traffic generated. This is especially so with the added improvements agreed. I do take the evidence of local residents seriously, but in this instance I am not satisfied that the objections made can be justified. I also note that the proposed developments include the provision of a travel plan which would seek to encourage the use of public transport.

68. The signal controlled pedestrian crossing close to Telford Bridge is used by many people, including children walking to school. Flows would increase here, but a minimal adjustment to timing of the crossing would allow traffic to flow satisfactorily and delay to be minimised, whilst having no perceptible impact on pedestrians. There is no evidence that any adverse safety implications would flow from the proposal.

69. The NPPF is clear that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. I have no substantive evidence that such a situation would occur here, but do have compelling evidence that impacts would be slight. I am therefore able to afford little weight to the representations which allege harm by reason of unacceptable increases in traffic flows or reduction in highway safety.

Sustainability

70. I deal now with the threads of sustainability outlined in the NPPF, these being the environmental, economic and social threads, together with the policies in the NPPF as a whole.

71. I have, as noted above, found some harm in environmental terms because of the fact of the loss of countryside, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area. But, as also noted, the harm is of limited extent geographically because of the self contained nature of the site. There would also be some benefits in the supplemental planting within and adjacent to the existing tree belt. There would be no demonstrable harm to flood risk, and potentially some benefit.

72. Economically there would be benefits in the provision of jobs associated with the development of the site. There would also be likely to be beneficial impacts

from the small commercial element of the proposal, which may well provide small scale services for the local community as well as long term employment.

73. There would, in my assessment, be significant social benefits from the proposals. These would be manifest in the potential for the provision of local services, but also in the substantial provision of affordable housing in either development. These are matters not to be minimised.
74. The Appellant's planning witness has provided his assessment of the appeals against the totality of the policy in the NPPF in his proof of evidence. The principal controversial matters in the appeals which include elements of NPPF policy relate to the question of housing land supply and location, flood risk, landscape impact, provision of affordable housing, and highway matters, and these are considered earlier. There are other policies within the NPPF relating to such matters as design, promoting healthy communities, and the historic environment, which are not at issue.
75. Taking these matters in the round I am satisfied that the site is, in terms of the NPPF as a whole, a sustainable site when assessed against NPPF policies. Given that policies for the supply of housing are out of date (as identified above) it is therefore appropriate that paragraph 14 of the NPPF is in play. The presumption is in favour of granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Other Matters

76. I heard at the inquiry that land to the south of the appeals site is in the same ownership. Local residents are concerned that approval of either of the current schemes would encourage an application on that land, and make it more difficult to resist. I disagree. Each application must be considered in the light of the circumstances pertaining at the time, and approval of either of the schemes before me would not lend any support to other applications on specific sites. They would have to follow their own course in the light of up to date circumstances, including the housing land supply at that time.
77. I also heard concerns expressed in relation to the use of high quality agricultural land as a result of these proposals. The NPPF recognises this as a matter to be addressed. There is a requirement on local authorities to seek to use poorer quality land where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary. I have not been made aware that the Council has identified any such necessity at present. Consequently each application must be considered individually, and these schemes would not involve the loss of a significant amount of high quality land. This matter can only be afforded limited weight.
78. Other appeal decisions have been brought to my attention. They cannot be treated as precedents. However, they do illustrate the changing interpretation of the NPPF and appropriate weights to be afforded to saved Local Plan policies as time passes. These other decisions are not of assistance in determining the appeals before me.
79. There was some comment about the status and treatment of the small area of open space to the rear of properties on Fairway, known as Herons Field. This area is used by local residents and in some plans has been indicated as being

incorporated into open space for the appeals proposal. However, Herons Field is not within the application sites for either proposal. Any future intention to extend open space into it would need to be the subject of agreement with the property owners. Omission of Herons Field from the proposals would have no material difference and would accord with the wishes of local residents. This is not a matter which is of material weight in the balance.

Conditions and Obligations

Conditions

80. A list of suggested conditions was provided in the event that I decided to allow either of the appeals. This was largely agreed, though with amendments for necessity, precision and enforceability, and to meet the tests set out in Planning Practice Guidance.
81. Apart from standard time limiting conditions it is necessary to impose a series of conditions to ensure the development is carried out to a standard which achieves an acceptable visual impact. These cover matters such as external materials, provision of refuse storage, tree protection, details of new landscaping and its management, and lighting. It is also necessary to impose conditions to ensure impacts are minimised for ecological and archaeological reasons.
82. Notwithstanding that I am satisfied that flood risk can be avoided a series of conditions requiring details to be agreed in these matters is necessary and reasonable. In order to mitigate impacts on local residents and the wider community conditions are necessary which control on site working, mitigation of noise, highway works and provision of on site amenities.
83. In relation to the outline part of the proposals it is necessary to impose conditions dealing with similar matters to those above, but also conditions controlling matters such as external storage, floodlighting and storage of trade refuse. These are necessary in the interests of the appearance and general amenities of the locality.

Obligations

84. Planning obligations (and deeds of variation) pursuant to S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been submitted for each proposal. The obligations are in the form of agreements with the Council in relation to the delivery of, and disposal or letting of, the proposed affordable housing units.
85. I am satisfied that these obligations are necessary and that they fairly and reasonably relate to the development to be carried out. As a consequence they meet the terms of the Community Infrastructure Regulations of 2010. I am therefore able to take the obligations into account in reaching my decisions.

The Overall Balance and Conclusion

86. Drawing together my conclusions I find the following:
 - i) There is a failure to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. Policies for the supply of housing are out of date. This carries substantial weight;

- ii) The provision of affordable housing is a matter which weighs significantly in the balance in favour of the proposals;
- iii) The harm to the character and appearance of the area is moderate and mitigated by the self contained nature of the site;
- iv) Flood risk is not likely to cause difficulties in the future, and in any case detailed mitigation can be required by condition;
- v) Highway and traffic impacts would be acceptable;
- vi) Taken overall the proposals accord with the NPPF to the extent that they can be regarded as being sustainable;
- vii) Paragraph 14 of NPPF is engaged;
- viii) There are no other matters which are determinative in the appeals.

87. The benefits of providing much needed housing for both open market sale and for affordable provision are significant and weighty matters. There are no adverse impacts which are significant and demonstrable such that the presumption in paragraph 14 of the NPPF should not apply.

88. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH APPEALS EXCEPT AS NOTED IN THE CONDITIONS

Full Planning Permission – the residential development

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the following approved plans:

Appeal A

Dwg No 2110-D-00-003 Rev B (Site location @ 1:2000)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-015 Rev E (Site Layout with Affordable Overlay)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-016 Rev G (Proposed Site Layout)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-023 (Site Layout showing Phasing)

Appeal B

Dwg No 2110-D-00-003 Rev B (Site location @ 1:2000)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-015 Rev J (Site Layout with Affordable Overlay)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-016 Rev P (Proposed Site Layout)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-022 Rev G (Proposed Site Plan @ 1:500)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-023 Rev B (Site Layout showing Phasing)

Appeals A and B

Dwg No 2110-D-00-100 (House Type: Bungalow)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-101 (House Type: Salisbury)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-102 (House Type: Sandhurst)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-103 (House Type: Talbot)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-104 (House Type: Brampton 2)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-106 (House Type: Bracknell)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-107 (House Type: Stourton)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-108 (House Type: Weston 2)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-109 (House Type: Belsay 2)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-110 (House Type: Brentwood 2)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-111 (House Type: Strand 2)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-112 (House Type: Kirby)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-113 (House Type: Coleridge)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-114 (House Type: Wetmore)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-115 (House Type: Rothschild)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-116 (House Type: Portland 2 Elevations)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-117 (House Type: Portland 2 Plans)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-118 (House Type: Bowland 2 Elevations)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-119 (House Type: Bowland 2 Plans)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-120 (House Type: Epping Elevations)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-121 (House Type: Epping Plans)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-122 Rev A (T2 House)
Dwg No 2110-D-00-123 Rev A (T3 House)

- 3) No construction work or deliveries to the construction site, in connection with the development hereby approved, shall be carried out other than

between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Mondays to Fridays, 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

- 4) No development shall commence until a schedule and samples of the materials to be used on the external elevations of the dwellings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be constructed other than in accordance with these approved materials.
- 5) No dwelling shall be occupied until details of the provision of refuse and recycling storage for each dwelling, and a programme for implementation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details and approved implementation schedule. The refuse/recycling area shall have a direct and level access from the street to the dwelling and be capable of accommodating the appropriate refuse/recycling bins.
- 6) No development shall commence until precise details of areas of hardstanding adjacent to the private access roads for the accommodation of wheeled bins on collection day have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the hardstanding areas shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the first dwelling is occupied.
- 7) No development shall commence until a detailed scheme to protect all the trees on the site identified as being retained in the submitted document "Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement, Ref ARB/AE/529" by Elliott Consultancy Ltd (4 January 2012) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The erection of fencing for the protection of all retained trees shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made.
- 8) No development shall commence until a fully detailed landscaping scheme, showing both hard and soft landscaping proposals (the detailed landscape planting plan must include the planting of locally native trees, shrubs, wildflowers and grasses of local provenance) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include, where required, the planting of trees and shrubs including a fully detailed planting schedule setting out species, numbers, densities and locations, provision of cross-site wildlife corridor linkages and sustainable urban drainage ponds, provision of screen walls or fences, the mounding of earth, the creation of areas of hardstanding, pathways etc, areas to be seeded with grass and other works or proposals for improving the appearance of the development. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings not later than the expiry of the next planting season following commencement of the development, or within such other time as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaped areas shall be subsequently maintained to

- ensure establishment of the approved scheme including watering, weeding and the replacement of any plants, or areas of seeding or turfing comprised in the approved landscaping plans, which fail within a period up to five years from the completion of the development.
- 9) No development shall commence until a detailed landscape management plan (for areas other than domestic gardens) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved plan shall be implemented in complete accordance with the approved details.
 - 10) No development shall take place unless in accordance with the mitigation measures detailed in the protected species report "An Extended Phase 1 & Bat Survey of Land at Loansdean, Morpeth" by E3 Ecology Ltd (7 November 2011).
 - 11) No development shall take place unless in accordance with the bird mitigation measures detailed in the protected species report "An Extended Phase 1 & Bat Survey of Land at Loansdean, Morpeth" by E3 Ecology Ltd (13 December 2011) including no development being undertaken between 1st March and 31st August in any calendar year unless an appropriately qualified ecologist has first confirmed that no birds nests that are being built or are in use, or eggs of dependent young will be damaged or destroyed; bird boxes being installed in the south eastern woodland area (type, numbers and timing of installation to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority beforehand); and a barn owl box being installed on either tree T1 or T2 at least two months prior to any tree works commencing.
 - 12) No development shall commence until a scheme of archaeological monitoring work for the duration of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the agreed monitoring details.
 - 13) No development shall commence until a detailed scheme for the treatment of foul flows from the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Northumbrian Water Ltd. Thereafter, no dwellings on the site shall be occupied until the scheme for the treatment of foul flows has been completed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details.
 - 14) No development shall commence until a detailed scheme for the accurate location, protection of and access to Northumbrian Water Ltd apparatus, during construction and following completion of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Northumbrian Water Ltd. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
 - 15) No development shall commence until a fully detailed scheme for the management of surface water from the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in complete accordance with the agreed details and in accordance with the timing/phasing

arrangements embodied within the scheme and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

- 16) No development shall commence until details of the proposed western bund have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the bund shall be implemented and subsequently maintained in complete accordance with the agreed details and in accordance with the-timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the approved surface water management scheme pursuant to Condition 15 above.
- 17) If during development currently unknown contamination is identified then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a remediation scheme for dealing with the contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 18) Written validation certification that the remediation works have been completed in a manner to ensure safety for future occupiers of the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within one month of the date of completion of the remediation works.
- 19) No development shall commence until details of measures to mitigate the impacts of noise from vehicular traffic using the A197 on those residential properties occupying plots 2, 3, 4, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56 (Appeal A) and 2, 3, 4, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54 (Appeal B) immediately adjacent to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those dwellings shall not be occupied until such time that the agreed mitigation measures have been installed in complete accordance with the approved details.
- 20) No construction shall commence on the site unless the proposed new roundabout on the A197 at the entrance to the site has been constructed in accordance with a detailed design and specification to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and has been fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 21) None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until improvements to the existing roundabouts at the A192/A197 Mafeking and A197/County Hall junctions have been completed in accordance with a design and specification to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and has been fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 22) No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of wheel wash facilities, or provision of a road sweeper and road cleaning schedule to ensure that the roads around the construction site are kept clear of mud and debris, dust suppression measures, compound provision for the storage of materials and temporary parking for site operatives and visitors, and the siting of construction access(es) where applicable. Thereafter, the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction Method Statement.

- 23) The areas allocated for parking on the submitted plans shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.
- 24) No development shall take place until a fully dimensioned layout plan incorporating road drainage, street and footpath lighting, and landscaping together with a longitudinal section of the new road and details of construction of the carriageway, footpaths and accesses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Authority.
- 25) The proposed roads, including footpaths and turning spaces where applicable, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling is served by a properly consolidated and surfaced footpath and carriageway to at least base course level between the dwelling and existing highway before it is occupied.
- 26) Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied, finalised travel plan targets shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Authority, and the travel plan shall be implemented as approved.
- 27) Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling a detailed scheme for the provision of a children's play area on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the children's play area shall be provided in the agreed location and in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the 30th dwelling.

Outline Planning Permission – the commercial development

- 28) Approval of the details of the layout, scale and appearance of the commercial elements of the proposal, including materials and surfacing finishes for the hard landscaping, and soft landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced. Thereafter, development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.
- 29) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 30) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.
- 31) No development shall commence on the commercial elements of the scheme hereby permitted until a schedule and samples of the materials to be used on the external elevations of the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be constructed other than with these approved materials.
- 32) No construction work or deliveries to the construction site, in connection with the commercial element of the development hereby permitted, shall be carried out other than between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Mondays

to Fridays, 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

- 33) No service vehicles shall be allowed to arrive at or depart from commercial element of the development hereby permitted, between the hours of 9.00pm and 7.00am Monday to Saturday, and between 5.00pm and 9.00am on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- 34) No air heating and/or cooling systems shall be installed at the commercial element of the development hereby permitted until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including the noise emissions of the systems, their locations, and proposed hours of operation. The systems shall thereafter be installed and operated strictly in accordance with the approved details.
- 35) No display or storage of goods, materials, unfixed plant or equipment shall take place other than within the buildings hereby permitted.
- 36) The landscaping scheme required by condition 28 above shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the end of the year in which the development starts, or within such other time as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in writing beforehand. The landscaped areas shall be subsequently maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme including watering, weeding and the replacement of any plants which fail.
- 37) Before development commences details of any fencing or other means of enclosure to be installed on the commercial part of the site hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 38) No floodlighting or any other form of external lighting shall be installed on the commercial part of the site until details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, lighting shall not be installed other than in accordance with the approved details.
- 39) The commercial units hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until details of the facilities to be provided for the storage of refuse have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the units shall not be brought into use until these facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details. All waste materials awaiting collection shall be stored within a suitable covered and enclosed lockable area or receptacles. The waste receptacles should be easily accessible by the waste collectors and should have sufficient capacity for the waste produced.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE SOUTH MORPETH COALITION:

Mr D Holden FCCA	Local resident
Cllr J Tebbutt BA PGCE CQSW	Local Councillor
Dr G Parkin BSc PhD	Senior Lecturer in Hydrology

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr I Dove QC
Miss N Pindham of Counsel

They called

Mr M Chard BA(Hons) DipLA MAUD CMLI	Barton Willmore LLP
Dr N Bunn BSc(Hons) PhD MCIHT CMILT	WYG Transport
Mr S Dickie MSc BEng CEng CEnv CWEM	Technical Director, Fairhurst Consulting Engineers
Mr J Hall MCD MRTPI	Partner, Barton Willmore LLP

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr T Graham	Solicitor, Northumberland County Council, to respond to the costs application
-------------	--

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr D Parker	Morpeth Town Council
Cllr A Tebbutt	Local Councillor
Mr K Kirkbride	Local resident
Mr P McKenna	Local resident
Mr P Ashmore	Chair, Hepscoth Parish Council
Mr T Smith	Morpeth Flood Action Group
Mrs W Stafford	Local resident
Mr D Thompson	Local resident

DOCUMENTS (submitted at the inquiry, and afterwards by agreement)

FROM SOUTH MORPETH COALITION

- 1 Opening Statement
- 2 Information and table on the difference between SMC and the Appellant on housing land supply calculations
- 3 Extract from South East Northumberland Growth Point Programme
- 4 Copy of objection letter to the first application from persimmon Homes
- 5 Appeal Decision ref: APP/P2935/A/12/2181035
- 6 Closing Statement
- 7 Comments on information submitted by the Appellant relating to flood risk

FROM THE APPELLANT

- 8 Opening Statement
- 9 Judgements in the 'Hunston' and South Northamptonshire cases
- 10 Secretary of State decision ref: APP/A0665/A/11/2167430
- 11 Information on the use of Area Tree Preservation Orders
- 12 Southgate, Morpeth Tree Preservation Order, 1969
- 13 Letter from Isos Housing relating to the proposed affordable housing
- 14 Explanation of the Council's housing delivery areas
- 15 Bundle of information from Mr Dickie responding to Morpeth Flood Action Group
- 16 Bundle of documents including executed S106 Obligations relating to both proposed schemes
- 17 Morpeth Town Council comments on the Core Strategy preferred options
- 18 Application for costs
- 19 Reply to the Council's response to the costs application
- 20 Closing submissions
- 21 List of suggested conditions
- 22 Information on flood risk

FROM OTHER PARTIES

- 23 Written statement from Cllr D Parker
- 24 Written statement from Cllr A Tebbutt
- 25 Written statement from Mr P Ashmore
- 26 Bundle of documents from Mr T Smith
- 27 Written statement of Mr D Thompson
- 28 Letter from Mrs J McPhail, member of Hepscott Flood Action Group
- 29 Letter from Mr C Pearson

FROM THE COUNCIL

- 30 Homefinder data submitted at the request of the Inspector
- 31 Response to the costs application, with source materials

PHOTOGRAPHS SUBMITTED SEPARATELY

- 32 Photographs from Mr P McKenna