

---

**Re: Notes of meeting**

1 message

**Jenny Ludman** <jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk>

22 May 2017 at 15:26

To: terrycrozier@btinternet.com

Cc: George Thompson &lt;gtlager@gmail.com&gt;, Fraser Reynolds &lt;freynolds@hotmail.co.uk&gt;, Mike ROWELL &lt;mjrowell.303@btinternet.com&gt;, Neil Liddle &lt;nliddle49@gmail.com&gt;, Tony Harries &lt;a.v.harries@durham.ac.uk&gt;, eileen.hall8@btinternet.com, robinminney@mail.ru

Dear All,

I have spent quite a bit of time looking at your Plan, and have put comments in as sticky notes in the pdf. Please ignore them if you wish – I may be a bit super critical now that I have been involved in quite a lot more NPs now, and am perhaps a bit more cautious about policies than I once was, and if you want the plan to be meaningful, it really does need to be as clear as possible.

Some general comments I would make about the Plan and background papers are as follows:

- **Maps:** I think you should try and get all the policies on one map, properly labelled. This will make the Plan easier to read. Your key would be split into areas that are Policies, and areas that are for 'information'. So, for example, your Key would refer to Policies on LGS, Settlement Boundary, Historic Core, and Front Street Regeneration Area. Your 'information' designations would be the green belt, and the designated Local Wildlife Site. You also refer to a wildlife corridor in the Plan, but not sure whether this is a designation you want to make through the NP, or whether it is a designation already (I know there is one). If so, do you want to refer to it on the Policies Map?
- **Policy Justifications:** I think it really needs to be more of a policy 'explanation', so providing clarity on what is meant in different parts of the policy, or explaining it more clearly in a way which wouldn't be appropriate within the policy itself. The justification for all the policies is really provided at the beginning, with all the summaries. There is quite a bit of repetition in the policy explanations (i.e. stuff that is already elsewhere in the Plan).
- **Background Documents: Historic Core:** I think you need a lot more information on this, including photographs and maps, (including historic maps) perhaps reference to listed buildings, and the contribution they make to the historic core. There is quite a lot of information on the Parish Council website I noticed which could be useful? It's translating this into something that gives clarity about what is historically important about this particular area, and why. You can get character appraisals done (by AECOM) under a technical support package through Locality. This might be worth considering. If you have a policy that is demanding a more rigorous approach to development in a certain area, then you really need a lot more justification for it.
- **Background Documents: Settlement Boundaries:** Again, I think you need more information here. Most of it is the methodology, which I think should almost be a separate document. The important bit is the last couple of pages, explaining why the settlement boundary is where it is. Again, I think you need to use maps ideally, but definitely have photographs as well, particularly where you are referring to the landscape and its importance to the setting of the village. More reference to reasons as to why the boundary is where it is – more specific preferably. Also, a map showing where the 'existing' settlement boundary is – there may be information that was used in drawing that up available as well? Landscape studies by DCC may help?
- **Background Documents: Local Green Spaces:** These should identify each green space, why it is important (in terms of the criteria in the NPPF). It should include maps of each green space, photographs, and a summary of why it is important to the local community, what the local community have said to support its designation, etc.

There seem to be rather a lot of LGS – a couple are in the green belt. Could they be something else, rather than LGS? Is one of them the wildlife site? In which case, it might be better to refer to it as that, rather than LGS.

- Background Documents: Housing Paper: I can't find a reference in this to why the density of development behind Front Street has to be 26 to the hectare, although it is referenced in the Plan. I know you are not allocating the other 'brownfield sites' in Witton Gilbert, but is it worth at least referring to them somewhere in the Plan? Again, if you were to get some assistance from AECOM, you could get more work done on the Housing Needs side of things. I have made comments separately on the Housing Paper as well.
- Format of Plan: I know it was me that had it in landscape form originally, but it might be easier if it was just normal A4 portrait. I'm not sure why some paragraphs are numbered and others are not. I think the numbering is a bit erratic and confusing. It would be better if all paragraphs were numbered, or none. The 'policy intention' should, I think, be in a separate coloured box, or above the policy in brackets.
- Justification/Explanation sections. I think these need to be more brief, and more clearly linked to the criteria of the policies. It should really be there to help 'interpret' the policy where there is any ambiguity. Any background information should perhaps be as an introduction to the policy, rather than coming after the policy as an 'explanation'.
- It could do with a 'glossary' to explain terms throughout the plan – happy to help with this if needed.

**Jenny Ludman MRTPI**

**Ludman Planning**

**Tel: 01434 611575**

**Mob: 07979 195455**

**Eastburn, South Park, Hexham, NE46 1BS**

**E-mail: [jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk](mailto:jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk)**

**[www.ludman-planning.co.uk](http://www.ludman-planning.co.uk)**

This message (including attachments) is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. The material in it may also be subject to copyright protection. If you are not the addressee you are notified that any use, review, disclosure, or copying of the information in it is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify us. Whilst we take sensible precautions, we cannot guarantee that this message or attachments are virus free.

---

**From:** Terry Crozier <[ldtflj@gmail.com](mailto:ldtflj@gmail.com)>

**Reply-To:** <[terrycrozier@btinternet.com](mailto:terrycrozier@btinternet.com)>

**Date:** Tuesday, 16 May 2017 at 15:27

**To:** Jenny Ludman <[jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk](mailto:jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk)>

**Cc:** George Thompson <[gtlager@gmail.com](mailto:gtlager@gmail.com)>, Fraser Reynolds <[freynolds@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:freynolds@hotmail.co.uk)>, Mike ROWELL <[mjrowell.303@btinternet.com](mailto:mjrowell.303@btinternet.com)>, Neil Liddle <[nliddle49@gmail.com](mailto:nliddle49@gmail.com)>, Tony Harries <[a.v.harries@durham.ac.uk](mailto:a.v.harries@durham.ac.uk)>, <[eileen.hall8@btinternet.com](mailto:eileen.hall8@btinternet.com)>, <[robinminney@mail.ru](mailto:robinminney@mail.ru)>

**Subject:** Re: Notes of meeting

Jenny

I attach the background papers together with a suggested amendment for policy 4 from the group. Currently looking at how we structure the sustainability element. I will rough it out and copy you in to see if were going in the right direction.

Terry

On 16 May 2017 at 14:36, Jenny Ludman <[jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk](mailto:jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk)> wrote:

Further to our meeting, I am going through this version of the Plan, and the amended Policy 4, and will send comments as soon as I can.

Do you also have background evidence base papers for a) settlement boundaries, b) Local Green Spaces, and c) Heritage zone? It would help me to see these as well if possible.

Thank you!

Jenny

**Jenny Ludman MRTPI**

**Ludman Planning**

**Tel: 01434 611575**

**Mob: 07979 195455**

**Eastburn, South Park, Hexham, NE46 1BS**

**E-mail: [jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk](mailto:jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk)**

**[www.ludman-planning.co.uk](http://www.ludman-planning.co.uk)**

This message (including attachments) is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. The material in it may also be subject to copyright protection. If you are not the addressee you are notified that any use, review, disclosure, or copying of the information in it is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify us. Whilst we take sensible precautions, we cannot guarantee that this message or attachments are virus free.

---

**From:** Terry Crozier <[ldtflj@gmail.com](mailto:ldtflj@gmail.com)>

**Reply-To:** <[terrycrozier@btinternet.com](mailto:terrycrozier@btinternet.com)>

**Date:** Tuesday, 2 May 2017 at 14:14

**To:** <[eileen.hall8@btinternet.com](mailto:eileen.hall8@btinternet.com)>

**Cc:** Mike Rowell <[mjrowell.303@btinternet.com](mailto:mjrowell.303@btinternet.com)>, Jenny Ludman <[jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk](mailto:jenny@ludman-planning.co.uk)>, George Thompson <[gtlager@gmail.com](mailto:gtlager@gmail.com)>, Robin Minney <[robin@minney.org](mailto:robin@minney.org)>, Tony Harries <[a.v.harries@durham.ac.uk](mailto:a.v.harries@durham.ac.uk)>, Fraser Reynolds <[freynolds@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:freynolds@hotmail.co.uk)>, Neil Liddle <[nliddle49@gmail.com](mailto:nliddle49@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Notes of meeting

Copy of updated Np Version 13C with Older Peoples home policy added.

Should I burden Carole with this update or wait until the meeting?

Terry

On 30 April 2017 at 11:40, Eileen Hall <[eileen.hall8@btinternet.com](mailto:eileen.hall8@btinternet.com)> wrote:

Notes from last Thursday

Eileen



**"Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2032 draft version 13C 2017 with JL"s%20comments.pdf**  
12655K