



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 10 August 2016

by D R Cullingford BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/15/3141228

Land west of 29 Church View, Longhorsley, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE65 8UH

- This appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against the refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is by Mr Peter Brotherton against the decision of the Northumberland County Council.
 - The application (ref: 15/02463/OUT and dated 27 July 2015) was refused by notice dated 15 October 2015.
 - The development is described as an application for 'outline planning consent for up to 5 dwellings [with] all matters reserved'.
-

Procedural matters

1. An application for a full award of costs was made on behalf of the appellant against the Northumberland County Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Decision

2. I dismiss this appeal.

Main issue

3. From what I have heard, read and seen, I consider that this appeal turns on whether the proposal would represent acceptable and sustainable small scale development at the edge of Longhorsley or constitute an unwarranted intrusion into the countryside beyond the village that would also impair the openness of the proposed Green Belt.

Reasons

The site

4. The site is a small area of rough grazing land (extending to about 0.39ha) immediately behind the neat estates in this part of the village (Nos.31-37 Church View). It is largely immersed amongst thick hedges and old hedgerow trees, though views southwards towards the rising slopes beneath Longhorsley Moor (an SSSI) are evident across intervening open land behind Whitegates and the back garden of No.29. A footpath meanders beside the western hedgerow and adjacent ditch linking the centre of the village (to the north) past allotments and a fenced multi-purpose playground to the open countryside and the Moor beyond. A series of long narrow fields, often enclosed by mature hedgerows, lie to the west behind the dwellings on West Road; a sequence of confined verdant vistas is evident through the western hedgerow towards Smallburn Road and Smallburn Cottages.
-

5. Longhorsley is recognised as a 'sustainable settlement' and as a large village in a rural part of the County. There is a first school, a shop, a public house, sports facilities, a village hall and 3 local churches (St Helen's, St Thomas of Canterbury and a Mission Free Church). The appeal site is within easy walking distance of all those facilities along quiet roads or pleasant footpaths; all are within about 350m and some much closer. The site is also within reach of higher order services (such as banks, supermarkets, middle and high schools, as well as employment opportunities) at Morpeth (some 7 miles away), Alnwick (about 14 miles distant) and the city of Newcastle upon Tyne (roughly 22 miles to the south). An hourly bus service provides direct connections to Newcastle via Morpeth with a change providing a route to Alnwick. The bus stops are within, or little more than, 250m from the site on the A697.

The proposal

6. The application is submitted in outline with all matters, including the means of access, reserved for subsequent approval. Hence, the proposal relates only to the principle of development here, with all other matters reserved for future consideration.
7. Nevertheless, an 'indicative site plan' shows how 'up to 5' dwellings might be strung across the site and served by an access taken from the head of the cul-de-sac in Church View running behind, and close to, the rear gardens of Nos.31-37. For what it is worth, the access is shown as being about 5.5m wide and without footways, positioned hard against the side garden of No.31 and the bungalow at No.29 and rather awkwardly configured in relation to the head of the cul-de-sac. There is some scope for flexibility. There is about 6.5m between the curtilage of No.31 and the nearest wall of the bungalow at No.29 (measured at the site): fewer dwellings could be accommodated on the site: minor alterations (or complete demolition) of No.29 might be contemplated. In any event, the intention is to protect the footpath along the western boundary, keeping it open for public use and unobstructed. All services could be provided on the site. And, there is now no objection from the Council relating to ecology or the potential impact of the scheme on protected species. No concerns were raised in relation to archaeology, highways, trees or flooding.

Planning policy and the main issues

8. The Development Plan currently consists of the only 'saved' policy from the otherwise revoked Structure Plan and the 'saved' policies in the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan (2003). Under policy S5, the Structure Plan seeks to extend the Green Belt to the north of Longhorsley and to the west of Widdrington Station. Precise boundaries, including those around settlements, are to be defined in Local Plans and, although that has been done for some of the former Districts within the County, precise boundaries were not identified in the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan. However, the Local Plan does identify boundaries around settlements demarcating the on-set of open countryside in which restrictive policies are to apply (policy C1). The limited circumstances in which housing may be permitted in the countryside are set out in policy H16 and the configuration of the settlement boundary for Longhorsley is identified in policy LHC1. It is explained that the latter is defined to address the 'strategy' of limiting new residential development in the village, save for certain identified sites, in order to achieve a period of less rapid

growth than had previously occurred, then entailing development at Whitegates and Reivers Gate.

9. The Local Plan was designed to cover the period 1991-2006, a period that ended some 10 years hence. Clearly, in relation to the provision for housing, the Plan must now be out-of-date. And, although strenuous efforts are underway to identify additional sites to meet the latest assessment of the housing required, the emerging Core Strategy remains far from adoption; currently, the results of consultations on the Proposed Modifications to the Pre-Submission Draft version of that document are being considered with the expectation that a further round of consultation will be necessary on a modified version of that 'modified' document. Nevertheless, as currently envisaged, new housing is to be focussed on the 'main towns' and 'service centres' with additional large scale schemes being accommodated at Blyth, Cramlington and Morpeth, while regeneration is to be encouraged in Ashington. In smaller settlements, such as Longhorsley, new housing is expected to be of an appropriate scale, meet various local needs (amongst other criteria) and be accommodated within or next to the settlement without adversely impacting on its character (policy 3). In addition, the emerging Core Strategy defines the extent of the Green Belt and, for Longhorsley, identifies an 'inset boundary' identical to the extant settlement boundary save for amendments to reflect recent planning permissions extending the village at Reivers Gate (25 dwellings), at the Shoulder of Mutton (55 homes) and at Normandy Terrace (12 houses).
10. In the light of those policies, the Council consider that the scheme would constitute non-essential and unjustified development in the countryside beyond the settlement boundary of Longhorsley. The claim is that that a 5-year supply of housing sites exists within this housing market area (the 'central delivery area'), so that the settlement boundary still serves to provide a reasonable distinction between this part of the village and the surrounding countryside. Moreover, the consequent restraint is seen as commensurate with the spatial distribution to be pursued under policy 3 of the emerging Core Strategy. In addition, since the settlement boundary here is also intended to demarcate the Green Belt boundary, the scheme would represent inappropriate development that would impinge on the openness of the proposed Green Belt, unwarranted by any very special circumstance. The proposal would thus be contrary to policies S5, C1, H16 and LHC1, cited above, and fail to reflect the relevant advice in the Framework (NPPF).
11. Local people address similar concerns. In addition, they dispute the adequacy of the access arrangements and object to the loss of a greenfield site that contributes to the amenity and enjoyment of residents walking their dogs or moving around the village or trekking into the surrounding countryside. It is claimed that the hedgerows form a natural edge to the village. There is also much concern that adding further to the 30% increase in the number of dwellings already permitted at Longhorsley, would erode the character of the place and encourage yet further intrusions across the small fields to the west.
12. In response, it is pointed out that the proposal would represent small scale residential development, in a sustainable place, on a vacant site at the edge of the village that is well contained by existing vegetation and existing development. All that is largely as emerging policy 3 requires. Indeed, the scheme would be far less intrusive than the much larger and recently permitted proposals at Reivers Gate and the Shoulder of Mutton. Moreover, the development would be justified by

contributing (albeit modestly) to meeting a dearth in the 5-year supply of housing (as properly calculated). The settlement boundary here is identified in a Plan that has been 'time-expired' for a decade and conceived to accord with a strategy of restraint rather than with the exhortations in the Framework to boost the supply of housing significantly and to foster 'sustainable development'. In contrast, adhering to the current settlement boundary would stymie further development in Longhorsley and remove the possibility of achieving a reasonable degree of flexibility to accommodate future small scale schemes over the lifetime of the emerging Plan. Moreover, the assertion that the proposal would entail inappropriate development in the proposed Green Belt must be wrong. Detailed boundaries have yet to be defined and that must await the examination and adoption of the emerging Core Strategy. Unresolved objections remain. Nor is it obvious that the site properly fulfils the purposes of including land within the Green Belt or that the boundaries around it are suitably clear, recognisable and likely to be permanent.

13. Taking all those matters into account, I identify the issue set out above.

The settlement boundary

14. Whether or not paragraph 49 of the Framework is engaged, which indicates that 'relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites', it is clear that not all policies affecting the supply of housing deal solely with housing supply. In this case 'saved' policies C1 and LHC1 also help to demarcate land use distinctions between settlements and the countryside providing a way in which decision-taking might address the 'intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside' and the distinctiveness of settlements, as the Framework extols. Thus, the distinction between town and country is not necessarily irrelevant, nor is the need to maintain and enhance the identity of settlements necessarily redundant.
15. A similar stance is evident in the Court of Appeal judgement in *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Limited and SoS and Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council and SoS*. The judgement indicates that 'relevant policies for the supply of housing' should be interpreted in the 'broad' sense as any 'relevant policies affecting the supply of housing' or, indeed, 'restricting' the supply of deliverable housing sites. That must encompass 'saved' policies C1 and LHC1. Hence, if there is not a 5-year supply of housing land, the presumption in favour of sustainable development means that permission for this scheme should be granted unless either any consequent adverse impact would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (assessed against the advice in the Framework as a whole) or specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted. Nevertheless, that does not provide *carte blanche* to necessarily disregard or discard a policy which is deemed to be 'out-of-date'. The judgement explains that the statutory requirements, both to have regard to the Development Plan and to make decisions in accordance with it unless material considerations indicate otherwise, remain. The task is to set those statutory requirements against the other material considerations that apply in order to arrive at an appropriate balance in favour or against the scheme, always bearing in mind that the advice in the Framework is itself an important material consideration.

16. In this case, the settlement boundary follows the strong hedgerow behind the dwellings in Church View. And, although the site itself is enclosed by an old hedgerow to the west and a 'belt' of trees to the north, it is beyond a 'crisp' boundary (in the words of my colleague - APP/P2935/W/16/3145262) that continues northwards between the dwellings within the village and the allotments, the play area and the countryside beyond, and southwards between the Whitegates estate and the adjacent open pasture. In my view, the appeal site contributes to a functional and visual coherence evident here. First, its verdant presence heralds the on-set of the countryside as the footpath across it emerges from the village, past the allotments and the play area. Second, the site affords fine views southwards towards the rising slopes beneath Longhorsley Moor and across intervening open land, thereby creating a visual connection to the surrounding countryside. Third, the site forms part of a pattern of small fields at the edge of the village stretching southwards and westwards, a pattern that is perceived from the footpath on the site. In those ways, I think that the site not only contributes to the character and appearance of the countryside here, but also to a distinctive relationship between this part of the village and the fields and farmland in which it is immersed. It follows that the settlement boundary here continues to demarcate an evident distinction between the village and the surrounding countryside, in spite of the age of the statutory Local Plan; that contributes to the distinctiveness of the place and enhances the identity of this settlement.
17. The proposal would breach that settlement boundary and be seen to intrude into the countryside beyond. It would result in development of some kind beyond the village that would meet none of the requirements of policies H16, C1 or LHC1. The scheme would also appear oddly marooned behind the existing estate jutting out into a mainly rural landscape. In that respect there would be similarities with the larger scheme recently dismissed by my colleague behind Whitegates (APP/P2935/W/16/3145262). And, partly for that reason, I rather agree with local people that permission for the appeal proposal could, all too easily, serve as a precedent for similar schemes that could cumulatively erode the small fields at the edge of this village with a succession of separate and uncoordinated housing projects. I consider that the consequences of such development would be very damaging. It remains to consider whether such damage would also impinge on the proposed Green Belt and whether it would be warranted, in any event, by a demonstrable lack of the housing required over the next 5 years.

Green Belt

18. The Council assert that the proposal would also entail inappropriate development in the proposed Green Belt, since a breach of the settlement boundary would be a breach of the intended Green Belt boundary in this part of the village. But, although Longhorsley is immersed in the adopted Green Belt, as extended under 'saved' policy S5, detailed boundaries (as required by that policy) have yet to be defined. They are not defined in the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan. The intention is to define them in the emerging Core Strategy. But the device of adopting an amended settlement boundary to serve as the Green Belt 'inset' at Longhorsley is explained no further. The function and purpose of such boundaries are different. And, although they may coincide, such coincidence needs proper justification. That is even more important here because the assessment of the Green Belt potential of the land around Longhorsley has resulted in exactly the same conclusion for the sector including the appeal site as for the sectors on which development has now been permitted at Reivers Gate and the Shoulder of Mutton.

No evidence is adduced to show why the characteristics of the former make it appropriate for inclusion in the proposed Green Belt while the characteristics of the latter do not. Nor is evidence presented to show that the intended configuration of the Green Belt boundary has involved any consideration of whether or not it is necessary to keep the appeal site permanently open for Green Belt purposes. That is a crucial test. In the absence of such evidence, and in the face of unresolved objections, the precise configuration of the Green Belt boundary around Longhorsley must await the outcome of the examination process and the adoption of the emerging Core Strategy. In the meantime, the appeal site is located just where uncertainty is greatest, on the very edge of the village. That is quite different from the situation at Fenrother (APP/P2935/A/13/2194195) where 5 wind turbines were proposed to be sited unambiguously in the adopted Green Belt, as extended under policy S5.

19. In those circumstances, I consider that it is not yet possible to find that the proposal would impair the openness of the proposed Green Belt or contravene Green Belt policy.

The 5-year housing land supply

20. The appellants suggest that the proposed development would be justified by contributing (albeit modestly) to meeting a dearth in the 5-year supply of housing (as properly calculated). The contribution of a scheme entailing no more than 5 dwellings (and maybe less) would indeed be modest. But, I accept that the question of whether a 5-year supply of housing land can be demonstrated can affect the weight to be afforded to the settlement boundary here. It is thus necessary to consider the point.
21. When the application was submitted the *Northumberland Five Year Supply of Deliverable Sites (2014–2019)* indicated provision for only 3.8 years within the County as a whole and just 3.6 years in the relevant 'housing market area' (the 'central delivery area'). However, in determining the application, an updated version of that document (2015–2020), although then unpublished, indicated that sufficient land existed to accommodate the housing requirements for 5.3 years within the County and for 6.1 years in the 'central delivery area'. Those latest results are disputed.
22. I need not deal with every dispute. The Council's response document demonstrates that the allowance for small windfall sites is well within the numbers that have actually been recently achieved and that the contribution from bringing empty homes back into use is not only supported by a relevant initiative but also would do no more than reduce the proportion of long term empty homes in the County towards (though still above) the national average. In both cases, I think that the allowances are modest but reasonable. Instead, the main disagreements relate to the rate of delivery on some large sites, the inclusion of sites currently within the Green Belt, the application of the 'buffer', the methodology and, although not disputed by the main parties, the 'buffer' itself.
23. Starting with the 'buffer' itself, the Framework and the Guidance (NPPG) indicate that a 'buffer' of 5% should be added to the housing required over the next 5 years to allow for choice, but that a buffer' of 20% should be added where there has been 'persistent under delivery'. The latter concept is not defined. But, there is nothing 'persistent' in the definition advanced in the Council's housing supply document.

There, it is suggested that if the annual delivery is below the 'target' more often than it is above, and if the overall requirement (over the monitoring period) has not been met, then 'persistent under delivery' has occurred. But the 'target' is an annual average, here taken over some 15 years. Variations about an average are inevitable and the excess of one kind of variation over another may largely be a matter of chance rather than 'persistence'. Much more importantly, housing is not a commodity that can be delivered in accordance with a uniform distribution. That is so even at a national level let alone within one modest 'housing market area'. Instead, housing comes in lumps and it follows cycles. An assessment of 'delivery' should take such characteristics into account and, indeed, the Guidance advocates taking an appropriately long term view. In this case the SHMA actually demonstrates that, over the last dozen years or so, the then relevant target had been missed only once more than it had been met. (The result is the same with the latest 'full and objective assessment of need' substituted for the requirement of the revoked RSS, where applicable). Such an occurrence is exactly what might be expected by chance. Moreover, until 2010/11, the cumulative requirement over the preceding decade or so had been achieved. And, although the annual requirement was not met over the subsequent 3 years, it was exceeded in 2014/15 (the last year for which figures are available). So, even though more than a year's supply remains undelivered, such under delivery could not be described accurately as 'persistent'. On the contrary, not only has the current under delivery accumulated during a severe building recession, but also there is every sign of a current recovery, the recent delivery levels exceeding the requirement. In such circumstances, the appropriate 'buffer' is just 5% to allow for choice.

24. The next step is to decide where the 'buffer' should be applied. The Council suggest that it should only be applied to the 5-year requirement without the addition of any 'shortfall' previously accumulated. That is wrong. The 'shortfall' is the accumulated failure to meet what has previously been required. It is thus part of the requirement. It would clearly be nonsense to suggest that the dwellings required over the next 5 years would suffice if nothing had materialised over the previous 5 year period; a shortage would remain and the cumulative requirement would not have been met. The 'buffer' (in this case an addition of 5%) must apply to the 'shortfall' and the 'requirement'. This is exactly as my colleague indicates in the Great Ayton appeal (APP/G2713/A/14/2218137) and, as she suggests, notwithstanding one or two previous appeal decisions, to do otherwise must be wrong.
25. The Council adopt the 'Liverpool' method of addressing the identified shortfall in delivering the dwellings required (making up any shortfall over the lifetime of the Plan) rather than the 'Sedgefield' approach (making up any shortfall within the next 5 years). Although both may be legitimate methods in certain carefully defined circumstances, the Guidance is clear, at least as far as it goes. It advocates dealing with any undersupply within the first 5 years, 'where possible'. A legitimate doubt involves the interpretation of what 'where possible' might reasonably mean. It must mean more than just 'difficult'. After all, the whole point of the exercise is to 'boost the supply of housing significantly' and to encourage a proactive approach in bringing forward sites for development that have already been identified and in identifying others to meet the specified requirements. Moreover, the Guidance indicates that 'where [the shortfall] cannot be met in the first 5 years, local planning authorities will need to work with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate'. That is quite a severe test. It implies that, if the Sedgefield

approach cannot be met within the confines of a particular authority (perhaps due to severe constraints or exceptional needs), then efforts to do so should be made by cooperating with neighbouring Councils. No evidence is adduced to show that any of that Guidance applies within either the County or within the 'central delivery area'. On the contrary, the argument is that because a 'step change' in delivery is not expected until the 6-10 year period (due to many of the identified sites being large and requiring long 'lead-in' times before delivery), the 'Liverpool' approach should be adopted to provide 'existing consents with a chance of delivering the shortfall'. That is a bit of a muddle. And, it misses the point. The 'Liverpool' approach is not a device for manipulating the 5-year housing supply to mask (in this case) relatively short term and temporary forecast deficits due to the particular mix and characteristics of the sites identified; it is not a means to 'side-step' the considerations that apply in the absence of being able to identify a 5-year supply of housing land. Even less so when, as here, such fears turn out to be more apparent than real. Hence, I see no reason why the Sedgefield approach should not be applied in this case.

26. The appellants question the estimated deliverable supply, suggesting that sites without planning permission to be released from the existing Green Belt should be omitted (as should sites without planning permission but of interest to developers), that a 10% 'lapse rate' should be applied to all sites benefitting from a planning permission and that the estimated delivery rates for some sites are too optimistic.
27. I agree that sites without planning permission but intended to be released from the Green Belt should be discounted until their release is confirmed by the adoption of the Core Strategy. Although the benefit of planning permission is not necessarily a requirement of a 'deliverable and developable' site, at this stage in the planning process the release of Green Belt sites cannot be guaranteed (in spite of the interest from developers), not least because many are likely to be hotly contested. And, although a Secretary of State appeal decision is subsequently awaited in relation to one of those sites in the 'central delivery area', the inability to accommodate changing circumstances (foreseen and unforeseen) must remain a limitation of any 'snapshot' assessment. Removing the relevant Green Belt sites reduces the relevant 5-year supply by 163 dwellings, as indicated in the representations.
28. There are no sites without either an outline or detailed planning permission in the 'central delivery area'. And, although the Council demonstrate that lapsed planning permissions are, in practice, likely to be more than outweighed by increases in the effective delivery achieved elsewhere, the assumption of a 10% 'lapse rate' is not unreasonable and can contribute to the robustness of the resulting estimate; the supply might thus be further reduced by 107 dwellings.
29. Much of the information about the rates of delivery on specific sites is gleaned from information supplied by the developers and builders themselves. In my view, the estimates of those with experience 'on the ground' are generally to be preferred to those derived from theoretical averages or those that emphasise potential doubts, unless there is sound evidence to indicate otherwise. Where returns from developers and builders are lacking, the SHLAA applies a consistent methodology, at least partly based on local experience. Specific sites were discussed at the Hearing and, almost without exception, I found either the local information available or the SHLAA methodology to warrant the estimates made. So, for example, although there are constraints to address and significant highway works

to implement before the site at St George's Hospital can be fully developed, some support for the 120 dwellings expected in the 5-year period is provided by the subsequent grant of a detailed planning permission and the on-set of the conversion work entailed in part of the scheme; indeed, the impression is that the current momentum may be in advance of initial expectations. Similarly, although pre-commencement conditions are still due to be discharged on the site at Stobhill, the developer (BDW) has now purchased the site, is keen to start and has provided the delivery figures. Since the appeal relating to this site was pursued by Barrat, David Wilson Homes and Tees Valley Housing, it is highly likely that any initial slippage in delivering the estimated 200 dwellings would be made up towards the end of 5-year period, given the experience and expertise of those operators. Moreover, although not affecting the actual figures, the results derived from updating and rolling forward the housing supply estimates tend to indicate that previous expectations are likely to be exceeded.

30. Taking all those matters into account and applying the calculation to the 'central delivery area' (the 'housing market area' in which Longhorsley lies), the 5-year requirement is 1,485 dwellings and the shortfall (to be made up in the first 5 years) is 497 dwellings, so that the total dwellings required is 1,982 and, with a 5% 'buffer', 2,081. The estimated supply is 2,376 and, allowing for the reductions outlined above, 2,106, just 25 dwellings above the full 5-year requirement (sufficient to provide for about 5.1 years). Given the assumptions and estimates that have to be made in such an assessment, it seems to me that this result is well within the margins of accuracy that might reasonably be expected; it demonstrates that a 5-year supply of housing land is likely to exist.

Other matters

31. I have considered all the other matters raised. Although the access arrangements are reserved for subsequent approval, the illustrative plan actually shows a rather unsatisfactory arrangement, awkwardly configured in relation to the head of the cul-de-sac, squeezed through the driveway and current curtilage of No.29 and entailing a sharp bend to serve a banal line of dwellings strung along the length of the appeal site. There is about 6.5m between the curtilage of No.31 and the nearest wall of the bungalow at No.29, but that would be insufficient to accommodate one of the recommendations made in the *Access Feasibility Report* (a 4.8m carriageway with 2m footways on both sides) and even an access arrangement entailing a shared surface would be just 2m from windows in the side elevation of No.29. That would appear cramped and incongruous in the midst of this pleasant estate. Creating an access more conventionally aligned with the head of the cul-de-sac and involving less severe bends across the site would entail demolition of parts of the appeal bungalow and a different layout of dwellings. In the absence of more detailed plans, it is not clear that such a scheme would accord with the pattern of development here.
32. I appreciate that the site was initially assessed in the *Northumberland Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment* as being suitable, available and achievable with a potential capacity for 10 dwellings. However, such assessments are not statements of planning policy, although they might address policies as they develop. It is quite clear why the assessment relating to the appeal site changed in the subsequent 'interim' version of that document.

Conclusion

33. I have found that the settlement boundary demarcates an evident distinction between the village and the surrounding countryside in this location; as such it contributes to the distinctiveness and identity of Longhorsley. Hence, in breaching the settlement boundary, the proposal would be seen to intrude into the countryside and, as currently envisaged, result in development that would contravene the requirements of policies H16, C1 and LHC1; such development would be harmful in itself and, as a precedent for schemes on nearby sites, very damaging. As a 5-year supply of housing land is likely to exist in the relevant 'housing market area', the cited policies carry due weight, particularly as they serve to foster aims advocated in the Framework. Although I consider that it is not yet possible to be certain that the proposal would impair the openness of the proposed Green Belt or contravene Green Belt policy, I find neither that, nor anything else, sufficiently compelling to alter my conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

David Cullingford
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Peter Brotherton	Appellant
Stephanie Linnell	Planning Consultant, George F White
Craig Ross	Planning Consultant, George F White
Laura Dixon	Planning Consultant, George F White

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ian Birkett	Senior Planning Officer, Northumberland County Council
Joan Sanderson	Planning and Housing Policy Officer, Northumberland County Council
Steve Robson	Senior Housing Policy Officer, Northumberland County Council
Frances Wilkinson	Specialist Senior Manager, Northumberland County Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Denise Primrose	Local resident
Stuart Armstrong	Local resident
Bryan Simpson	Local resident
Elizabeth Mearns	Local resident
Michael Parrish	Local resident
Iain Elliot	Chair, Longhorsley Parish Council
Shelagh Prescott	Local resident
Bill Butler	Local resident
Tim Wood	Local resident
Richard Cansdale	Interest in nearby land
Alan Todd	Local resident
Don Learmouth	Local resident
Karen Horner	Local resident
Janet Newman	Local resident
Alan Wade	Local resident
John Prescott	Local resident

And some people that I failed to record

DOCUMENTS

Document	1	List of persons present at the Hearing
Document	2	Statement of Common Ground
Document	3	Statement of Case; appellant and appendices 1-5
Document	4	Final comments; appellant and appendices A-F
Document	5	Appellant's appendices 1-11 submitted with the Grounds of Appeal
Document	6	Statement of Case; Council
Document	7	Housing land supply response; Council
Document	8	Final comments; Council
Document	9	Core Strategy Pre-Submission Draft
Document	10	Comments on Core Strategy Pre-Submission Draft 1. Longhorsley Parish Council 2. Peter Brotherton
Document	11	Core Strategy Pre-Submission Draft; Proposed Modifications
Document	12	Northumberland 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites 2014-2019
Document	13	Northumberland 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites 2015-2020
Document	14	Interim SHLAA October 2015
Document	15	SHLAA May 2016
Document	16	SHLAA extracts; small sites
Document	17	Small sites in the Green Belt
Document	18	Updating the Northumberland 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites
Document	19	Representations from local people
Document	20	Inspector's index and summary of the representations from local people
Document	21	Appeal decision; 22 July 2016, Longhorsley 3145262
Document	22	Appeal decision; 27 May 2015, Huby 2194376
Document	23	Appeal decision; 25 May 2016, Morpeth 3135278
Document	24	Appeal decision; 13 July 2014, Fenrother 2194915
		<i>All other proofs of evidence, appendices, statements, submissions, plans and communications are on the file</i>

PLANS

Plans	A	Application plans 1 Location plan 2 Indicative site plan
Plan	B	The settlement and the fields to the west of the appeal site

PHOTO

Photo	1	Parking in Church View
-------	---	------------------------