



Ponteland **Neighbourhood** **PLAN**



www.pontelandneighbourhoodplan.co.uk

Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan Group. c/o Town Council Offices,
Meadowfield Industrial Estate. Ponteland. Newcastle upon Tyne NE20 9SD

Report and Analysis

Visions and Objectives **Community Consultation Document**

Consultation period
From 19th September until 30th September

Via the website www.pontelandneighbourhoodplan.co.uk
Or at the Drop-In Sessions at the Memorial Hall

Fri 19th September 10.00 am - 7.00pm
Sat 20th September 9.30 am - 1.00pm
Fri 26th September 10.00am - 7.00pm
Sat 27th September 9.30am - 1.00pm

Ponteland Neighbourhood Steering Group,
Has taken the analysis from the previous Survey in 2012,
Questionnaire responses in 2013 collated evidence and
identified eight sections to form the Vision for Ponteland for
the next 16 years.

Report Contents

Background

Introduction

Ponteland Vision Statement

Conservation & Heritage

Natural Environment, Open Spaces & Habitats

Housing & Affordable Housing

Retail, Business & Employment

Transportation & Highways

Drainage & Potential Flooding

Healthcare & Care of the Elderly

Education & Youth Activities

Analysis

Previous Evidence

Evaluation & Analysis

Methodology

Community Consultation Results

General Comments covering the Vision & Objectives

Planning Issues

Projects

Conclusions

Other outcomes

Next step

Background

It is important to understand that from 2011 Ponteland had been subjected to a number of events, staged by developers, the Local Authority and the Town Council which have caused a negative accumulative effect and one of hostility to anything related to development.

When the Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan Group (PNP) was formed its members were and are made up of volunteers representing organisations, County Councillors and Town Councillors all to be accountable to the Town Council.

In 2012 the PNP decided they needed to assess the resident's views by means of an initial survey to give some direction in the introduction of the process of neighbourhood planning. The following year the group was invited to events at the High School involving Year 9, Year 11 and 12 this opportunity gave a distinctive view from the youth and attended a fun day at "Party in the Park". Later in 2013 through the Pont News & Views was circulated a detailed questionnaire to every household (4,500) in the civil Parish of Ponteland. It was these four engagements with the community on their views and opinions that was used to prepare the most recent Ponteland Community Consultation in September 2014.

- Summary of the Initial Survey 2012
- Summary of the "Party in the Park" 2013
- Views from students at the High School 2013
- Summary of the Questionnaire 2013

[Link to website](#)

Introduction

The notification of a Ponteland Community Consultation Event on Vision and Objectives was publicised in the local magazine, Pont News & Views, which has a circulation of over 4,500 residencies in the civil parish. This guaranteed that every household, in our designated area, would be informed with their own invitation to support the consultation event, either at a drop in session or via the website. Additionally, notices were put on all the parish notice boards in the civil parish, facebook and entered into twitter.

The Community Consultation period started from the 19th September starting at the drop in sessions and finishing on the 30th September, on the website or at the Town Council Offices.

Residents had the choice of visiting the website throughout the consultation period, at their own convenience or supporting the timetabled drop in sessions.

The Community Consultation started on the Friday 19th Sept 10am-7pm & Saturday 20th Sept 9.30am-1pm and repeated on the Friday 26th Sept 10am-7pm & Saturday 27th Sept 9.30am-1pm at the Memorial Hall Ponteland with 8 informal drop-in-sessions over a two week period. This event allowed the Steering Group the opportunity of showing an extensive exhibition from the start of the neighbourhood planning process undertaken by the group since the autumn 2012. Each session was manned by steering group members who were available to

answer resident's questions and receive comments. Attendees after registering would be given their response sheet and a Consultation document giving full information on the consultation process to take away.

Apart from the drop in sessions a gizmo interactive survey was also provided for the public to use to view the visual display boards from the exhibition on the website www.pontelandneighbourhoodplan.co.uk this was available from

Included in this report are detailed written comments on the Vision Statement and each of the 8 Topic group outlined Objectives. The evidence submitted is a true and accurate record from the comments made throughout the consultation period. The analysis will follow later in the document.

Respondents were encouraged to complete a double sided A4 response sheet displaying the Vision Statement and all objectives under the 8 Topic areas with an agree/disagree sections and a general area for comments.

135 Respondents at the drop-in-sessions
56 Respondents from the website
191 In total.

The online response system used on the website developed a problem early on in the consultation process. Responses on the Vision Statement and sections A-G recorded, H on Education & Youth Activities failed to record the data. The steering group felt that as this section was not able to provide draft planning policies this would not have a significant impact on the consultation and the final percentage would be in relation to 191 responses and not 135. It should be noted that a percentage was calculated on 132 agreed responses out of 135 it would convert to 97%.

Vision Statement

Our vision is to maintain and enhance the unique character of Ponteland.

Comments

- Re – the unique character of Ponteland: “what is it? It is a transient population.”
- Whatever the ‘Visions & Objectives’ the ‘reality’ of incapacity existing and consequent need to be considered.
- But everyone has their own idea on what might enhance the area!
- Change is needed which will negate this vision/mission.
- An open mind is needed in order for change to take place.

Conservation & Heritage

A1 To promote the protection of the historic centre of Ponteland village through robust Character Statement, a local list of buildings of interest and strengthened policies.

Comments

- Particularly important.
- There is no “historic centre” to the village. It has become a hotch-potch with more residential buildings filling in the spaces.
- (Protection – underlined.) Conservation and Heritage ‘Character Statement’ - The Darras Hall committee and council have over the years allowed the conservation and heritage to be destroyed by allowing interesting homes and bungalows be knocked down and replaced with large monstrosity buildings called homes that will house nor normal families but 3 and 4 generations of families and way out of the reach of normal families. These developments are outside of the present council tax values. These are just some of the factors that destroy your item A3 of protection of Darras Hall character.
- I agree with only A1”.

A2 To promote the protection of the open spaces in Ponteland village and Darras hall and the “green approaches” through appropriate design and policies.

Comments

- Particularly important”.
- (green approaches – underlined). Green approaches very important to town character – prevent sprawl and preserve the green belt as priority.

A3 To require the protection of the existing character of Darras Hall.

Comments

- Agree with A1, A2 & A4. The character of Darras Hall is becoming ever more dominated by vast mansions.”
- Character altering, needs harnessing.
- Much of recent development not in line with original plan.
- Stop building the mansions on Darras.
- Darras Hall Estate Committee not able to retain character – largely destroyed.
- Spoiled already?.
- (protection – underlined.) Also see comment made against A1.

A4 To support the protection of the green Belt, particularly the strategic separation between Ponteland and the Newcastle upon Tyne/Airport border.

Comments

- The Strategic Green Belt is extremely important in maintaining separation from Newcastle.

- The Strategic Green Belt is extremely important in maintaining separation between Ponteland & Tyneside.
- Minor amendments to the Green Belt may need to be considered to allow for future housing growth.
- Particularly important.
- Agree in the main but not A4. Protect the green belt where necessary but accept that some deletions to enable delivery of sites which do not encroach into the countryside.
- Protection of the green belt is vital.
- Green belt to be maintained at all costs.
- Protect the green belt please!
- A4 needs vigilance!
- Shouldn't build on green belt as we need our village back and not become a town.
- (“protection of the green belt” and “strategic separation” – underlined.) The building of Sainsbury Supermarket should never have been allowed as it causes terrible holds up of traffic which used to flow more freely plus it has not enhanced the village architecturally. This feature also goes for the fact there are too many eating houses for such a small village.
- Remembering it was originally Darras Hall “Garden Village” and therefore A4 should say retain green belt.

General Comments Conservation & Heritage

- Very important to keep the heritage of Ponteland. We are losing some already.
- Just don't spoil it.
- All essential. No advertising on gable ends in Conservation Area.
- Ponteland is gateway to Northumberland. Needs to be protected for enjoyment and lives of future generations.
- Important to retain the existing character.
- Whereas I AGREE with the above, as the map of Ponteland extra to today, what if, in view of the way N.C.C. are administering the area, we think it would be better to merge with Newcastle? Is there a degree of flexibility (.e. plans) possible?
- Darras Hall must be seen as part of Ponteland. It is not a separate entity.
- The alteration suggested to the Conservation Area are debatable.
- Crucial to protect the approaches to Ponteland and avoid mass development that would stress the already stretched infrastructure.
- These points have my full support.
- Maintain village feel of Ponteland and green nature of the area as a whole.
- An absolute must. Key objective.
- Leisure Centre fields are at risk from inappropriate proposal from NCC as Business Site.
- Strongly agree”.
- Nothing will be done without an open mind.
- Sustainable development at appropriate locations should be incorporated into these aims.
- No mention of sustainable development as per National Planning Policy Framework.
- The demand for housing cannot be met on existing PDL sites and so sustainable green belt release is necessary.
- Agree A1, A3, Disagree A2, A4.

- This vision lacks an evidence base and does not reflect the needs of Ponteland, Northumberland and Newcastle. Ponteland cannot sit in a vacuum whereby it pulls up the drawbridge to additional development which ultimately cannot be delivered elsewhere. The key to the success of Ponteland and enhancement of its economic, social, and environmental structure is to acknowledge that growth brings benefits and that such growth carefully planned can be sustainable. The green belt boundary surrounding Ponteland is out of date. Government guidance is that Green Belt boundaries are NOT permanent. They should be reviewed every 15 – 25 years. The green belt boundary surrounding Ponteland has in the past, however the tightness of its definition has constrained development which coupled with lack of delivery elsewhere in Northumberland has had major impact on the County, and its social, economic and environmental credentials. This continued malaise will result in environmental degradation, job losses, devaluing of property prices, and importantly a reduction in services provided by the state. Such is not a future Ponteland should comprehend. Ponteland and its residents should be better informed as to the consequence of a continued objection to green belt developments.
- Protection of green belt to safeguard the existing character of Darras Hall.
- There are too many issues included in the statements above – respondents should not be asked to agree or disagree with all 4 statements in one response.
- But still move forward. We must modernise without losing our past.
- Nothing will be done without having a completely open mind towards change.
- I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments contained within the documents. (I REALLY DO). However the Vision Statement is a Mission Statement (which itself is contradictory – how do you maintain something while enhancing it). It would seem to me the Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan should seek to ‘build’ on the best of what is (we have a beautiful village, with good amenities, where people from other communities would like to come and live). However there are issues that need to be addressed e.g. the risks of over development, flooding, over-industrialisation, and the dangers of through traffic) I would like to suggest that the Vision Statement should be an exciting statement defining, if the Neighbourhood Plan is enacted in its entirety, what the village of Ponteland will become – hopefully a great place to live and bring up children – a village surrounded by green fields, where new housing is developed on brownfield (not green belt/field) sites such as the police HQ, where flood risks are managed in a coordinated way, where through traffic is removed by the development of a relief road etc etc. So the Vision Statement would be a brief and exciting statement that will describe what Ponteland will become as a result of the achievement of the objectives contained within the Plan. The Plan should then list the objectives describing the processes that will be initiated (with timelines and measurable outcomes) to achieve them. As regards Conservation and Heritage – no problem with these but promotion, support and requirements are not objectives.
- As long as you do what you say.

Natural Environment, Open Spaces & Habitats

B1 To require any new development to respect and protect the natural environment wherever possible.

Comments

- Delete last two words – ‘wherever possible’.
- Agree with the general focus of the objectives. However, B1 we suggest removing the words “wherever possible”. In addition, we advise that B1 should include reference to new development enhancing the natural environment wherever possible.

B2 To require the protection of our historical hedgerows around the fields and network of waterways.

Comments

- This should be retrospective for new builds that have ripped out hedgerows in recent years”.
- B2 maintenance often neglected at present.
- “protection” – underlined.
- Agree with the general focus of the objectives. We recommend including the words “wherever possible” at the end of B2.

B3 To promote the protection and enhancement of facilities for recreation and the provision of access for residents, workers and visitors of all ages.

Comments

“protection” – underlined.

B4 To promote the conservation and enhancement of the local landscape and open spaces, and the protection of wildlife.

Comments

- Agree with the general focus of the objectives. At the end of B4, we suggest including reference to natural habitats.

General Comments Natural Environment, Open Spaces & Habitat

- Agree strongly with all – particularly B4.
- As a developer we would strive to comply with the above.
- B1 & B4 are very important. Protect hedgerows.
- Highly desirable where possible.
- Keep river clean for wildlife.
- River needs protecting and cleaning.
- Define Prestwick Carr SSI’s – shown on maps. Wildlife corridor should run all way up to Eland Hall.
- Improve footpath/cycle links to surrounding areas such as Medburn. Keen for children to be able to cycle to school from anywhere in and around Ponteland/Darras Hall.
- Much wildlife has disappeared. This is our chance to protect, preserve and enhance what we have before it is too late.
- Important to retain the current attractive natural environment for future generations.
- Should protect.

- Complete agreement.
 - Create or maintain walkways, and walking routes.
 - The environment & wildlife must have our protection.
 - No development close to wildlife corridors i.e. old railway line through Darras Hall and towards airport.
 - The old railway lines are great for wildlife. Try to avoid development nearby to preserve wildlife and local well used walks.
 - Leisure Centre fields to be left alone.
 - Ponteland Park is a great asset to the area.
 - Natural environment open spaces and habitats you mention the word Pride. This has been taken away and the infrastructure is not enhanced but destroyed by the building of more houses and trying to change Ponteland from a village and into a town without the open spaces and environment for those wishing to live in the established village.
 - An open mind is required.
 - We don't need new development otherwise I agree.
 - Subject to a degree of flexibility".
 - All the above is in line with the principles of Sustainable Development. It is not a barrier to the delivery of good quality well designed development".
- We will need new developments.
- An open mind is required with vision for the future.
 - As above – the objectives need to be objectified. What are you trying to achieve and how will we know when they have been achieved. So if the local landscape is conserved and enhanced what will it 'look like' how will the residents of Ponteland know – how will tell Mr Pickles that we have been successful.
 - Keep a tighter rein on new developments.

Housing & Affordable Housing

C1 To require that new houses are appropriate to the demonstrable needs of Ponteland.

Comments

- (demonstrable – underlined). Demonstrable is important.
- "needs" – underlined.

C2 To require that new developments take place in appropriate locations, in stages, and only when required by a demonstrable housing need.

Comments

- (demonstrable – underlined). Does "demonstrable" mean local or national need?
- "and only when required by a demonstrable housing need" – underlined.
- Strongly agree.
- (demonstrable – underlined). Demonstrable is important.
- Who decides 'appropriate locations'.
- Who decides 'appropriate location' etc.

C3 To require that the size of the future developments, their location and design does not harm the existing character of Ponteland.

Comments

No comments

General Comments Housing & Affordable Housing

- Appropriate location should not include any Green Belt.
- Appropriate location should not include any Green Belt.
- To limit the size & number of excessively large/hotel sized houses on Darras Hall. Ref Map C Police HQ Development – provide access road to West Road as well as North Road.
- It is important to use small area statistics (census etc) appropriately – unlike NCC.
- Housing for young families would balance the development of housing provision for the older population but only if fitting in with C1, C2 & C3.
- Unsure of need for affordable housing.
- Ensure that ONS 2012 is adopted. Use all previously developed and brownfield sites first.
- Housing to be on previously developed land and brownfield sites first before further land developed.
- Poss agree to C3. We need affordable houses. Not for sale!
- Housing suitable for young/single professionals.
- Entirely agree.
- Needed for starter homes.
- Starter homes required.
- Fewer houses instead of large development on single site – scatter the homes instead.
- Birney Hill should not be developed for housing – already houses standing empty”.
- Housing should only be built when the infrastructure is adequate – (more services, roads etc).
- Care needed with term ‘intermediate housing’.
- I understand that new housing will b required, however I strongly feel that it is important not to lose the ‘village’ feel and not to provide large housing estates such as Newcastle Great Park.
- It is a myth that jobs follow housing – just look at Newcastle Great Park. Keep more traffic out f the village – use sites away from Ponteland centre and surrounds.
- Don’t need any more houses.
- Complete agreement.
- Any proposal to remove green belt status for the land north of Rotary Way would be indeterminate at inquiry. It is suitable for education purposes and low cost housing.
- Particular reference to proper services and flood prevention.
- Brownfield, Greenfield and infill sites should be developed before any encroachment into greenbelt then development to north of village preferable.
- We also need dwellings suitable for older people who wish to downsize and remain in the area.
- To set in stone the phasing and pace of development is important.

- I endorse all these points.
- With protection of green belt.
- And does not impinge on the green belt.
- No large sprawling housing development.
- Brownfield sites only for any proposed building ONS2012 population and DCLG2012 Housing indicate no housing requirement at all.
- I can only agree insofar as your idea of “needs” agrees with mine – I don’t see a need for 850 new houses.
- Housing nos at NCC proposal plan are over ambitious and any housing development not to exceed existing provision over the last 20 years.
- Section C needs rewriting to include the need ‘NOT’ to release green belt land in order to achieve natural and gradual housing growth. However area indicated on map for mixed use and housing is not strategically located and far better/alternative locations would create better retention of the areas qualities such as local character and lesser ‘damage’ to green belt zones.
- Some affordable needed. Young people should be able to stay in the area.
- People who presently work at county hall and their predecessors have not and do not give a great deal of thought in allowing land that could have been used for affordable housing and have allowed it to be used and sold off to speculative builders, but where has the proceeds gone that could and should have been put into a pot to be used or possible council tenants in Ponteland.
- Housing development will spoil the character of Ponteland – say NO” to Westminster.
- Section C4 – to require that existing infrastructure is not overloaded by any future developments.
- Far too general. Need to be specific.
- Should reflect the needs of the wider area as Ponteland is primarily a commuter/dormitory town.
- Strongly agree”.
- Agree – However I would not like to see large housing estates, i.e. Barrett etc, in and around Darras Hall.
- Further detail is needed. How do we define need? Infill opportunities should be supported thereby preventing large scale housing developments. Could I suggest infill off beech court which has not been developed on one side of the road. Or small scale extension of Meadowvale / Avondale as a way of gaining a direct pedestrian link to Medburn.
- The land at north west of Ponteland provides a sustainable and logical extension to Pontelands built up area with limited impact on the Ponteland area.
- The needs of the wider locality i.e. Northumberland need to be considered alongside the needs of the immediate area.
- Please see the previous comments. Indeed reference to a Government Inspectors report regarding the planning appeal at Ponteland Auction mart addressed this very issue. Ponteland cannot SELFISHLY determine its needs without reference to the wider needs of the Region. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and its Duty to Co-operate.
- A policy to deter change of use from dwelling to commercial should be developed. 2. A policy to deter housing development on existing industrial land should be developed. 3. A policy to bring back residential occupation above existing commercial premises should be developed.

- Also not on green belt land.
- We must welcome newcomers to the area and they will need somewhere affordable to live.
- As above – much clearer objectives should be developed that are in tune with the vision.
- However we do need affordable and social housing for our children to remain in the village they grew up in. Sadly mine have been forced out of their home village due to high prices. Before you condemn the building of new housing – think on – do you want your family close by when they have grown up.
- “I don’t personally think that Pontelands infrastructure could cope with any more housing. The village as a whole already struggles with traffic, accessible amenities (schools, doctors, dentist etc) drainage issues without putting more strain on it.
- Stop all new developments as there are too many empty houses.
- We need more housing for young couples and single people no more retirement homes.

Retail, Business & Employment

D1 To identify and encourage employment opportunities for appropriate sustainable economic growth across the Parish.

Comments

- Employment opportunities in area essential to prevent ‘dormitory town’ status.
- Delete ‘across the parish’ and substitute ‘in specific areas where considered appropriate’.
- ‘parish’ – underlined.

D2 to promote opportunities to enhance, diversify and improve the range of shops and services within the centre of Ponteland and Broadway.

Comments

- I am especially keen to preserve the amenities of Broadway. We are steadily losing shops and restaurants.
- Broadway is in a sorry state for such an affluent area – shops ok but it looks shabby. Rent is too high to sustain shop ownership.
- “Broadway” deleted – change to Darras Hall.
- D2 is very important as not all able to travel to Newcastle, Hexham or Morpeth.
- Broadway in need of refurbishment with reasonable rents.
- Ponteland & Darras Hall offer a very limited range of shops and standards of premises are poor.
- Business rates need to be monitored i.e. Broadway, to sustain these businesses improvement to design of Ponteland Merton Way shops to be in line with historic village and character.
- Improve the range of shops and services. ‘centre’ – underlined.

D3 To promote innovative solutions for the regeneration of the centre of Ponteland, in tandem with improvements to infrastructure and a relief road.

Comments

- (Relief road – underlined). Relief road is a long term objective.
- D3 needs to be mindful of sections A & B. Public transport important to improve.
- Relief Road now urgent.
- Do not agree with a relief road – most traffic going to Darras Hall, so would come into Ponteland in any case, or use existing link road.
- (improvements to infrastructure and a relief road – underlined). Where is the centre? Relief road essential to take traffic away from the village centre, avoid congestion and noise pollution.
- I do not feel a relief road is necessary and it would take valuable passing trade away from the town.
- Although as a Ponteland business owner, I wouldn't want to see a relief road thereby bypassing Ponteland as this would lose trade for the local businesses.

D4 To provide diversification, sustainable development, leisure and tourism across the Parish.

Comments

- Agree to D1, D2 & D3, disagree to D4. Unsure of what is meant by diversification here.
- Don't wish to promote D4.
- Promotion of tourism is wishful thinking.
- D4 is too wide a brief – this should be more specific.

General Comments Retail, Business & Employment

- Largely agree. However I believe a more realistic solution to the traffic problems is to combine pressure for full dualling of the A1 to divert traffic and restrictions on parents bringing children to the school gate when a walk would be much healthier.
- As parking is a major problem in Ponteland, before the range of shops are developed around Merton Way – why not build a large underground car park with shopping centre above?
- Extra car park needed in village. Rent on Broadway are not in line with any similar local shopping centre – quite unaffordable for private traders.
- Extra parking needed for shoppers in Ponteland & Darras Hall. Rents on Broadway are designed to deter new shops, rents completely out of scale to other shopping areas of a similar nature. State of both shopping centres are a blot on the area.
- Agree mainly with D2, D3 & D4. D1 is not as important. People like Ponteland mainly as a place to live not work. Residents accept commuting out of Ponteland.
- Shift the Meadowfield businesses to another location, thus releasing land for housing in the village.
- Not necessarily the wholesale replacement of Merton Way. Wooler a good model for retail?

- Too many cafes and hairdressers.
- A range of shops other than cafes, hairdressers etc would be appreciated
- Do we need 2 charity shops?
- More shops required – not restaurants – too many already. Bus Service to Cramlington required.
- Tourism should be one of the priorities enhancing the village centre. Merton Way shops and parking need to be renovated/rebuilt to give access to all.
- Keen to encourage more local employment and business. Improvements to the shopping areas/choice of shops would be greatly received.
- Affordable small office units would be welcomed A village centre/'market square' would be a great asset.
- Need new shopping centre.
- New business centre should be on outskirts say near Airport NOT near town centre/leisure centre. Ponteland centre & Broadway need some attention. They are very poor compared to other town/village shopping centres.
- I found this section too ill-defined & open to many lines of interpretation. The whole section needs more definition.
- Not previously aware of NCC Business site – queer type of business intended? As Broadway and many shops etc in Ponteland Centre privately how could local plan influence owners to meet these objectives? All dependent upon Finance.
- Ensure that any proposed by-pass route is set in stone before any potential development is allowed near the route.
- Trading Estate badly positioned. Should be relocated even at expense of some green belt.
- It should be accepted that Ponteland is a 'dormitory town' with the majority of residents working elsewhere – expectation of vastly increased employment opportunities and economic growth is unrealistic.
- Long term development of Ponteland is impractical without a 'bypass' of some sort and probably metro extension.
- I agree but would like to see the industrial elements of Meadowfield transferred to another more suitable site.
- While protecting green belt land.
- As long as green belt protected/not impinged upon.
- Ponteland will only have a centre when there is a by-pass/relief road.
- Relief road neither viable or realistic in the context of other link roads already in Core Strategy adjudication of Gateshead and Newcastle or Airport to Seaton Burn Holiday Inn/Wideopen. Also, Hazelrigg – Woolsington – Throckley – A1 link being considered.
- Ponteland is a place to live, not a place to work. Anyone living here would expect to commute to their place of work.
- Would like to see improved Ponteland shopping centre facilities and improved car parking facilities".
- Rotary Way area needs to be kept as a green corridor.
- The 'alternative' business site has better access from the urban motorways and removes traffic off A696.
- NCC proposed site at Clickemin has no roads and would be intrusive. Opencast centre more appropriate.
- Council to take action to promote redevelopment of the Merton Way area in line with previous consultations and report on progress and time frame.

- Retail outlets could replace many of the present eating establishment and maybe more jobs.
- Serious action is required on all these issues.
- Ponteland is really a village. When people shop they naturally go to Newcastle or Metro Centre for great choice and competitive pricing. Shopping on the internet is also increasing.
- Regenerate Merton Way.
- Agree primarily but disagree to the centric focus of opportunities for growth across the Parish. Ponteland needs to recognise that as a location is it likely to have the largest private sector employment base of any town in Northumberland. This significant status cannot be stifled by regarding Ponteland in a Silo and as a Village. It is a major settlement with a geographical extent similar to Morpeth and Hexham with a population approaching the scale of those very settlements. Its location adjacent to the A1, the A69, the A696, the NIA, the Metro and its proximity to the Tyne & Wear conurbation mean that is ideally located to accept additional growth to benefit the region, to stimulate the economy, and to create significant benefit for the collective whole rather than entrenchment for the few.
- Policy D1 should not be at the sacrifice of existing green belt. Too much industrial land has been converted to residential recently – Lairage, Mart, Dobsons Sweet factory. 2. Policy D3 should not include the transportation statement – the relief road statement belongs in the “T” policies.
- Serious area action is required in all of these areas.
- As above re objectives.
- We do however need more shopping facilities here in Ponteland. There is nowhere to buy even the basic of needs – i.e. a pair of shoes/underwear without having to travel into one of the larger towns. Not something everyone has the luxury of being able to do so.
- Update the shopping centres.

Transportation & Highways

E1 To promote the reduction of traffic through Ponteland village by the provision of a future relief road with an appropriate reserved route and traffic calming and/or traffic management measures.

Comments

- Alternative route for by-pass should be considered.
- Support a relief road but consider alternatives to present route.
- Why include traffic calming in a by-pass.
- Agree – “with the exception of traffic calming”.
- The alternative relief road seems to be the best solution to E1.
- Relief road is long term objective.
- How practical/likely is a future relief road/bypass? Where will the funding come from? If future development is concentrated to the south of Ponteland, and east of Darras Hall, is a relief road required?
- Like the idea that the alternative relief road be considered and further developed.

- Relief road very necessary.
- ‘appropriate reserved route’ – What does this mean?. ‘traffic calming and/or traffic management’ – Where?
- Do not agree with relief road – most traffic going to Darras Hall, so would come into Ponteland in any case, or use existing link road. Traffic calming – too urbanised.
- Traffic calming needed on Darras Hall Estate.
- Alternative relief route would provide opportunity for development near Police site thus protecting Ponteland/Darras Hall.
- ‘reduction of traffic’ and ‘a future relief road’ underlined. “How far in the future?”
- New relief road proposal in agreement but only if the housing need dictates the requirement.
- No to traffic calming.
- Is E1 realistic, otherwise agree.
- Traffic calming measures currently do not work. The speed limits in Ponteland are not enforced. Ponteland does not require a by pass.
- Agree – Apart from E1 (see comments from previous page) – “Although as a Ponteland business owner, I wouldn’t want to see a relief road thereby bypassing Ponteland as this would lose trade for the local businesses.

E2 To promote the provision of safer cycling in and around Ponteland.

Comments

- Improve cycle links/routes, especially for children to cycle to school.
- Where are the cycle routes to the airport metro to allow for a mix-mode journeys to work/Newcastle. It would cost very little to do this along Rotary Way.
- Consideration to framework of cycle paths as roads in vicinity are too small to handle cyclists and traffic.

E3 To promote safer travelling to and from schools for children and their parents.

Comments

- Police to be more vigilant in prosecuting dangerous parking near schools.
- It is the parents using cars who present most danger to children with speeding and inconsiderate parking.
- DHFS: No school patrol/no zebra crossing/no 20mph speed limit around school/no traffic calming/no thought to safety of CHILDREN ALSO Eastern Way for PCMS.
- I am really concerned about the levels of traffic through the village. I’m a mum of two young boys age 11 and 7 each morning I have to stop traffic so my eldest child and his friends can cross the road to go to school, it is a very very busy road now I dread to think how bad it will be once the new houses are built on the police head quarters site. I fear that it’s an accident waiting to happen.

E4 To require that any future developments fully take into account the proximity to Newcastle International Airport with particular reference to potential noise and air pollution issues.

Comments

- Recognise that the Birney Hill development proximity to the flight path, noise of air position areas and take consideration of possible airport developments. Why build new houses here?
- There has been a crash landing of a light aircraft near farm so no development under/near flight path.

E5 To require any future developments to maintain and, if possible, enhance the footpath 7 formal access network in and around Ponteland.

Comments

No comments.

E6 To promote the provision of adequate car parking and access to public transport.

Comments

- Public transport most inadequate, buses on Edgehill only every two hours.
- Better services to different areas.
- Better bus services to outlying areas i.e. Kingston Park and Cramlington.
- More bus services required. More car parking available.
- No development should reduce the amount of public car parking in Ponteland.
- Public transport in the evening is useless. Maybe there should be a shuttle service from the metro to Ponteland and Darras.
- ‘adequate car parking’ – underlined.
- Especially near the schools.
- Should include word “free” car parking.

General Comments Transportation & Highways

- Proper dualling of A1 would divert traffic. Also parents should let their children walk the last few hundred yards to school – much healthier!!
- To promote/develop better public transport links.
- Infrastructure should be provided when it is logistical and viable. The airport plans should be taken into account, but not to exclude sites what would in effect sit within the same proximity as existing housing.
- Agree - but there must be consultation on the route for a relief road and on footpaths – some residents prefer grass banks to footpaths.
- Agree – but resist any plans to introduce the metro to Ponteland. New route for alternative route seems attractive to me.
- E7 – Access to public transport improved.
- E7 – Promote use of schools to encourage cycle route uses.

- Great ideas!
- Need metro come to Ponteland make less cars travelling.
- Unrealistic. We will never get a relief road. NCC refuses to admit Ponteland under pressure.
- I have expressed concern about access regress to the proposed police H.Q. housing development. The proposed relief road does NOT reassure m. I agree in general terms.
- Need by pass urgently especially at school times. Parking also is barely adequate”.
- 100% agree & metro link.
- Reduction of traffic through Ponteland must be a priority. Safer footpaths – keep vehicles off them.
- I think we need to reduce the traffic through Ponteland before significant new housing or business development.
- To discourage children from out of Northumberland attending Ponteland schools. This would reduce traffic.
- Only realistic relief road already built on at Eland Haugh Estate. Traffic now at significant incapacity.
- I particularly agree with E6. I do not agree with E1 – a new road would simply open up new area ripe for development.
- Needs considerable work to ease this problem.
- A great deal of traffic problems at peak times are caused by parents who bring their children into and away from the schools and live out of the area. This causes congestion and could be rectified if the children went to school in their own living area. I am all in favour of a by-pass but this is a problem that has been discussed many times over many ears. May I further add the use of traffic calmers causes more problems than they are worth.
- Traffic problems in Ponteland are created by people working and using schools in Ponteland and living here. This cannot be avoided unless school places are reserved for local children.
- Re 2, 3, 5 & 6 – can I ask that a direct cycle / pedestrian only link is investigated & proposed i your plan between the avenue in Medburn and Darras Hall (possibly Meadowvale Road? This will allow safer cycling routes, and a direct link for the children of Medburn to access the school in a sustainable manner – reducing traffic congestion, tackling health issues and improving wellbeing. In addition this could create a lovely healthy walking route for all the residents of Darras Hall. There is already a track in place for some of the route.
- A good first step to E2 and E3 would be to make Callerton Lane (at certain times of the day) and Middle Drive ‘residents only’ access with a low speed limit so that children and adult pedestrians/cyclists could use that route in safety. There are alternatives (Darras Road and Edgehill” for vehicular access to Darras Hall.
- Before adopting policy E1 there is a need to consult with Newcastle City Council over the route of an East West Bypass. The city are currently developing a route south of Newcastle Airport through the Woolsington estate which could have a profound effect on the traffic on Throckley/Blagdon traffic through Ponteland. Traffic figures have consistently demonstrated that a North/South bypass is ot the issue with only one third of traffic travelling to Ponteland/Darras Hall pas north. 2. I would have thought that the words “if possible” in policy E5 unnecessary. 3. Policy E6 should be strengthened to require developers to provide adequate car parking.

- Again, too many issues for one response.
- I would support the promotion of use and access to public transport which would reduce the impact on both the local and strategic road networks. I would be interested in the inclusion within the plan of the proposed visions of the proposed relief road and where its connections would be.
- The motor car and other forms of road transport are here to stay. Look forward not backward embrace and provide for new ideas.
- Again Objectives need to be clear. Some will say that it is safer to transport children to school by car.
- Traffic at school times is horrendous we need one place for school drop offs so all children can walk safely to their school without the worry of an accident by irresponsible drivers parking.

Drainage & Potential Flooding

F1 To require that surface waters and waste waters from new developments are separated.

Comments

No comments.

F2 To require that surface water run-off from hard surfaces on new developments is minimised.

Comments

No comments.

F3 To require that all new properties can demonstrate an annual risk of flooding of less than 1 in 100 from both fluvial and pluvial sources.

Comments

- F3 - based on historical or projected future probabilities of 1 in 100 flood level?.
- F3 & F5 key to any new developments.
- This is already NPPF requirement. Attempts at pluvial flooding objectives very poor and plagerises NPPF + repourous.

F4 To make easily understood information about flooding risk available to all residents and to provide access to informed advice and assistance.

Comments

- Again small queries F4 info should be for ALL potential buyers.

F5 To require that any new development adheres to sustainable drainage principles and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Comments

- Important not to build new houses on potential flood plains.
- New larger homes and division of plots has resulted in flooding throughout Darras.
- Darras Hall has had a flooding problem for many years – now made worse by division of plots and larger house sizes. Flood plane has been altered noticeably over last 40 years.
- Most important that any new building does not affect drainage and all local services.
- F3 & F5 key to any new developments.
- This is already NPPF requirement.

F6 To require that the unnecessary infilling of ditches and watercourses is prevented.

Comments

No comments.

General Comments Flooding & Potential Flooding

- F5 and F6 should also apply to alteration to existing properties/land.
- F5 and F6 should also apply to extensions and renovations.
- Vital – the area is prone to flooding and we must avoid development that would add to flood risk.
- Keep all water routes free of rubbish.
- Definitely needs sorting.
- The river needs cleaning to keep flowing also floods onto main.
- The river should be kept clear at all times which gets overgrown. Also Fairney Burn to help prevent flooding and flash flooding.
- Define on maps the present flood defences so people know.
- Enforcement of legislation on drainage, porous driveways etc essential.
- Need clean drains out as leaves fall in and block.
- Rivers build up over time and 'meander'. In Ponteland town it can't meander and thus should be carefully dredged from time to time.
- F7 – Ensure those responsible guarantee regular cleaning of drainage and gullies throughout the year.
- To ensure waste water limitation is resolved before any further non-organic growth.
- These issues are an absolute priority!
- Flooding causes great distress and cost to residents and businesses – must be a development priority.
- Nothing new to existing NPPF requirements. Pointless statement as already NPPF requirement also in porous requirement. System already in incapacity. 165 photos of pluvial resident issues continue to be unaddressed and ignored by all. The Police official Sainsbury is 'Gold' centre and will be first to flood! Absolutely no help to significance to pluvial affected residents in these objectives. Historic flooding pluvial has been ignored.
- Concerned about existing sewage provision proposals and large scale housing water surface run off.

- Fowl drainage important as some large buildings in Belfast cannot be used as sewers at full capacity.
- Idea of settling ponds etc is daft.
- The River Pont should be dredged regularly. Needs attention now.
- River Pont should be maintained and not allowed to become overgrown.
- Also encourage digging out of existing ditch and waterways.
- Consideration of MTCE and improved drainage to minimise flooding.
- My wife and I have lived in Ponteland for at least 46 years but its only these last few years that Ponteland has had problems with drainage and flooding and in our opinion this is due to the increase of housing using present drains that cannot cope with the increase plus the poor maintenance of the river Pont. The drains are not maintained and cleaned on a regular basis and further developments would increase the problem even more.
- Why build more housing development and risk flooding being increased.
- Agree in part, however, this must all be looked at and assessed by the relevant authorities including the Council, NWL and EA.
- Policy F5 should be strengthened to ensure ongoing maintenance through the addition of something like “... drainage principals, together with a appropriate maintenance regime, and does.....”
- These matters are already dealt with in the planning process.
- All statements are perfectly laudable but they are processes not objectives.
- Agree with the general focus of the objectives. However, we suggest that at the end of F1, the words “wherever possible” are included. We advise that objective F2 is integrated into objective F5. We also suggest that F5 could be more focused on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) principles being adhered to in new development as the current objective includes not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. This is already represented in existing planning policy. We support objective F4. However, it is unclear who will be making flood risk information easily accessible and understandable and how will they achieve this. We appreciate, however, that this detail may be included in future stages/versions of the plan. For F6, we are unsure what would define “unnecessary”. This objective may require further clarification in order to achieve the expected outcome.
- This isn’t adhered to now without the extra housing being built. Drains are never cleaned and the state of Ponteland river around the bridge and it’s banks are a disgrace when the river doesn’t flow freely.

Healthcare & Care of the Elderly

G1 To promote the expansion and enhancement of health provision to meet the needs of the population and the geography of Ponteland.

Comments

- Housing growth has grown faster than medical facilities. We must avoid NHS getting overstretched by too much growth.
- Need to plan ahead for future increase in demand and population.

- Particular concerns about whether expansion of healthcare provision would take place.

G2 To promote the concept of a community that values its older population.

Comments

- G2 a key part – more local community volunteering opportunities.

G3 To promote the expansion of primary care facilities in Ponteland with appropriate public transport links and parking.

Comments

- Where's the cycle transport links?.
- Ageing profile of population. Need for some type of local transport.
- Appropriate transport links – now that's a joke.

G4 To promote the provision of appropriate accessibility for older people to all facilities.

Comments

- Improve access to Health Centre – try pushing a wheelchair through the industrial estate to get there.
- Better footpath in Meadowfield needed for pedestrians to access the primary care facilities, especially for elderly or by wheelchair.

G5 To require that any new housing development is appropriate to the projected age profile for Ponteland and to promote the inclusion of accessible public transport links.

Comments Healthcare & Care of the Elderly

- Would not G5, older persons housing is a priority but do not agree it should be appropriate to the projected age profile. You should be trying to also attract younger people.
- The definition of “accessible transport” needs to be appropriate to elderly people.
- We need lower cost smaller properties.
- What has new housing development to do with health care of the elderly. Health care is for the NHS.

General Comments

- I am concerned that Ponteland would become something to be a combination of vast mansions and geriatric facilities.
- More car parks needed for care homes.
- Health centre in wrong location – make more central/accessible.
- Older people still like spacious properties but with smaller gardens.

- Housing for the elderly is important however there needs to be a recognition that housing should be provide for the younger/next generation in order to have a balanced community.
 - Open Health Centre at weekends and in evenings.
 - Housing for the older population needs to be affordable also.
 - We need housing for young people as well.
 - Expansion of existing facilities capacity prerequisite to any further population growth.
 - Also needed NHS Dentist.
-
- Appointments waiting two or three weeks, which at present is the case.
 - NHS Dentist required in village.
 - Healthcare Dentist required.
 - We need a national health Dentist.
 - There is not a National Health Dentist in Ponteland – one or more required as a matter of urgency.
 - Larger second health centre needed.
 - Care of the elderly and provision of their needs is essential but not at the cost of encouraging children and families.
 - They need more care for over 80 yr my grandad 93 not much care.
 - Again more definition needed.
 - Low cost housing, especially for the aged is important for the overall profile of the place.
 - While protecting the green belt.
 - As long as green belt protected/not impinged upon.
 - Large increase in elderly already at system incapacity 2014-2034 population projections set for 60% increase in 65+ age group.
 - I agree – we should accept that Ponteland is an area favoured by older people – there is nothing wrong with this but their needs should be met – e.g. public transport, care homes etc. Bus routes to outer edges of Darras Hall are poor.
 - So why was the Health Centre built at the far end of the industrial estate?
 - Footpaths are not elderly friendly.
 - The Health Centre are at full capacity now. An increase in population would not be able to cope and I think the community does value its older population. The problem with building more care homes is that there are many of them who come from outside the area but we must try to cater for people already living in Ponteland.
 - All age groups must be accounted for in housing provision.
 - The wider needs must also be considered here and appropriate locations whether in Ponteland and/or elsewhere identifies when all things considered.
 - As above re Objectives.
 - Already a large number of care homes in Ponteland. Seems to have more than a fair share of care facilities.
 - We struggle now to get a doctor's appointments sometimes you have to wait 3 weeks to get one. That is no good when you are poorly.

Education & Youth Activities

H1 To promote the provision of sufficient school places for local children of all abilities within the existing feeder partnership system.

Comments

- Particularly important that local children have places at local schools.
- H1: Would be happier if this said 'at least@. Local children alone would not provide sufficient pupils for a financially sustainable secondary and 18+ school.
- School places for local children should mean local, not from Newcastle".
- Children attend DHFS from Whickham/Gosforth/Fenham at cost of local children moving into area and unable to get a place in their local school.

H2 To promote and encourage access to, and use of, school facilities by the community, of all ages, out of hours and during school holidays.

Comments

- More evening activities across the ages.
- Particular interest in H2 which encourages better use of facilities.
- H2 important rather than these school facilities being underused.

H3 To work with external agencies to engage with the youth on future projects.

Comments

- H3 – Key!
- Encourage youth to be involved and be a partner in youth projects (i.e. "ownership").

General Comments Education & Youth Activities

- Give priority to Northumberland children.
- Objectives are excellent.
- We need young families in the parish to fill the schools.
- Likewise increased capacity to reduce associated traffic flow patterns.
- What percentage of children come from outside catchment area as they add to traffic problem.
- Anything for young children is a benefit.
- Where and when was a comparative study done for skate park!! These researches are very important.
- Really don't want to lose the 3 school system.
- Need local back in village and not just people from out of village.
- Need to plan for more schools if large scale housing goes ahead.
- To abolish the non-provision of free transport to all pupils over 16.

- The 'school run' of private cars needs discouragement.
- Especially important if new housing is to be built.
- Important to get the young people of the area interested in their environment and reduce littering and vandalism.
- Any further house building will cause incapacity.
- Definitely.
- The one point I agree with is to use the present schools and facilities more for local children and encourage parents to take greater interest in their children's welfare and take part in the activities that are available.

Analysis

Previous Evidence

Since 2012 the Neighbourhood Plan Group has encouraged comments from the community through events (Party in the Park, High School Year 9, 11, & 12), the website and formal assessments through the initial survey and the more extensive questionnaire in 2013. All of these views, from all age groups, and responses have been listened to and have influenced this recent Consultation.

- [Link to Summaries of these Events](#)

Evaluation and Analysis on Community Consultation September 2014

Introduction

This evaluation has been taken from the written and electronic responses received during the Ponteland Community Consultation on Visions & Objectives 19th-30th September. The information contained in this document provides a summary of responses from the community during this period of consultation at the drop-in-sessions at the Memorial Hall on the 19th/20th September and 26th/27th September and from the 19th-30th September on the website. www.pontelandneighbourhoodplan.co.uk

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide a clear summary on the communities view on the Vision Statement and on eight Topic Group Objectives. This in turn will produce the next step in the process.

Methodology

The Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan Group (PNPG) intends to prepare a development plan identifying draft policies and draft projects covered in this analysis as areas of community concern.

The initial publicity was through a 1 page article in the Pont News & Views in the September edition of this monthly local magazine delivered to 4,500 households in the civil parish of

Ponteland. To coincide with this publicity all information was also displayed on the PNPG website. www.pontelandneighbourhoodplan.co.uk

The 1 page article was also publicised on 6 parish notice boards.

The Community Consultation Event started on the 19th-30th September 2014 available through the website and drop-in sessions at the Memorial Hall on 19th/20th/26th/27th Sept. Community responses were fed back via A4 Handout at the drop in sessions, a take away Community Consultation Document and via a gizmo/interactive reply system on the website.

Community Consultation Results

Vision Statement **93% agree** **6% disagree**

Conservation & Heritage **89% agree** **7% disagree**

Summary of comments

- The importance of identifying and supporting the extension of the Character Statement to include Darras Hall and a wider area as a means of protection for the future.
- Additional protection is required to include the value of the green approaches to Ponteland.
- To preserve the existing Green Belt and maintain the separation between Newcastle City and Ponteland.

Natural Environment, Open Spaces & Habitats **93% agree** **4% disagree**

Summary of comments

- The need to respect and protect the natural environment and habitat to exist in harmony with the community.
- Encourage management on maintenance of watercourses and ditches.
- Encourage access and promote the use of existing footpaths, bridleways, and cycle ways.

Housing & Affordable Housing **88% agree** **6% disagree**

Summary of comments

- Housing should be determined by need, not built to stand empty.
- Concerns over appropriate and suitable locations i.e. use of infill and Brownfield sites in preference to eroding the Green Belt.
- Small scale developments preferred.
- Concerns over the existing infrastructure and the potential flooding issues.
- Housing requirements to encourage young families to live in Ponteland, first time buyers and social housing.
- Accommodation/Housing for older residents to down size.

Retail, Business & Employment **87% agree** **6% disagree**

Summary of comments

- Ponteland is really a village with a population size of Hexham who shop in Newcastle, Metro Centre or on the Internet for goods.
- Ponteland is currently a “dormitory town” a place to live not work.
- Concerns over the lack and variety of shops and services available with too many cafes, hairdressers and charity shops.
- There should be a village centre or market square.
- A need for regeneration and improvement to Merton Way and the Broadway and encouragement for a greater choice of shops which would give additional employment.
- Tourism could enhance the village centre.
- Public transport provision needs to improve.
- Major problem with parking and congestion during school times.
- Many comments for and against a relief road-would it take passing trade away?
- Move the Industrial Estate away from the centre of the village and relocate nearer to the Airport.
- By relocating the Industrial Estate this would release land for housing in the centre of Ponteland.
- Affordable small office units located near Airport.

Transportation & Highways

87% agree

9% disagree

Summary of comments

- Develop better access transport links.
- Improved public transport would reduce the impact on the road network.
- Traffic problems caused by school run, discourage out of area pupils at our local schools.
- Children can walk short distances to school.
- Priority to reduce the traffic through Ponteland.
- Traffic at full capacity.
- Traffic calming causes problems.
- A relief road would encourage more housing.
- Need to consult on the route of any relief road.
- Encourage cycle routes.
- Request for a cycle way from Medburn to Darras Hall(around Meadowvale area)
- Request for Callerton lane/Middle Dr a resident’s only area with a reduced speed limit due to the number of children, pedestrians and cyclists.
- Footpaths should be for pedestrians.
- Would an extension of the metro line assist?
- Consult with Newcastle City Council over route of East West bypass.

Drainage & Potential Flooding

92% agree

1% disagree

Summary of comments

- The area is prone to flooding and flash floods-avoid development that will increase the risk.

- If housing numbers were to increase, using the existing system with the increased capacity and risk of flooding-system couldn't cope.
- Concerns about existing sewage provision and potential large scale housing water runoff would add to the existing problems.
- Consider MTCE to improve drainage & minimise flooding.
- Suggest the use of SUDS principles.
- Regular river management maintenance required.
- Responsibility to clean ditches and waterways to help flow of water.
- Regular drain & gully cleaning required to clear debris and remove leaves before blockage occurs.
- Dealt with in the planning process.

Healthcare & Care of the Elderly

90% agree

3% disagree

Summary of comments

- Concerns over the image of Ponteland-vast mansions & geriatric facilities.
- Too many care homes.
- More care provision for the elderly is needed.
- Medical Centre located in the wrong place.
- Doctor waiting lists too long up to 3 weeks for an appointment.
- Medical Centre needs to open evenings & weekends.
- More car parking for care homes.
- **NHS dentist required.**
- Footpaths not always elderly friendly.
- Recognise the need for a better housing mix for the elderly and the young at a reasonable cost.

Education & Youth Activities

69% agree

Summary of comments

- The 3 tier education system is valued.
- School places for local children.
- Discourage car use for the "school run"
- Free transport for all pupils over 16 years of age.
- When arranging activities for the youth-research is important.
- Increase the use of school facilities for all to use.

General Comments covering the Vision & Objectives

- We want to ensure Ponteland does not lose its uniqueness and end up being joined to other developments by enthusiastic developers.
- Please ensure that Ponteland is not overdeveloped to meet the demands of the large building groups. We do not want to join Newcastle.

- Green Belt should not be developed.
- Green Belt should be protected at all costs.
- How does this plan affect the LUGANO application. Is not the horse already down the road.
- I do not see anything controversial in all this.
- A good all round questionnaire – hope much of it comes to fruition.
- The importance of the airport's development of future needs appear to have been totally ignored. A prospective owner on the proposed development at Birney Hill may feel aggrieved if it develops like Heathrow! Surely air traffic can be expected to increase.
- A good comprehensive vision to support.
- Looking forward to ideas for improving Ponteland.
- Generally agree with declared objectives, with certain defined qualifications.
- Generally supportive of statements made above, however there will need to be recognition that an element of the green belt (where appropriate) will have to be developed to allow for future housing need (in line with the emerging Northumberland County Council).
- Very comprehensive.
- Overall I think the mission and objectives are taking a long step in the right direction to derive from the consultation process a good and deliverable basis for the plan.
- Good exhibition. Priorities are to protect the green belt and to void too much development. Build on brownfield not green belt. People moved here for the way it is and not what it might become. Thanks.
- Very concerned about red 'blob' on Banks desired building area. Equally concerned that Lugano has challenged the outline application for Police HQ.
- Very concerned about the 'Red Blob' which is shown on the Banks potential Clickemin in Dev but I now understand. Why it is there after it has been explained to me.
- The comment and wishes of Ponteland people MUST be listened to.
- I agree with the above and consider it well thought through, with a focus on what matters to those in our locality.
- Fantastic piece of work.
- Agree with sentiments expressed and priorities displayed in questionnaire analysis
- Lacking in Ponteland is an NHS dentist.
- We need better bus service to (Morpeth, Kingston Park, supermarkets like Aldi, Farm Foods and Iceland in Westerhope. Also a service to be able to attend hospitals for those without own cars.
- Please clear cars from pavements as people cannot walk with safety. They should be asked to park in the correct parking areas. AS they are free for their use
- We don't want to be another suburb of Newcastle. This will be the case if more housing is built linking up to Newcastle's development of land. We wish Ponteland to remain a village of character.
- I like the village as it is with a few additions but not too many.
- Leisure facilities should be improved to make sport and fitness accessible to all age groups.
- The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be produced in Draft form as soon as possible. You must get NCC to adopt more realistic housing projections in the light of the latest ONS2012 statistics and get their sums right.

- A complete set of Town Council bye laws should follow adoption of the N. Plan – plumbing into correct drains could be one of them.
- Very thorough and well thought out vision.
- Well considered plan – worthy of support by all Ponteland and Darras Hall residents, and businesses.
- This is a very thorough assessment of the issues that concern me. The protection of green belt is my main concern but I agree the other topics are important – Ponteland’s strongest asset – in my opinion! - is it’s peaceful, semi-rural environment and I would hate this to be lost.
- The “Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan” appears to be a well balanced and fair strategy that should benefit the whole community – existing and future.
- Very comprehensive and well thought out proposal.
- Depressing. My experience of NCC staff is not good. They do not understand, or care about Ponteland. Admire your efforts. Good luck!.
- Very difficult – N.C.C. ignorant or do not care.
- Change address from Newcastle upon Tyne to Northumberland. It is possible. The ‘Wirral’ changed from ‘Mersyside’ after locals objected.
- Whereas it is easy to agree to all the sections and appreciate the time, care and work provided by the Committee members, nevertheless, more precise definitions of some statements needed.
- Generally agree with all objectives, however in the present economic climate not confident on those dependent upon a high degree of finance can be achieved in the foreseeable future. To enhance community support and pride for Ponteland, attention needs to be given now to improve the facilities at Merton Way and Broadway.
- Any whiff of nimbyism must be squashed!
- I’m not sure what the answer is but one thing lacking in Ponteland is the absence of a natural village centre. This should be a long term aim linked with any development of the library site and the village shopping centre.
- There is danger in current proposed building developments on Throckley Fell and Street Houses. Could overwhelm village services and character, schools, leisure and employment. It risks making us an easy suburban target for Newcastle City.
- The plan seems to reflect a common sense approach to the situation on the ground in Ponteland, future needs and avoids the high-handed approach mooted by NCC.
- I would like to congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan Group on their comprehensive and exhaustive investigation into all these vital issues – so clearly and comprehensively laid out.
- Important to maintain strategic green belt protection to keep NCL and Ponteland separate, maintain green spaces, general character protect wildlife and prevent further traffic congestion and over development.
- We support development of businesses at the airport site (already semi derelict) not on Cheviot View where it will cause further congestion and impact on the old railway line which provides an excellent walk/ride and encourages wildlife i.e. important local amenity which requires protection from development.
- Well put together Neighbourhood Planning objectives list which hopefully NCC take notice of. Protection of the green belt to remain prominent along with strategic separations between Ponteland/Newcastle upon Tyne/Airport border.
- Very professional – excellent work – many thanks for your efforts.

- Well done to all concerned. Very professional.
- Most of the following is predicated on allowing further building development. The neighbourhood plan needs to focus on incapacity of infrastructure when 'Visions and Objectives' are in conflict with existing network support. Identified incapacity – 1) Medical Centre, access availability, transport, visiting times. 2) Schools continuing 'to allow' students from elsewhere. 3) House building plans that exacerbate incapacity. 4) Sewage incapacity NWL cannot accommodate any further development. 5) Traffic incapacity – parking in town / jams in town. 6) Increase in population 65+. Large incapacity increase of 65+ age group – facilities / library / activities. 7) Flooding incapacity unaddressed totally. Let residents who have flooded do it!
- I would wish to preserve green belt and restrict development to brownfield sites. Expansion of Ponteland should be limited and we should avoid "creep" towards Newcastle. I do not regard the provision of affordable housing as an issue – there are many developments containing starter homes within 5 miles of Ponteland. I would see the area around Police HQ as the ideal place for development.
- No large scale housing development is required within the village. The NCC housing numbers are over ambitious and not realistic. I agree with the proposal of small pockets of housing development and the proposal of a relief road out of the flood zone areas and support the work of the Ponteland Neighbourhood Group.
- The proposals are short sighted and a knee jerk reaction to central government housing policy. Green belt is and was green belt for a reason – for future generations to enjoy. There are/is plenty of housing for sale that would not be so detrimental to the existing local character. Think long and hard about what you (The Local Authority) are about to do) as the impact will be very detrimental for future generations of Ponteland.
- I can see that a great deal of work has gone into this plan and it has given the people of Ponteland a fair chance to express their views. I agree with the aims that are outlined here.
- Who are the members of the group and what fits then for the role? No indication given at all. There is very little in the questionnaire that anyone could disagree with. A bit like voting for mother's love and apple pie. Who could disagree with it? The proposed objectives are all 'to promote', or 'to require' but no indication of **how** either of these can be achieved. And that is probably the most important part of any future plan for Ponteland. Just one I've picked at random. **To promote the provision of safer cycling in and around Ponteland.** As a cyclist myself the roads and car drivers around Ponteland frighten me – especially on Darras Hall Estate. Also, from Prestwick to the Street Houses roundabout there is a pavement on one side of the road, ideal for cyclists since the road is narrow, but the hedge is overgrown, the path is hidden by vegetation and debris, and if this was cleared it would be much safer. The same comments apply to the A696 between Limestone Lane and Fox Covert. Why is nothing done here and now? Cycle lanes such as the one at Woosington are not the answer. They go over drains, potholes and offer no protection. So yes I agree with the proposition but how will it be implemented. The same comments could apply to the other questions. In Section D questions are asked which have been asked for more than 10 years. What is needed here are more specifics and more consultation with those involved, for example, the shopkeepers at Merton Way have not yet been asked for their views on redevelopment! Really! All activity in the village centre needs car parking. I don't see this addressed anywhere. Cars, vans, even lorries parked all day

at the back of Merton Way. Do we need a time limit? Cyclists come and unload their bikes, go on tour, probably contribute nothing to the local economy. Any so called industrial development is inappropriate for Ponteland when much better facilities are available at Throckley, Kingston Park and at the office complex at Prestwick. We need to be realistic. Ponteland is a dormitory for Tyneside. Concentrate on services for our population. We can't be everything to everybody. If the main road through Ponteland, the A696, is our showcase a lot of attention should be given to removing A boards, chalk boards and multiple signs since these are a distraction to motorists and an impediment to all those who use pavements. The highway signs are duplicated and are often damaged. If this street was attractive, visitors would be inclined to stop, have a drink, perhaps a meal. We don't need to have special campaigns to attract tourists unless it is for better restaurants for all. Housing is always a difficult topic. Ponteland does not need any more 4 or more bedroom houses, all with en-suite. These houses do not address the current and future needs of our population. Two bedroom houses of decent size rooms and storage facilities are needed for first time buyers, young professionals and older couples or people on their own. Well-designed flats, terraces and more imaginative planning are needed. Especially on the new estate on the Police HQ. It is not the number of houses which is important but the type and location!

- There is a lot of aspiration, which is good. But this has to be tempered with reality. People here do not like change and anything that happens should be focused and seen through properly. What tends to happen is continuous delay/consultation etc and then things happen very ad hoc. Don't envy you the job.
- Merton Way is biggest problem. Shall encourage more housing instead of shops with demolition of part. The proposal of road will only encourage residential development within the enclosed area!
- Housing plans should focus on social housing, small starter homes and supported housing priorities for people with mental/physical health needs.
- Inevitable that objectives are lumped together but makes it hard to comment on subsidiary objectives within the main topics.
- If only we could turn the clock back and start again, but we must look forward and to redress the past. Start by calling it Ponteland Parrish Council instead of Ponteland Town Council. Elect councillors who have total commitment to Ponteland Parrish Council and look after the residents of Ponteland to fight to keep as much as possible any money coming from council tax, land sales, council houses sales and others so that it is spent on the infrastructure and needs of Ponteland and its people. I do realise what it must be like going into a lions den when any councillor from Ponteland goes into a Northumberland county meeting comprising of labour counsellors from other parts of the county who seem to be only interested in extracting as much money as possible from Ponteland and Tynedale to waste in ideas in Broomhill, Hadstone Ashington, Blyth and so on. I think selling the county hall in Morpeth and transferring the head quarters to Ashington is just another way of miss using money on wasteful ideas of the present county council. It is time the county system of representation was changed where each parish runs its own affairs and then sends its best representative to the council for a particular item. This would seem more fairer play and cut down on time spent on discussions and items from people like Ronnie Campbell and Nick Brown who are a total disgrace as M.Ps. I feel sorry the people they represent. I also think we are lucky in having Guy Operman as our M.P. May I

finally as the question as a small village why do we need a Mayor. After all with so many councillors surely they could look after the total needs of Ponteland. My final point is we have an estate being built of 4 bedroom homes by John T. Bell on the land that was once the Care village and next to the Police head quarters which should have been for low cost housing or council houses and where has all the money from the sale of this land gone to. Again this money should have gone into the Parrish council house pot but what has the counsellors done about it? It is with all these ponderables I think we should have a north devolution and dispose of these present lines of bureaucracy which will keep out the federalists like Nick Clegg. I feel very passionate about Ponteland and want the best that people in office can give for those living in the area.

- Ponteland and Darras Hall has been stagnant for 30 years in terms of infrastructure and resident facilities – major change is needed.
- Noise levels of builder is becoming out of hand. They should be reminded of noise regulations. We do not need “affordable” housing. There are plenty of smaller properties – that are “allowed” to be knocked down and replaced with “Southfork” properties. If that practice was stopped we would have all the affordable housing we need on Darras. Build only on brownfield sites. Keep the “rural” feel of Darras by curtailing concrete outer walls and metal fencing. Keep our hedges!
- This is not just a Ponteland issue, the whole of Northumberland is going through a detailed review and any decisions made i Ponteland must be made in consideration what is happening elsewhere.
- Thanks for the efforts made by all in developing these policies – an unenviable task!
- There is very little consideration of younger families/younger generations within this. I also feel it is unfair to ask for an agree/disagree response to multiple, significant matters that are too complex for simple one word answers covering several statements. You have not made reference to an actual plan setting out where you wish to see these developments take place – it is very difficult to make comments with only limited information presented in a format such as this.
- You may wish to avoid the opportunity given my (hopefully) constructive comments – but I would be happy to contribute to the further development and realisation of the Plan.
- Although answering ‘agree’ to the questions, I am uncomfortable in that if all these things are done, a developer may come in and say ‘well we’ve taken all this into account and acted on the requirements, therefore, there is nothing stopping us building on the green belt’. There should have been a question ‘Brownfield sites OK to build on?’ answer ‘yes’ greenbelt ok to build on? Answer “NO”
- My particular concerns are the use of Berwick Hill Road as a short cut to the A1 by HGVs and cars. Increasing both the traffic to the village and the damage to the roads.
- My particular concerns are the use of Berwick Hill Road as a short cut to the A1 by HGVs and cars. Increasing both the traffic to the village and the damage to the roads.
- Don’t agree with some of the statements a ticking system would of been more appropriate.
- Ponteland is becoming a retirement village and needs more variety of age groups it also needs a variety of shops not just hairdressers and places to eat.

Summary of General Comments from the participants at the Community Consultation

The general comments on the whole experience of the consultation have been extremely complimentary to the Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan Group. Their professionalism and exhaustive investigations in preparing, presenting clearly and comprehensively issues of major concern to the community have been expressed by residents. Many comments appreciated the opportunity to pass on their views and indicated they wished the PNPG to give more detail in the near future.

Concerns highlighted from these general comments are:

- The importance of the Character Statement
- Protection of the Greenbelt, Natural Environment and the separation between the Newcastle International Airport (location & expansion) and Ponteland.
- Housing Development, Housing need & Housing mix. Use of Brown field sites & infilling.
- Ponteland an area prone to Flooding & flash floods, concerns over existing infrastructure overload, maintenance of the river-watercourses & ditches.
- Retail, regenerate Merton Way & the Broadway encourage a greater variety of shops. Possible relocation of Industrial Estate closer to Airport.
- Manage traffic congestion; improve public transport, parking and think about a possible relief road, cycle ways.
- Healthcare over capacity at Medical Centre. Housing needs for the elderly.
- Education-school places for local children and the use of school facilities for all.

All of this Analysis needs to identify draft planning policies and other issues that can be dealt with under projects.

Planning Issues and Recommendations:

- **Role of Ponteland in Northumberland**
- **Life of the Plan and Beyond**

Refer to Castle Morpeth District Local Plan Each Topic section, Introduction, Implementation, Relationship to NPPF & Core Strategy and Sustainability.

Projects and Recommendations

- **Relief Road**
- **Education Campus**
- **Conservation Area Character Appraisal**
- **Housing Allocation and Delivery**
- **Sites for Business**
- **Meadowfield**
- **Merton Way & Broadway**

- **Other Projects in the Conservation Area**
- **Flood Protection**

Supporters Group

Attendees of the Community Consultation were invited to become a Neighbourhood Plan “Supporter” as part of a focus group to be set up in the New Year 2015.

The Steering Group never envisaged this group to be large in number but would consist of residents who could support with a variety of expertise and skills. They will be encouraged to play a more active role in the progress of the Steering Group and some may take on the role of Advisors if appropriate.

Conclusions on Objectives refer to Executive Summary

Appendix

For detailed information view website for Consultation Booklet and Display Material from the drop in events

Available to Examiner only

Drop in session attendance & response sheets

Additional information

Community invitations were sent to every household (4,500) in the civil parish of Ponteland through the local parish magazine, Pont News & Views.

A full page article was taken out in this magazine which was delivered between the 28th August and the 3rd September advertising the Community Consultation period and drop in sessions at the Memorial Hall.

Other parties invited to make comment are listed below under the following headings. Statutory Organisations, Local Government, Community Facilities, Education, Business, Social Amenities, Youth Facilities, Other.

STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS

- The Coal Authority
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- The Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
- The Highways Agency
- Relevant Primary Care Trust – NHS Northumberland Clinical Commissioning Group
- Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority i.e. Avonline / British Telecommunications

plc / Cybermoor / Mono Consultants / Hutchinson 3G UK Limited – Virgin Media Limited / Wildcard Networks

- Northern Powergrid
- National Grid
- Northern Gas Networks
- Northumbria Water Limited – sewerage undertaker and water undertaker
- The Theatres Trust – Planning & Heritage Advisor

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

- Newcastle City Council – Head of Planning & Neighbourhood Planning
- Dinnington Parish Council
- Woolsington Parish Council
- Belsay Parish Council
- Heddon-on-the-Wall Parish Council
- Stamfordham Parish Council
- Stannington Parish Council
- Whalton Parish Council
- Northumberland County Council – Head of Planning and Housing Services

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

- Dissington Hall
- Memorial Hall
- St Mary's Village Hall
- Health Centre Ponteland Medical Group (Doctors) Meadowfield
- Health Centre White Medical Group Meadowfield
- St Mary's Church
- Merton Village Hall
- Methodist Village Church
- St Matthew Roman Catholic Church
- United Reform Church

BUSINESS

- Horton Grange
- Stonehave Lodge B&B
- Fratellis Restaurant
- Rialto Restaurant
- Waggon – Public House/Restaurant
- Highlander Inn – Public House/Restaurant
- Jewsons Meadowfield
- Lawson Fuses Meadowfield
- Opal Computer Repairs Meadowfield
- PTH Van Hire
- James Burden Ltd
- Peter Harrison Business Equipment

- Tilley Roofing Meadowfield
- Tofco Ltd Meadowfield
- Trigger Points Meadowfield
- Ponteland Barber Shop
- Ponteland Foot Care Clinic
- Mackley and Stevens Opticians
- Diagonal Alternatives
- HB Opticians Broadway
- Alan Newton Butcher
- Browell Smith and Co
- Iain Nicholson Estate Agents
- Major Family Law
- Colette Stroud Solicitors
- Grange Lea Care Homes
- Stephen Coates Chartered Accountant
- Independent Financial Advisors
- Dobsons Estate Agents
- Trading Places Estate Agents
- Keith Pattinson Estate Agents
- Rook Mathews Sayer Estate Agents
- Steel Fix
- Geo Marine Ltd
- Useful Vision Prestwick Business Park
- West Marketing Communications Prestwick Business Park
- I.T. Solutions Ltd Prestwick Business Park
- Darras Dental
- Lloyds TSB
- Barclays Bank
- HSBC
- Natwest Bank
- Newcastle Building Society
- Britannia Hotel Airport
- Premier Inn Newcastle Airport
- Blackbird Inn
- Diamond Inn
- Wheatsheaf Premier Inn
- Doubletree by Hilton Airport
- Samms Cafe
- Poppy's Cafe
- Merton Way Chinese Takeaway
- Lorenzos Italian Restaurant
- The Mogul Raj Restuarant
- Surma Tandoori
- Gills Fish & Chips
- The Badger Inn
- Dobbies Garden Centre
- Seven Stars Public House

- Princess Garden Chinese
- New Rendezvous Restaurant
- Bawarchi Restaurant
- Ponteland Tandoori
- Lowrey's Cafe
- Fratellos Restaurant @ Doubletree by Hilton @ Airport
- Alnorthumbria Vets
- Post Office Sorting Office
- Maysan Foods Ltd
- A&K Motors
- Custom Advanced Systems
- Spa Beauty
- N Tweddle Furniture Restorers
- Aubery Design
- Waterstons
- Moralee & Co
- Strettle Memorials
- Strachan & Tyson Veterinary Surgery
- Hendersons Pharmacy
- William Hill Bookmaker
- Look Twice
- Boo Hairdressers
- Fuse Hairdressers
- Galliford Try Partnerships North
- G Scott of York Ltd @ Dobbies Garden Centre
- Bardgett & Son Funeral Directors
- Nichols Bakers
- Elliotts
- Q Hair Design
- Barbers
- Mills News Agency
- Parklands Pharmacy
- Darras Hall Post Office
- Nicholson & Morgan
- Ponteland Club & Institute
- Reed Wallace
- Kirby Solicitors
- Manors Village Care Homes
- McCarthy and Stone Assisted Living
- Abbeyfield Care Home
- Leonard Cheshire Supported Care Home
- Care (Ponteland)
- Rowlands Chartered Accountants
- Waitrose
- Sainsbury's
- Davidson's Bakery
- Carousel Cards

- Broadway Deli
- Co-op
- Martin's Newspapers
- Henderson Pharmacy
- John Blades
- West End Farm
- Bairstow Eves
- Sanderson and Young
- The Professional Partnership
- TML Communication
- Pajunk UK Medical Products
- Maxi Ltd Internet Services
- Kitty Kattery
- Armstrong Waste Disposal
- Broadway Cabs
- Darras & Pont Taxis Ltd
- Dulais Dry Cleaners
- H B Opticians
- Western Way Garage
- Trinity Youth Ponteland

EDUCATION

- Darras Hall First School
- Ponteland First School
- Richard Coates C of E Middle School
- Ponteland Private Nursery
- Ponteland High School
- Ponteland Middle School
- Band House Nursery

SOCIAL AMENITIES

- Local Tennis Club
- Local Bowls Club
- Local Cricket Club
- Local Gold Club
- Local Leisure Centre
- Newcastle Falcons Rugby Club
- Local Rugby Club
- Rifle Club
- Ponteland Rotary Club

YOUTH FACILITIES

- Guides/Brownies Darras Hall
- Ponteland Youth Centre

OTHER

- Darras Hall Estates Committee
- Newcastle International Airport