



Ponteland Green Belt Group.

RESPONSES TO THE NORTHUMBERLAND CORE STRATEGY ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION ending 2nd Jan. 2014

Executive Summary:

1. It is important to stress from the outset of this document that the Ponteland Green Belt Group are not against development in Ponteland per se. We believe that any development should be proportional and must not have a detrimental affect on the unique and distinctive character of the village. The use of Brownfield sites and Greenfield land that is not Green Belt should be the primary focus for any development. The release of Greenbelt land must be a case of last resort and must be based on clear evidenced based housing need and not developer greed.
2. The number of houses planned for the plan period of 24,310 dwellings (Para.5.13) is unrealistic and unachievable.
3. Increasing the number of units in Ponteland will not reduce the volume of commuting to and from Tyneside it will only serve to increase it and is therefore in direct conflict with the Core Strategy policy to create a balanced sustainable economy where homes and jobs are linked.
4. Ponteland has been treated as a main town in allocating its population/dwelling increase. Ponteland performs as less than a Service Centre because of its proximity to Newcastle upon Tyne and its population increase should be absolutely no more than the 4% - 8% acceptable population growth recommended by NCC over the plan period. NCC proposal of 850 houses equates to an increase in the number of houses of 19% (850/4,486). For the County as a whole the proposed increase in house numbers is 17% (24,310/138,994). In Ponteland parish, where the vast majority of houses will be built, this equates to a population growth of between 14% -18% **Almost double of NCC's maximum acceptable recommended population growth for a service centre**
5. With the proposed housing on the Police HQ site (350) and Medburn together with our correct¹ average house build of 20 units per year; Ponteland will contribute more than adequately to NCC housing requirements.
6. Ponteland is being singled out to carry a disproportionate, unrealistic heavy load to build houses. The justifiable requirements for housing and economic development can be accommodated entirely within existing available sites, Previously Developed Land at the Police Headquarters and windfall applications

¹ 20 units per year based on previous 5 and 10 years NOT the 3 years selected by NCC

7. Ponteland should be included in Policy 4d. The failure to include Ponteland alongside Hexham Corbridge and Morpeth in Policy 4 d i.e. to preserve the setting and special character, is unjustified.
8. There is a demonstrably low market for new employment land and future needs can be accommodated by existing properties and available land.
9. The whole of the existing Green Belt to the south of Ponteland is of critical importance to the prevention of urban sprawl. The Green Belt to the south of Ponteland and Darras Hall is more critical now than it was when it was created because of the continued expansion of urban Newcastle and Newcastle Airport
10. The open nature of the approaches to Ponteland Village are essential to its special character, which must be protected.

Responses to questions.

Question 4

Do you have any comments on the spatial portrait for the Central Northumberland Delivery Area?

The Role of Ponteland

Section 2.32 states that Ponteland *“is a key service centre”*.

Section 2.21 of Preferred Option Stage 2, relates to the South East delivery area, but gives an indication of the role of Service Centres:

“provide important services for both residents and communities” and for other settlements:

“Other smaller settlements within the area also provide local services to their resident communities.”

The Issues and Options Consultation defined Tiers:

Table 5.1 Proposed settlement criteria and tier specific development principles

	Settlement Criteria	Development Principles
Tier 1	Key hubs for education, healthcare, housing, employment and retail. Extensive range of services and facilities and good transport links.	Main focus for future development and regeneration. Location for planned housing and employment urban extensions. Development on previously developed land should be prioritised where viable.
Tier 2	Wide range of services and facilities. Key service centres to their resident	Development that maintains and strengthens the role of the settlement as a service centre.

	communities and in some cases a wider network of villages and hamlets.	
Tier 3	Fewer services and facilities than tier 2 settlements but with a First School - an important service which benefits a wider community.	Small-scale development, change of use and conversions to meet defined needs and to maintain or enhance local services and facilities.
Tier 4	Small settlements with significantly fewer services and facilities than tier 3 settlements and a less frequent public transport service.	Small-scale infill, change of use or conversions to meet defined needs and contribute to maintaining and enhancing the viability of services and facilities in that and adjoining settlements.
Tier 5	All places outside of those settlements listed in tiers 1-4 will be classified as falling within tier 5, which covers an extensive part of the county. This will include hamlets and other small groups of buildings in the countryside.	Priority is the re-use of existing buildings or conversions. Development permitted which demonstrates the need for such a location, for example outdoor recreation, leisure and tourism, equine uses or economic development (specific policies to be developed elsewhere in the Core Strategy or subsequent DPDs).

In the Issues and Options consultation Tier 2 is described as “a key service centre” and therefore appears to be consistent with the term “Service Centre” now used in the Stage 2 Preferred Options consultation.

Ponteland does not fit the criteria for Tier 2 as set out in the Issues and Options consultation or the more limited description in Section 2.21 of the Stage 2 Preferred Option consultation, for the following reasons.

- It has a limited range of services and facilities because many are provided by Newcastle upon Tyne which are accessed by the community of Ponteland.
- Surrounding villages and hamlets also access services and facilities largely from Newcastle upon Tyne which they find superior and more convenient for their needs.

This is recognised by the Stage 2 Preferred Options consultation in Section 2.32 which states:

“Ponteland looks to Newcastle upon Tyne for its main employment, retailing and services”.

Ponteland is therefore actually closer to Tier 3 Settlement Criteria (Fewer services and facilities than tier 2) with the exception that it provides schools at all levels.

For this reason the development principles set out in the Issues and Options consultation should apply.

“Small-scale development, change of use and conversions to meet defined needs and to maintain or enhance local services and facilities”

Only small-scale development is therefore appropriate for the village.

The response to a freedom of information request seeking justification for the excessive housing allocated to Ponteland (850) stated that NCC regards Ponteland as “indicative of a main town”

This premise is fundamentally flawed for the reasons outlined and cannot be justified.

NCC appears to have taken no notice of previous consultation events that were part of the Stage 1 consultation. This brings into question the integrity of the whole consultation process. No notice has been taken of the resident’s opinions especially at the issues and Options Workshop consultation event held in Ponteland on 19 July 2012 and the Preferred Options Workshop at Hexham on 7 March 2013.

At the 19 July 2012 Workshop residents overwhelmingly stated:

- Ponteland is a village not a town.
- Ponteland should be a Tier 2 settlement, which is a settlement that “maintains and strengthens”. The Preferred Options document classes Ponteland as a Service Centre but NCC has quietly changed the definition of a Service Centre to one being a “focus for development”
- The individual workshop groups unanimously stated that there should be no change to the Green Belt boundaries around Ponteland to maintain its character and separation from urban Tyneside. This document proposes wholesale removal of Breen Belt which will destroy the character of Ponteland, completely against the wishes of Ponteland residents.

Northumberland residents were asked to register their views with NCC in the stage 1 consultation process.

To the question- *Do you agree with the proposed treatment of settlements within the existing and proposed Northumberland Green Belt.*

There were a total of 445 comments registered on the NCC website in response to this question. 309 relate to Ponteland. 37 of the responses were signed Mr and Mrs but only provided with 1 ID number. Had these respondents been counted separately then the total number for Ponteland would have been 346.

The Ponteland responses stated the existing green belt boundary should not be changed in order to protect the character of Ponteland village and prevent urban sprawl

To the question. *Do you agree with the settlement as set out in tables 5.2- 5.3 - 5.4 (These are the tables within which Ponteland is shown as Tier one settlement)*

There are a total of 506 comments recorded for the whole of Northumberland.

326 (64.5% of all responses) are from Ponteland residents who disagree with Tier 1 and state Tier 2 is more appropriate. Of those 326 responses 41 of the responses are recorded as Mr & Mrs but have been allocated 1 ID number only. Had the system counted both responders the total responses for Ponteland supporting as a Tier 2 is 367.

98% of respondents who recorded a response of 1 or 2 for Ponteland adamantly supported Tier 2 as reflecting the status of Ponteland

It is therefore clear that despite the views of the residents of Ponteland (who actually live in the village and use the services) NCC appear to insist in their flawed categorisation of Ponteland as indicative of a Main Town.

It regrettably brings into question the Integrity of the process.

Employment

In Section 2.32 Ponteland looks to Newcastle for its main employment, retailing and services. Any further development in Ponteland would therefore only serve to increase the commuting into Tyneside and is therefore in direct conflict with the objective of the Core Strategy 7.4 to create a balanced economy where homes and jobs are linked

Green Belt Restriction

Ponteland's future growth is NOT restricted by the Green Belt as there are sufficient sites available within the existing inset or on Previously Developed Land to meet future needs.

The Green Belt to the south of Ponteland and Darras Hall is more critical now than it was when it was created because of the continued expansion of Newcastle and Newcastle Airport.

Question 7

Do you have any comments about the changing economy of Northumberland or its relationship with the regional economy, including the key issues that have been identified?

Relationship with the regional economy

Increasing the number of units in Ponteland will not reduce the volume of commuting to and from Tyneside it will only serve to increase it and is therefore in direct conflict with the Core Strategy policy to create a balanced sustainable economy where homes and jobs are linked.

Increasing the number of units in Ponteland will not serve to support growth in the number and quality of Northumberland based jobs stated above due to its close proximity to Tyneside.

The acknowledged low employment rate and low productivity (para. 3.2) indicates the need to improve the number and quality of employment opportunities for existing residents, not to increase the number of residents competing for the available jobs.

Question 8

Do you have any comments about the future of the Northumberland economy, including employment and land requirements and the key issues that have been identified.

Economic Growth

The number of unemployed people in Northumberland according to the 2011 Census was 10,329. The above paragraphs propose 3000 FTE Private Sector jobs assuming the higher projected changes in the economy to 2030. The proposed 24,310 new homes across the

County and only 3000 FTE Private sector jobs created give an average of over 8 new homes per FTE.

As Ponteland is already identified as a location where the majority of residents commute to Tyneside for employment, retail and social purposes (see Section 2.32) there is likely to be no new private sector FTE jobs for Ponteland and therefore the local community would not benefit.

The land to be redeployed for commercial use to create employment for future generations needs to be located where there are the highest levels of unemployment in the region. The LA has failed to state the numbers of unemployed by area in order to address this issue.

The proposal to remove 3HA land from Greenbelt for Class B use on the South East side of Ponteland is unjustified. There are numerous vacant units at Newcastle Airport Industrial Estate located within 3 miles of Newcastle Airport in the neighbouring LA of Newcastle and 40 % of the Prestwick business Park is vacant. Ponteland is a residential community where residents commute to Newcastle for employment, social and recreational purposes. There is very little demand for new employment space in Ponteland. Any removal of Greenbelt for this purpose would inevitably end up as housing at a later stage. The creation of more industrial land use in Ponteland will change the nature of the settlement. The removal of Greenbelt boundaries to create this proposal is therefore unfounded.

Question 9

Do you have any comments on population projections and the key issues that have been identified.

The increase in dwellings required that is proposed is based on the assumption that household size will decline from 2.25 in 2011 to 2.11 in 2031. (Appendix A)

This does not reflect the trend based on ONS statistics for the 2001 and 2011 censuses which show an increase in household size from 2.19 to 2.24 in that 10 year period. It is therefore inappropriate to assume that there will be a fall in household size and the percentage increase in dwellings required should be the same as the percentage increase in population.

Question 10

Do you have any comments on the impact of housing on population and economic growth and the key issues that have been identified?

Impact of housing on population and economic growth

NCC policy of "Build it and they will come" is fundamentally flawed; evidence of this is contained within the core strategy document.

Section 2.45 states that "*the town of Berwick upon Tweed has underprovided in recent years despite an abundance of housing sites with planning permission*".

The significant danger in NCC continuing with this policy is that this situation is replicated all over the county

In order to ensure that housing is provide at locations that will support areas where new employment opportunities can be provided. (Para 4.11) it is essential that new housing land is NOT created in areas that would be especially attractive to developers because they will provide high value homes for those who will commute out of the County for both employment and shopping. To do this would detract from the development of housing in areas which could support economic development within the County.

It is incorrect to state that significantly boosting the supply of housing will necessarily increase the labour force (para. 4.14 - Key Issue). This will only occur where the market will support new employment opportunities AND where new residents will be attracted to local employment. Boosting the supply of housing in areas which are attractive to commuters will increase outward commuting without providing any significant contribution to the labour force available to businesses within the County.

Question 11

Do you have any comments on our preferred strategic approach to growing and diversifying the economy?

Growing the economy

Building new dwellings in Ponteland which has easy access to Newcastle upon Tyne will increase commuting out of the county for both employment and shopping. It will divert investment in housing and economic activity away from areas where population growth is needed to support new employment opportunities.

Question 12

Do you have any comments on our preferred strategic approach to growing the labour force and the level of housing growth?

Level of housing growth

To deliver the County Council's strategy of encouraging economic growth within the County, housing needs to be provided where there are employment opportunities. There are very limited employment opportunities in Ponteland. Providing extra housing in Ponteland will simply serve employers outside County and commuting.

The Core Strategy suggests that an appropriate scale of housing is necessary to support sustainable growth of the economy and local communities. Sustainable growth requires the provision of homes in areas where employment will be sourced locally and the provision of employment where a local workforce is available. Neither of these will occur in areas where better employment prospects are available and easily accessible out of the County.

Furthermore, housing needs to be located in areas which can provide viable local shopping. Again this is not possible where a nearby larger economy creates market conditions in which local centres cannot successfully compete.

Creating new housing land in Ponteland will inevitably result in developers building there in preference to those areas where employment opportunities are better.

The requirement for the provision of 24,310 new dwellings over the plan period (Core Strategy Para. 5.13) is clearly unrealistic and unachievable, since it represents an increase in the rate of delivery of 56%. It would also require an increase in population substantially (83%) greater than in the sub-national population projections. The County Council are unable to influence birth rates within the existing population so this large increase can only be achieved by assuming that there will be net inward migration. Historically, there has been a continual net outward migration and there is nothing in the Core Strategy that would reverse this.

The County Council must plan for realistically achievable populations or it will consistently find it fails to deliver new housing to meet the targets it has set itself. This will result in the loss of control of its planning policies because developers will always be able to argue for the release of additional land on the incorrect premise that the existing allocations are in the wrong place.

Question 13

This is our preferred option for employment land supply and distribution. Do you have any comments?

Economy and employment

The Core Strategy proposes in different sections either 3 hectares or 5 hectares in Ponteland. This is contradictory.

The ELR report states that previous take up rates for employment land are 52.17ha over the 5 year period 2004-2009 equates to 10.43ha per annum with the inclusion of development in Tynedale occurred in just one year (2007/08) primarily as a consequence of the expansion of Egger's operation at Hexham. The report states that take up levels are unlikely to continue at such levels over the LDF period. We also conclude that this was during a period of prosperity and before the onset of the recession. The report suggests that the gross amount of potential new B class development with extant Permission at April 2009 stood at 46.65ha. Based upon average annual gross take-up of 10.43ha per annum, this equates to approximately 4.5 years of future supply.

The suggestion to remove 5ha's land from Greenbelt around Ponteland equates to nearly ½ of the previous take up achieved and we conclude that is too much for a small settlement close to the Tyneside border.

The report suggests that there is hidden demand for employment land space in Ponteland use due to lack of supply and that existing business may locate to Ponteland if the right sort of accommodation was available. This is all hearsay and clearly not proven.

The ELR Review states:

'It is considered that even though there appears to be a substantial mismatch between supply and demand, a cautious approach should be taken to release of employment sites',

And 'given the level of demand, there would be a quantitative need for around 64-87ha of new employment land in the County to 2030'

The suggestion that Ponteland has 5HA/s of mixed B1 land use equates to between 5.7% and 7.8% of the total proposed for the whole County and we argue that this provision is too high in one location and will have a significant effect on the settlement.

The Local Authority has provided no evidence on the number of enquiries from business' wanting to locate close to Newcastle Airport and the strategy is based upon wish list.

The report suggests in order to meet future market demands we should have 'ideal' vacancy rates of 5% for office, and 10% for industrial and storage or distribution and the current vacancy rate across the County is 8%. Ponteland currently has more than 40% vacancy rates for prestige office space at Prestwick Park and we anticipate the former site of Lawson's Fuses currently vacant on Meadowfield to soon become available for rent/sale or redeployment for Industrial use. Ponteland currently has 140,000 sqft of Industrial/office space given over to employment use on Meadowfield Park of which a large proportion is currently a closed factory. We also have office/employment land at Dissington Hall, Milkhope Centre, and Horton Grange none of these existing locations feature in the employment land review report. Other employment land in the Ponteland parish are at West End Farm, Berwick Hill (D9) consists of a mix of retail units converted from agricultural units. We also need to be mindful of the existing competition for Class B1 office use with Newcastle Great Park where there is currently 24,000 sq ft vacant space representing 5% un-occupancy.

The proposal to remove 3HA's land from Greenbelt for Industrial Class B use on the South East side of Ponteland is unfounded. There are numerous vacant units available within 3 miles of Newcastle Airport in the neighbouring LA of Newcastle at the Airport Industrial Estate, Kingston Park.

There are currently brown field unoccupied units for re-deployment within the vicinity of the Ponteland Meadowfield Industrial Estate on the former site of Lawsons Fuses

The local authority has failed to identify vacant brownfield industrial land already designated before committing to a plan to revise Greenbelt boundaries.

The ELR report states 70ha of employment land were lost to other uses over the 5 year period 2008-2013 equating to approximately 13.828ha per annum. These losses were driven by a number of factors including residential schemes and non B class development including retail and community uses. The overall suggested employment space requirement ranges from 293ha to 506ha gross between 2010 and 2030.

Lost employment land to housing/other uses at these rates equates to between 23.8% at the higher range and 13.8% at the lower range on an annual basis.

In reality the 5 Ha's proposed removal of Greenbelt boundaries for mixed use land which would include an element of office space for Ponteland would in its entirety be converted to residential use due to sufficient vacant premises available for rent and previous take up rates already identified above.

The ELR states that the N'land West Service Area has 37 sites totalling just over 18ha for employment development however much of the land that is notionally available in the area is heavily constrained, with the owners often pursuing alternative, higher value uses for the site. Any new employment land allocated is unlikely to be developed because the build costs will be more than the end value therefore any commercial development cannot proceed without significant public sector subsidy.

The ELR report also suggests suitable sites for the employment land as 'Clickemin Farm or, alternatively, the land around Dobbies Garden Centre near Ponteland. Here, mixed use developments could play a role in delivering high quality employment space in accessible locations'.

We argue here that the above chosen sites are not in the right location and can currently only be accessed by a single carriageway Class A road A696 running through the settlement that is already at capacity. The A696 is a major trunk road to Scotland and the only direct alternative to the A1 and is therefore used by commuters as a gateway to the Northumberland Countryside and Scotland. Any proposed development at this location will only serve to impede the existing infrastructure at current capacity.

The proposed removal of 3ha of land from the Greenbelt on the South East end of Ponteland Village is in direct contradiction to the NPPF framework. The resulting urban sprawl will undermine the Green belt openness and permanence it will have the effect of merging Newcastle and Ponteland, it will erode the semi –rural Ponteland village settlement.

In order to create employment in Ponteland the local Authority must do more than provide space for anticipated new business to the region. There has to be financial support by way of business rate holidays for new start-ups or business' wishing to locate from outside the County. Unless the LA provides additional financial support the removal of existing GB boundaries for the proposal of mixed use land which would include an element of office space will undoubtedly fail. Whilst we appreciate there should always be some new development coming forward to reduce risk of stagnation and further decline in the market we suggest the provision of a sustainable dual development at the former site of Ponteland Police HQ to incorporate the provision of new homes and employment land use.

Question 14

This is our preferred option for housing provision. Do you have any comments.

Housing Provision

The draft Core Strategy is putting unfair emphasis on Ponteland.

The population projection is over ambitious and does not follow natural trends from the Office of National Statistics

The assumption by all the nearby Local Planning Authorities that their population will increase by migration cannot be true for all authorities and NCC have failed to consider the effect on Ponteland of 4000 houses planned by neighbouring Newcastle LA on the North West boundary at Callerton and Woosington encroaching towards Ponteland.

The lack of deliverable housing land supply is more attributable to recent poor market conditions rather than a lack of housing land supply.

There was a net gain of 92 residential units in Ponteland Parish between April 2009 and September 2013 ie divide by 4.5 gives just over 20 units/year. NCC are using the last 3 years delivery figures only which gives only 8 units/year. This cannot be statistically sustainable on such a small sample period in unusual market conditions. This methodology also conveniently ignores the fact that the 20 units/year has been delivered on “windfall sites” which could equate to 400 houses over the plan period

There are 176 lapsed or extant permissions not yet implemented which does not include the 73 res care bedrooms on the Auction Mart (Outline). So there are 249 undeveloped units with consent, and a stated 350 to be allowed on the Police HQ site ie a shortfall of 251 against the County aspiration of 850 (this is a different methodology to the SHLAA). They state the proposed deletion site off Rotary Way will accommodate 450 units (Old PPG3 guidelines 14HA @ 30, 9HA @ 50)

Even if the NCC’s target is accepted, it can be demonstrated that the shortfall is only 251 Units. Even using the inappropriate 3-year data demonstrates that windfall sites have historically delivered 8 units/year ie 160 units over the 20 year plan (136 over the remaining 17 years of the plan period). The requirement is therefore for a maximum of 115 units above what can be demonstrated to be available. However, the more reliable 20 units/year figure comfortably exceeds the requirement delivering 400 units over the 20 year plan or 340 over the remaining 17 years

NCC’s SHLAA Methodology states that: “The average windfall delivery five years previous to the start of the trajectory period will be used to forecast windfall delivery in the future five year period of the housing trajectory”.

The NCC are ignoring their own methodology which shows that an adequate supply of housing land is deliverable on windfall sites in Ponteland

Many of the SHLAA sites were previously discounted because they have not been “sold.” This is further evidence, acknowledged by NCC that the lack of deliverable housing land supply is attributable to current market conditions rather than a lack of housing land supply. However the methodology has changed and unsold sites are now included.

An artificially high population prediction together with an unrealistic assumption on delivery will mean that NCC is continually failing to achieve their target leaving the Core Strategy open to challenge by developers.

Para. 7.7 infers that significantly boosting the supply of housing will increase the labour force. This will only occur where the market will support new employment opportunities AND where new residents will be attracted to local employment. Boosting the supply of housing in areas which are attractive to commuters will increase outward commuting without providing any significant contribution to the labour force available to businesses within the County.

The Core Strategy suggests that an appropriate scale of housing is necessary to support sustainable growth of the economy and local communities. Sustainable growth requires the

provision of homes in areas where employment will be sourced locally and the provision of employment where a local workforce is available. Neither of these will occur in areas where better employment prospects are available and easily accessible out of the County.

Furthermore, housing needs to be located in areas which can provide viable local shopping. Again this is not possible where a nearby larger economy creates market conditions in which local centres cannot successfully compete.

South East Northumberland has the greatest opportunity to provide additional employment with its 207 hectares of strategic employment land and by far the largest availability of employment sites listed in Tables D 1 -3.

Accordingly South East Northumberland requires the greatest proportion of housing to support sustainable development and should have a significantly higher share of population increase than Central Northumberland.

The proposal to allow for 850 additional houses in Ponteland represents an increase in population of approximately 14% by 2031 taking into account the fall in occupancy rate predicted in Appendix A.

This is more than the increase proposed for the County as a whole (Appendix A1) and cannot be justified on the basis of serving a proportional increase in employment. It appears to be a cynical attempt to boost housing numbers by feeding outward commuting, since it is perceived that Ponteland will be attractive to house builders because of the high values that can be achieved.

Such an increase would be wholly unsustainable because:

1. It will increase population with little or no increase in employment
2. It will increase the carbon footprint of the settlement due to very significant increased journeys into Newcastle for employment, shopping, leisure and other services. This is in direct conflict with the Policy 1 in the Preferred Options Core Strategy (Stage 1) "Sustainable Development".
3. Ponteland is poorly served by public transport and has a high car ownership so that a large proportion of journeys will be made by car, with associated high carbon emissions.
4. It will increase demand on local infrastructure and health services which they will be unable to support.

It will also divert house building away from areas which are better able to provide growth in employment.

A more appropriate increase in population would be 4% which is the lower end for a Service Centre. Ponteland is unable to act as a Service Centre due to its proximity to Newcastle upon Tyne and lacks a critical mass of services. This should therefore be the maximum increase allowed for over the plan period of 2011 – 2031. A 4% increase in population would require a total of 400 new dwellings, which would also allow for a reduction of occupancy across the whole population of Ponteland Parish. However since ONS census statistics suggest that household sizes are not falling, a 4% increase in population only requires 180 new homes to be delivered in Ponteland Parish in the period 2011 to 2031.

The Core Strategy proposes 850 additional new homes in Ponteland in the 20 years between 2011 and 2031. This includes allowing for a prediction that average occupancy per household will fall by a factor of 2.2/2.3 (=0.9565217). Based on the 2011 population of Ponteland Parish of 10,798 (National Office of Statistics) an additional 204 homes would be needed without any increase in population just to account for the fall in occupancy per household.

That leaves 646 new homes, which the Core Strategy is proposing to supply to accommodate population increase. The 2011 occupancy rate in Ponteland Parish was 2.4 which would reduce to 2.3 in 2031 based on the factor used by NCC. At an occupancy rate of 2.3 the population of Ponteland would need to increase by 1,487 or 14% above the 2011 figure.

This is well above the Core Strategy's target of 10.3% for the County and is clear evidence that NCC wants to put more of the proposed housing in Ponteland!

One of the arguments that NCC uses for the 10.3% growth is that for communities to remain sustainable they need to grow. The population of Ponteland fell over the 10 years between 1991 and 2001, but recovered up to 2011. Overall it has reduced by 2.3% since 1991. There is no evidence that this has resulted in an unsustainable community!

Question 15

This is our preferred option for delivering affordable housing. Do you have any comments?

Affordable Housing

The lower proposed Affordable Housing target for South East Northumberland (Table 7.4) is not justified,

With the prospects for a large increase in employment in the South East delivery area, it is essential that affordable housing be available for the potential increased workforce.

Affordable housing is also more likely to be deliverable in the South East Delivery area.

Question 16

Do you have any comments on our approach to localised Green Belt review?

Green Belt around Morpeth

Morpeth is less at risk of urban sprawl and of merging into other urban areas than is the case in Ponteland where Green Belt deletions are proposed. New development should be steered towards land that is not currently Green Belt before Green Belt deletions are considered.

Existing Green Belt Boundaries

Ponteland is not able to act as a Service Centre (See response to Q 4) and there is no justification for deleting Green Belt in the vicinity of the village.

Ponteland High and Middle School and Ponteland Leisure Centre are identified as previously Developed Land in the Green Belt (Table 8.1)

The majority of these sites comprise open playing fields and their Green Belt status should not be changed.

Future built development at these institutions can be accommodated within the strategy for development in “washed over” areas, without the need to delete Green Belt.

NCC response to a freedom of information request states

The area of Brownfield land that is currently available within the Central Delivery Area that is classified as deliverable and developable is 199.41 hectares. This area includes sites categorised as 100% Brownfield and mostly Brownfield in the SHLAA 2013

The area of Greenfield land that is not in the Green belt and is available and classified as deliverable and developable in the Central Delivery Area is 70.37 hectares. This area includes sites categorised as 100% Greenfield and mostly Greenfield in the SHLAA 2013 that are not in the Green Belt

Using the guide of between 30 to 50 units per hectare, Brownfield sites alone equate to the ability to build 5970 to 9950 units on Brownfield sites alone.

Using Greenfield land not in the Green Belt equates to the ability to build between 2100 and 3500 units.

Therefore on land that is currently classified as deliverable and developable within the Central Delivery Area this equates to 8070 to 13,450 units.

There is therefore absolutely no justification in releasing Green belt land in the Central Delivery Area.

Questions 19 and 20

Do you have any comments on our preferred Morpeth Inner Green Belt boundary?

Green Belt around Morpeth

Morpeth is less at risk of urban sprawl and of merging into other urban areas than is the case in Ponteland where Green Belt deletions are proposed. New development should be steered towards land that is not currently Green Belt before Green Belt deletions are considered – see response to Q 16 where we highlight a Freedom Of Information request which identifies that there are in excess of 270 hectares of Brownfield and Greenfield land currently classified as deliverable and developable within the Central Delivery Area.

Question 21

This is our approach for Green Belt. Do you have any comments?

Green Belt

The Castle Morpeth District Local Plan stated: *“For the past 30 years the countryside in the south of the Borough has been protected from development by its designation as part of the Green Belt. Approximately a quarter of the Plan area has Green Belt status, including the Parishes of Heddon-on-the-Wall, Ponteland and parts of Stamfordham and Stannington. The Green Belt has proved to be an extremely robust piece of planning legislation and forms a major platform protecting the countryside, in that part of the Borough closest to the Tyneside conurbation, where pressures for development are strong”*. Consideration was given to altering or extending the Green Belt boundary at the Local Plan Enquiry in 1998 so the present boundary can reasonably be expected to last until **2028**

The Green Belt to the south and east of Ponteland and Darras Hall is of critical importance in maintaining the character of the village and keeping its identity separate from urban Tyneside.

The proposals will seriously damage the character of Ponteland village which makes it attractive as a place to live and work.

The resulting urban sprawl and light pollution will undermine the Green Belt's characteristic openness and permanence.

The proposed removal of land from the Greenbelt to the south and east of Ponteland Village is in direct contradiction to the NPPF framework. The resulting urban sprawl will undermine the Green belt openness and permanence. It will have the effect of merging Newcastle and Ponteland, it will erode the semi –rural Ponteland village settlement.

The proposed development will bring the settlement boundary closer to the west edge of Newcastle where thousands of new homes are planned

The proposals fail to consider the effect on Ponteland of proposals from neighbouring Newcastle LA to build 4000 homes across the North West area encroaching towards Ponteland at Woolsington and Callerton. This is in direct conflict with the policy 4 on Greenbelt.

Policy 4

The setting and special character of Ponteland should be preserved as much as Hexham, Corbridge and Morpeth. The centre of the village is a conservation area and the open rural character surrounding the settlement is of great importance in preserving its attractiveness as a place to live and maintaining its role in providing high quality homes for entrepreneurs and business leaders as well as the long established local population.

Question 35

This is our approach for the Settlement of Ponteland. Do you have any comments?

Role of Ponteland

The proposal for 850 additional houses over the plan period is excessive and not required. The role of Ponteland justifies an increase a population increase of no more than 4%. Based on ONS census data household size has been increasing and its decline over the plan period is unjustified.

The more appropriate increase in population of 4%, which is the lower end for a Service Centre, is owing to the fact that Ponteland is unable to act as a Service Centre, (see detailed reasons below). This should therefore be the maximum increase allowed for over the plan period of 2011 – 2031. A 4% increase in population would require a total of 400 new dwellings, which would also allow for a reduction of occupancy across the whole population of Ponteland Parish. However since ONS census statistics suggest that household sizes are not falling, a 4% increase in population only requires 180 new homes to be delivered in Ponteland Parish in the period 2011 to 2031.

Ponteland is not a “key service centre”(Para. 9.102). Ponteland is unable to act as a key service centre because it has a limited range of services and facilities. Most services are available in Newcastle upon Tyne, which are easily accessible to residents of Ponteland and surrounding villages and hamlets. Ponteland cannot compete with those out of the county services which have access to a much wider market.

Section 2.32 states that Ponteland “*is a key service centre*”.

Section 2.21 of Preferred Option Stage 2, relates to the South East delivery area, but gives an indication of the role of Service Centres:

“*provide important services for both residents and communities*” and for other settlements:

“*Other smaller settlements within the area also provide local services to their resident communities.*”

The Issues and Options Consultation defined Tiers:

Table 5.1 Proposed settlement criteria and tier specific development principles

	Settlement Criteria	Development Principles
Tier 1	Key hubs for education, healthcare, housing, employment and retail. Extensive range of services and facilities and good transport links.	Main focus for future development and regeneration. Location for planned housing and employment urban extensions. Development on previously developed land should be prioritised where viable.
Tier 2	Wide range of services and	Development that maintains and strengthens

	facilities. Key service centres to their resident communities and in some cases a wider network of villages and hamlets.	the role of the settlement as a service centre.
Tier 3	Fewer services and facilities than tier 2 settlements but with a First School - an important service which benefits a wider community.	Small-scale development, change of use and conversions to meet defined needs and to maintain or enhance local services and facilities.

In the Issues and Options consultation Tier 2 is described as “a key service centre” and therefore appears to be consistent with the term “Service Centre” now used in the Stage 2 Preferred Options consultation.

Ponteland does not fit the criteria for Tier 2 as set out in the Issues and Options consultation or the more limited description in Section 2.21 of the Stage 2 Preferred Option consultation, for the following reasons.

- It has a limited range of services and facilities because many are provided by Newcastle upon Tyne which are accessed by the community of Ponteland.
- Surrounding villages and hamlets also access services and facilities largely from Newcastle upon Tyne which they find superior and more convenient for their needs.

This is recognised by the Stage 2 Preferred Options consultation in Section 2.32 which states:

“Ponteland looks to Newcastle upon Tyne for its main employment, retailing and services”.

Ponteland is therefore closer to Tier 3 Settlement Criteria (Fewer services and facilities than tier 2) with the exception that it provides schools at all levels.

For this reason the development principles set out in the Issues and Options consultation should apply.

“Small-scale development, change of use and conversions to meet defined needs and to maintain or enhance local services and facilities”

Only small-scale development is therefore appropriate for the village.

The response to a freedom of information request seeking justification for the excessive housing allocated to Ponteland (850) stated that NCC regard Ponteland as “indicative of a main town”

This premise is fundamentally flawed for the reasons outlined and cannot be justified

NCC appears to have taken no notice of previous consultation events that were part of the Stage 1 consultation. This brings into question the integrity of the whole consultation process. No notice has been taken of the resident’s opinions especially at the issues and Options Workshop consultation event held in Ponteland on 19 July 2012 and the Preferred Options Workshop at Hexham on 7 March 2013.

At the 19 July 2012 Workshop residents overwhelmingly stated:

- Ponteland is a village not a town.
- Ponteland should be a Tier 2 settlement, which is a settlement that “maintains and strengthens”. The Preferred Options document classes Ponteland as a Service Centre but NCC has quietly changed the definition of a Service Centre to one being a “focus for development”
- The individual workshop groups unanimously stated that there should be no change to the Green Belt boundaries around Ponteland to maintain its character and separation from urban Tyneside. This document proposes wholesale removal of Breen Belt which will destroy the character of Ponteland, completely against the wishes of Ponteland residents.

Northumberland residents were asked to register their views with NCC in the stage 1 consultation process.

To the question- *Do you agree with the proposed treatment of settlements within the existing and proposed Northumberland Green Belt.*

There were a total of 445 comments registered on the NCC website in response to this question. 309 relate to Ponteland. 37 of the responses were signed Mr and Mrs but only provided with 1 ID number. Had these respondents been counted separately then the total number for Ponteland would have been 346.

The Ponteland responses stated the existing green belt boundary should not be changed in order to protect the character of Ponteland village and prevent urban sprawl

To the question. *Do you agree with the settlement as set out in tables 5.2- 5.3 - 5.4 (These are the tables within which Ponteland is shown as Tier one settlement)*

There are a total of 506 comments recorded for the whole of Northumberland.

326 (64.5% of all responses) are from Ponteland residents who disagree with Tier 1 and state Tier 2 is more appropriate. Of those 326 responses 41 of the responses are recorded as Mr & Mrs but have been allocated 1 ID number only. Had the system counted both responders the total responses for Ponteland supporting as a Tier 2 is 367.

98% of respondents who recorded a response of 1 or 2 for Ponteland adamantly supported Tier 2 as reflecting the status of Ponteland

It is therefore clear that despite the views of the residents of Ponteland (who actually live in the village and use the services) NCC appear to insist in their flawed categorisation of Ponteland as a Main Town.

It regrettably brings into question the Integrity of the process.

Housing Delivery

Using the last 3 years delivery figures only for Ponteland cannot be statistically sustainable on such a small sample period in unusual market conditions. This methodology conveniently

ignores the fact that the 20 units/year has been delivered on “windfall sites” which could equate to 400 houses over the plan period.

There is no proven need for more market housing in the Ponteland village area. In Ponteland and Darras Hall there are between 300 and 400 market houses available at any one time. Information sourced from Rightmove and The Land Registry indicates that there were approximately 1,300 homes marketed in 2012 with only 135 sales. This confirms the previous conclusion in the Tribal Report that there is already a surplus of market housing and demonstrates that in the Ponteland area there is no special need for non-affordable housing. The plans by Newcastle City Council to release Green Belt land for housing to within 1.5 miles of the existing settlement boundary must be a significant factor in considering the supply of dwellings in the area and there is a suspicion that the decision by Newcastle/Gateshead to reduce their aspirations in the Woosington area has had a direct effect on the aspirations of Northumberland County Council.

Ponteland’s future growth is therefore NOT restricted by the Green Belt as there are sufficient sites available within the existing inset or on Previously Developed Land to meet current needs.

The Green Belt to the south of Ponteland and Darras Hall is more critical now than it was when it was created because of the continued expansion of Newcastle, where it is proposed to build 4000 homes across the North West area encroaching towards Ponteland, and the increased development associated with Newcastle International Airport.

Development Sustainability

The scale of new housing proposed will clearly not be “sustainable development”, because it will increase travel out of the County with associated carbon footprint, without contributing to economic development. This is especially the case for the housing proposed to the south of the village.

Additional housing would almost exclusively result in a population which commuted out of the County for employment, shopping, leisure and other services.

1. It will increase population with little or no increase in employment
2. It will increase the carbon footprint of the settlement due to very significant increased journeys into Newcastle for employment, shopping, leisure and other services. This is in direct conflict with the Policy 1 in the Preferred Options Core Strategy (Stage 1) “Sustainable Development”.
3. Ponteland is poorly served by public transport and has a high car ownership so that a large proportion of journeys will be made by car, with associated high carbon emissions.
4. It will increase demand on local infrastructure and health services which they will be unable to support.

Employment

Ponteland is a residential hub providing executive homes for personnel commuting to and from Tyneside with excellent links to local transport and the Airport. It is not an area for business/industrial development and as such any development of this sort would destroy the

nature of the settlement which would detrimentally affect the desirability of the settlement to executives and business leaders.

The Council have failed to state where the local employment in Ponteland would be created by the proposal of 850 units and removal of 3 or 5 hectares of land for b class development within the Greenbelt in order to fulfil the objective of creating a balanced economy where homes and jobs are linked (Core Strategy Section 7.4)

There is little market demand for employment land and with current vacancies unfilled.

Green Belt

The setting and special character of Ponteland should be preserved as well as Hexham, Corbridge and Morpeth

The proposals will seriously damage the character of Ponteland village which makes it attractive as a place to live and work.

The Green Belt to the south and east of Ponteland and Darras Hall is of critical importance in maintaining the character of the village and keeping its identity separate from urban Tyneside.

A large development on the main approaches to the village would be completely out of character

The loss of any green space on the A696 route would result in the joining up of Ponteland village with the Newcastle conurbation by way of a continuous urban corridor.

Green Belt is a long term planning tool and in this location, where there is a high level of pressure for development, it is serving an essential purpose in maintaining a separation between the Tyneside conurbation and Darras Hall. There is already an "Urban Corridor" extending from Cheviot View, past Dobbies and the Airport through Woosington to Newcastle with the Metro line running alongside and a floodlit all weather sports pitch and fly drive car park clearly visible from the A696. Any further development along this route is clearly inappropriate and not acceptable. The proximity of the Newcastle conurbation is the main reason why the Green Belt boundary was drawn so tightly around Ponteland and Darras Hall yet the draft core Strategy now say this is restricting development

Ponteland Parish extends to about 5752Ha of which around 5206Ha is Green Belt. However only 955Ha or 18% of this lies below a line drawn running south west to north east through the village centre parallel to the edge of the Newcastle conurbation. There are already significant washed over settlements within that including Cheviot View, the leisure centre and high school, Prestwick, High Callerton and the Airport. Plans by Newcastle Council seek to extend at the Airport on their side and at Woosington will be further eroding this essential separation.

Housebuilders are sitting on 507,000 sites with planning permission but building work has not started on 257,000 of them while they wait for prices to rise (Daily Telegraph 09/11/13)

The proposed deletion site in Ponteland is up to 67Ha, it includes some areas already built on, some flood plain and the school and leisure centre sites so the "developable area" is

somewhat less at about 35Ha. NCC's proposal for 850 additional units could be delivered on between 18 and 30 Ha if the land was used efficiently. However the need is overestimated and all growth could be accommodated in other areas without any Green Belt deletion.

NCC response to a freedom of information request states

The area of Brownfield land that is currently available within the Central Delivery Area that is classified as deliverable and developable is 199.41 hectares. This area includes sites categorised as 100% Brownfield and mostly Brownfield in the SHLAA 2013

The area of Greenfield land that is not in the Green belt and is available and classified as deliverable and developable in the Central Delivery Area is 70.37 hectares. This area includes sites categorised as 100% Greenfield and mostly Greenfield in the SHLAA 2013 that are not in the Green Belt

Using the guide of between 30 to 50 units per hectare, Brownfield sites alone equate to the ability to build 5970 to 9950 units.

Using Greenfield land not in the Green Belt equates to the ability to build between 2100 and 3500 units.

Therefore on land that is currently classified as deliverable and developable within the Central Delivery Area this equates to 8070 to 13,450 units.

There is therefore absolutely no justification in releasing Green belt land in Ponteland

Transport and highways

Ponteland experiences significant traffic flows especially along the A696. The junctions with Callerton Lane and North Road are close to capacity and already experience congestion and delays.

- A traffic count on 25 October 2012 at the traffic junction indicated a morning peak hour flow into the junction of approximately 1700 vehicles per hour.
- A drive-through eastwards along Ponteland Road from Cheviot View to Callerton Lane traffic lights took 8 minutes 45 seconds on 21 November 2012 at 8.45am.
- Long queues and delays are reported by residents of Cheviot View in the evenings and at weekends.

All three school sites at Callerton Lane, Thornhill Road and Darras Hall Estate suffer from severe congestion at the start and end of the school day. A child was recently struck by a vehicle on Thornhill Road.

- During the traffic count on 25 October 2012, queues from the school entrance extended southwards across the Middle Drive roundabout and onto the Rotary Way roundabout disrupting flows to and from the link road.
- A drive-through northwards along Callerton Lane from Rotary Way to the school entrance took 4minutes 15 seconds on 21 November 2012 at 8.30am.

The proposed addition of 850 new houses into Ponteland will significantly increase these flows and hence the delays and disruption. Improvements to the capacity of the junctions would be very difficult to achieve because of the limited land available in the village centre which is also a conservation area.

NCC use the argument within the Core Strategy document that any additional development to the immediate northwest of the settlement, while being centrally located, would generate significant additional traffic in the town on the way to Newcastle or the A1. (para 9.111)

It matters not where the additional development is located. The population of Ponteland will need to access the services within the village centre. These are, in the main, located to the North of the traffic pinch-point at the traffic lights by the Diamond public house and the roundabout at St Mays Church. Significantly increasing the population of Ponteland to more than double the maximum recommended for a service centre cannot do anything other than generate significant additional traffic in the town.

Parking

The proposed additional housing would result in demands for car parking in the village centre that would overwhelm the existing provision.

Although parking availability currently largely meets the needs of existing users, the present situation is finely balanced. Such a large increase in population would inevitably result in a shortage of parking spaces which would cause disruption to businesses, inconvenience to shoppers and potentially have safety implications.

Sewage

The existing sewer infrastructure Ponteland does not have the capacity to accommodate the proposed development and would require major works over a large distance with significant environmental impact.

The proposed increase in housing and employment land will create a large increase in waste water which will need to be collected and sent for treatment by Northumbrian Water Ltd. The majority of waste water from Ponteland, Darras Hall Estate and Medburn passes through a sewage pumping station located at Eland Lane. From there the waste water is pumped along a rising sewer which extends for more than 5km before it can discharge into a gravity sewer and ultimately to Howdon Sewage Treatment Works.

The pumping station and the rising sewer are close to capacity and would need extensive works to accommodate the level of new development proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Stage 2. Although Northumbrian Water would be under an obligation to provide the new capacity this would be at considerable expense and would be likely to create the need for civil engineering works to be carried out across several kilometres of land with associated environmental impact.

Flooding

The proposed development in SE Ponteland is in an area where flooding occurs regularly and includes parts of the fluvial flood plain, Flood Zones 2 and 3.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that new development be steered to areas with the lowest probability of flooding, indicating that the site identified for development in the Core Strategy is inappropriate.

Excess surface water run-off from the proposed development would increase flood risk in Ponteland. The land earmarked for development is crossed by the Fairney Burn and its tributaries which carry very heavy flows and cause widespread flooding closely downstream from the site. It is inevitable that the development would need to be drained into these watercourses.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that when determining planning applications, planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. In order to comply with this requirement, developers would have to design a drainage strategy that would limit the rate at which rainfall was discharged from the development to prevent an increased flood risk. The land suggested to be removed from Greenbelt currently comprises areas of grass and arable land, trees, shrubs and water meadow. These have a high potential to retain rainfall so that water is released only very slowly into watercourses. The proposed removal of Greenbelt boundary for re-development would contain a high proportion of impermeable surfaces from which rainfall would be rapidly shed thereby increasing the flood risk and is in direct conflict with NPPF policy.

Damage to the character of Ponteland Village

The emerging Ponteland Conservation Area Character Appraisal gives great importance to the green approaches to the village and their contribution to the topography and setting of the Conservation Area. In the case of the approach from the south east (Newcastle) it says:

“Approaching Ponteland from Newcastle upon Tyne to the south east on the main A696 trunk road we leave the urban corridor of the Woolsington Bypass and the Newcastle Airport approach to enter a narrow green corridor at Street Houses. A large Garden Centre, Dobbies, is mostly hidden behind boundary planting and a public House, The Badger. The road widens here and a modern link road heads off towards Darras Hall while the A696 continues towards the village centre through a mixture of mid 20th century houses and farmland

The post war houses differ in design but all are constructed of red brick and render with red tiled roofs and chimneys. They are set back from the road frontages onto the A696 behind grass verges and with only a couple of exceptions retain the original low walls and hedgerows along their whole length. This creates a rural approach to the village. Once derided, a key aim for the United Kingdom's post-War planning system was to halt such "Ribbon Development" but now in many areas the pleasing suburban character of such development is being recognised by designation as a Conservation Area”

One of the charms of the village is the broad swathe of farmland which runs along the Fairney Burn and extending westwards to the eastern edge of Darras Hall Estate which is also separated from the southern access into the village by a critically important green area. The farmland separates the housing from the main village and is a living link to Ponteland's agricultural past

Northumberland County Council Land Use Consultants Key Land Use Impact Study September 2010 (KLUIS) states among its aims to

“2_Guide development to areas of lower landscape sensitivity, to the east of the settlement” and “4_Protect Green Belt”

The majority of the proposed deletion site in Ponteland falls within Area 4 and, for reasons stated earlier, development along the east south corridor (the A696) would not be at all appropriate.

Policy 4

Policy 4 Green Belt states The Tyne and Wear Green Belt, including the detailed boundary of the extension of the Northumberland Green Belt around Morpeth, will be protected in accordance with national policy to:

- a. Safeguard the countryside from encroachment;
- b. Check the unrestricted sprawl of Tyne and Wear;
- c. Prevent the merging of:
Newcastle upon Tyne with Ponteland, Newcastle Airport, or Cramlington; and
North Tyneside with Cramlington or Blyth;
- d. Preserve the setting and special character of Hexham, Corbridge and Morpeth;
- e. Prevent Morpeth merging with neighbouring settlements; and
- f. Assist in the regeneration of settlements in South East Northumberland beyond the Green Belt.

Ponteland is described within the Core Strategy Stage 2 document as having a distinctive character. NCC's Ponteland Town Centre Health Check report dated May 2009 describes Ponteland as being unique in the North East region. Ponteland is the town closest to the threat of urban sprawl. The Green Belt to the south of Ponteland and Darras Hall is more critical now than it was when it was created because of the continued expansion of Newcastle and Newcastle Airport.

This, combined with the objective of Policy 4c, requires that Ponteland should also be included in Policy 4 d as having a setting and special character that should be preserved.

Vision for Ponteland

There should be no deletions of the existing green belt which is of critical importance to the protection of the character of the village and its role in providing exceptional homes for entrepreneurs and business leaders.

Future development in the parish can be accommodated within vacant sites, existing approvals, windfall sites and previously developed land (excluding open space uses). There should be a balance of employment and housing within these sites.

Question 36

This is our preferred option for the Central Northumberland Delivery Area. Do you have any comments?

Central Northumberland Delivery Area

Ponteland is not able to act as a Service Centre (See response to Q 4). Only small scale growth is achievable or sustainable. Policies should seek to maintain or enhance local services and facilities. Growth should be kept within the inset into the Green Belt or on previously developed land on which built development already exists, but not on open spaces such as playing fields.

There is no proven need for more market housing in the Ponteland village area.

Due to close proximity of Ponteland to Newcastle Airport any land North of Newcastle Airport 15HA's retained for redevelopment will have impact upon Ponteland. The location for this is left undefined.

Stephen Carrs

Alma Dunigan

David Hobson

Susan Johnson

Lesley Noble

Tony Noble

Muriel Sobo

Gaye Templeton

Amanda Turner

Christopher Winks

Christine Young

Co-opted member Andrew Tucker.