

PONTELAND
RESIDENTS

SAY NO

To building on the Green Belt!

Visit us at...www.pontelandgreenbelt.co.uk



Ponteland Greenbelt Group

Northumberland County Council (NCC) Core Strategy Final Draft for Housing, Employment and Greenbelt Consultation will be examined independently by The Planning Inspectorate to determine soundness of the development plan

We say, NCC are continuing to use flawed and out of date data and do not appear to have listened to the valid, evidence based concerns from the Ponteland residents

This is part of our last opportunity to register our concerns and NCC has had an unprecedented response to date from Ponteland residents so far....4,300 responses

We need this to continue during the Final Consultation.
Remember, previous responses will not count against this new document

What can we do?

- Attend the “drop in” events

Wednesday 14th Jan at the Leisure Centre 1pm-7.30pm

Saturday 31st Jan at the Memorial Hall 10am-3pm

The drop in events will provide an exhibition and an opportunity to meet and discuss your concerns with Planning Officers. This is the last opportunity to let NCC know how the community feels, as we did last year. See the guidance on the reverse of this leaflet for suggested topics

- View the website www.pontelandgreenbelt.co.uk This will keep you up to date
- Respond to the Core Strategy Consultation by the 11thFeb; remember all previous responses will not be counted against this new document
- The NCC Consultation Document can be viewed at:
- http://northumberland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/core_strategy/csf

PLEASE NOTE Even if you have previously responded to the Core Strategy Stages 1 & 2
You need to respond to this new document

Ponteland Greenbelt Group will use all objections and concerns from the residents as evidence to the Inspectorate that NCC's vision of Ponteland is flawed and continues to be challenged by the majority of our residents

The “drop in “events will provide an exhibition and an opportunity to meet and discuss your concerns with Planning Officers. This is the last opportunity to let NCC know how the community feels, as we did last year

BIRNEY HILL APPEAL at Newcastle Falcons Rugby Club 13th-29th Jan

We need to show a good presence at the 3 week Inquiry

Please support the Ponteland Greenbelt Group in their efforts to protect our Greenbelt

More details: <http://www.pontelandgreenbelt.co.uk/2015/01/>

Suggested Topics

- The housing requirement for Ponteland is 640 dwellings, this projection is based on assumed and averaged data while more accurate Government projections are awaited. Is it not premature to be consulting on such an important issue as Green Belt deletion before this data is available?
- Can we be assured that if the publication of up to date data results in a reduced requirement this will be taken into account as the plan moves forward?
- Allowing for the number of planning permissions already in the system only a further 88 consents are required to meet the 640 target during the 16 year remaining plan period. Allowing for the likelihood of “windfall” sites coming forward is there any need for Green Belt deletion at all?
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that a Green Belt boundary may be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Is the assumed need for a further 88 houses an exceptional circumstance?
- Proposed Policy 20 b. states that part of the Strategic approach is to “check the unrestricted sprawl of Tyne and Wear.” In this context it is equally important that Ponteland should not extend towards Newcastle as it is that Newcastle should not extend towards Ponteland. The suggestion that the land to the south east of Ponteland is the area of least impact and landscape sensitivity is completely at odds with the perception of the community, the outcome of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consultation, common sense and the Community Character Statement produced by the Ponteland Civic Society and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- Proposed Policy 20d will preserve the setting and special character of Hexham, Corbridge and Morpeth. Why does this not include reference to the special character of Ponteland? The open nature of the approaches to Ponteland Village are essential to its special character which is clearly described in the Community Character Statement and must be protected
- Why does the proposed Green Belt deletion of the area around the High and Middle Schools include the possibility of employment use? Surely this would be the most inappropriate location for employment use
- Why does the proposed Green Belt deletion of the area around the High and Middle Schools include the possibility of housing use? The logistics of replacing the leisure centre and school buildings (should this happen) would mean constructing buildings of similar size to those existing, on presently undeveloped land, to allow the current uses to continue. A phased approach would ensure the minimum amount of undeveloped land would be needed. Allowing other development in this area would prejudice this approach
- Why does the whole of this area need to be deleted from the Green Belt? Retaining the majority of the area in Green Belt would allow playing fields and protected open space but prevent speculative development in the longer term
- Why is the proposed Green Belt deletion of the area to the north of Cheviot View split into 2 parts? If development here is intended to facilitate the construction of a relief road, there is no need to provide access onto Cheviot View
- There is presently no development visible in this area which gives a true sense of openness on the final approach to the village. The isolated Clickemin Farm House and wedge of open countryside here is a living link to Ponteland's agricultural past and should be retained in the Green Belt
- An alternative relief road route was suggested by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Surely the whole of this area should be treated as dependent on the delivery of a relief road and safeguarded until the route is confirmed through a local or neighbourhood plan
- Would the housing numbers which might come forward on the proposed safeguarded land to the north of Ponteland not fund a relief road without the need for deletion of Green Belt to the south east of Ponteland
- Why can the housing numbers at the Police Headquarters Site not be increased to accommodate any requirement for the plan period, once the correctly calculated numbers for the current plan period are known? This area has effectively gone from the Green Belt and the additional housing could fund an alternative traffic link from that site onto the A696
- How has the requirement for safeguarded land in the next plan period been calculated? The amount of safeguarded land proposed could accommodate thousands of houses whereas you have already assessed the need for the current plan period at 640
- Why does the safeguarded land need to be removed from the Green Belt now? Surely the most effective way of safeguarding it for future development within the next plan period would be to retain the Green Belt protection until the next plan is produced
- How can you demonstrate the need for a relief road based on the current projections?
- How does this consultation document reflect the responses to the last consultation from our community which was strongly against large scale development and development on Green Belt?
- How does this consultation document reflect the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and Government guidance which seek to prioritise the development of brownfield land?