

HARTLEPOOL RURAL PLAN



RESIDENTS COMMENTS AND RURAL NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUP RESPONSES

CONSULTATION 2015

Plan Strategy

Policy GEN1 – Village Envelopes – Page 2
Policy GEN2 - Design Principles – Page 7

Housing

Policy H1 – Housing Development – Page 11
Policy H2 – Affordable Housing – Page 19
Policy H3 – Rural Exceptions for Local Needs – Page 26
Policy H4 – Housing in the Countryside – Page 31
Policy H5 – Housing development on the edge of Hartlepool – Page 36

Rural Economy

Policy EC1 – Development of the Rural Economy – Page 43
Policy EC2 – Retention of Shops, Public Houses and Community Facilities – Page 48
Policy EC3 – Former RHM Site to the South of Greatham Station – Page 52
Policy EC4 – Service Stations and Travel Related Development – Page 57

Transport and Movement

Policy T1 – Improvements to the Highway Network – Page 60
Policy T2 – Improvements to Public Transport – Page 66
Policy T3 – Improvement and Extension of the Public and Permissive Rights of Way Network – Page 71

Community

Policy C1 – Safeguarding and Improvement of Play Areas, Sports and Recreation Facilities and Allotments – Page 78

Natural Environment

Policy NE1 – Natural Environment – Page 82
Policy NE2 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy – Page 85

Built Environment

Policy BE1 – Enhancement of Heritage Assets – Page 88

Infrastructure

Policy INF1 – Infrastructure Priorities – Page 92

General Comments - Page 96

POLICY GEN1 – VILLAGE ENVELOPES

SYNOPSIS

- For most the green gaps should be protected
- Villages to be protected from “ Urban Sprawl” and maintain village life
- Suggestion that it may restrict growth of the village
- Important not to have negative impact on local amenities and restrict investment

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
2 (DP)	Strongly Agree	The villages need to be protected from being swallowed up by the urban spread	Noted
3 (DP)	Agree	Development within the village envelopes needs to be considered also in context of the amenities available within those communities. Some have no practical amenities such as local shops or community focal hubs or functioning social spaces such as sports / playing fields or schools - some villages have an absence of safe walking routes to school	We have taken into account in housing site selection – infill only at Dalton Piercy & Newton Bewley (policy H1)
5 (DP)	Strongly Agree	This does not go far enough - for example, rural tourism and leisure development are completely inappropriate for a village such as Dalton Piercy	Rural tourism mat be appropriate so long as it meets policy requirements (see policy EC1)

9 (G)	No Answer	I feel the green gap will be very restrictive because it will limit the development and this will impact negatively on local economy. Also what are exceptional circumstances? Also the green gap is not consistent	Sufficient sites including strategic sites like the South West Extension at Claxton have been allocated. Development will be permitted as defined in policy
18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No developments anywhere	Noted
19 (G)	Strongly Agree	As long as these apply to all villages within the plan	Policy does apply to all villages
20 (G)	Strongly Disagree	My garden is not a green gap my children love to play in there	Noted – if garden within village envelope it should not be in green gap
28 (G)	Strongly Disagree	Who deems what is essential for public infrastructure	Hartlepool Borough Council, Rural Neighbourhood Plan, N.P.P.F & public through consultation
35 (G)	Strongly Agree	Village envelopes must be supported with meaningful controls on urban expansion - no use restricting the villages if it is just to let the towns sprawl	Green Gap policy aims to control urban expansion
37 (G)	Disagree	Greatham needs to be protected by a larger protective band between it and its neighbours	Green Gap policy aims to protect identity of Greatham
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Whilst keeping links through 36 bus	No36 bus should not be affected
47 (NB)	Strongly Disagree	Village envelopes should all be kept within existing boundaries	Any expansion of village envelopes at Elwick and Hart done to meet needs of village because of lack of sites within envelope and to support sustainability

56 (E)	Disagree	I do not think there should be any building at all between Elwick and Hartlepool. This is agricultural land and should remain so	Noted – green gaps policy Any expansion of village envelope at Elwick to meet need of village and support sustainability
59 (E)	Strongly Agree	Important to keep villages separate and not become urban extension	Agree – green gap policy
60 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Past history shows that a council cannot give an unbiased view as future income depends on their decision	Noted
61 (E)	Agree	Standard generic rural development policy for villages	Noted
62 (E)	Strongly Agree	Overdevelopment of villages will result in the villages ceasing to be villages	Noted
63 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Green gaps will inhibit the continuation of the village community. Why is Elwick omitted from justification 8.1	Sites allocated for incremental growth of villages. Elwick to be added to justification 8.1
64 (E)	Strongly Agree	The villages should remain and not end up as the outskirts of Hartlepool. That would ruin all	Noted – green gap policy
65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Introducing green gaps will stunt the growth of a thriving village community by not allowing development of mixed housing and not imposing the green gap in others some of which now look like shanty towns	Expansion of village envelopes at Elwick and Hart introduced to meet needs of village because of lack of sites within envelope and to support sustainability

66 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Green gaps should not be too close to existing villages	Plan takes into account appropriate growth for villages for 15 year live of plan
71 (E)	Agree	Important to protect village life	Noted
72 (E)	Disagree	<p>I was interested when I looked up the word gap, a noun meaning a break, an opening an interval or an interruption. On examining the map in parts I agree it represents a gap however some of the areas cover a land mass with no breaks this cannot be considered a green gap. By restricting the development to outside the village envelope and the green gap there will be little or no growth and development. This plan will produce a negative view to prospective investors. The country is highly valued by the landowners who devote a lifetime to ensure it is productive and valuable resource. Village envelopes are seen as a transition point between urban and rural more often become straitjackets which inhibit exploration or improvement.</p> <p>Preparation of tree planting and landscaping schemes are an important means of encouraging a more enlightened approach this depends on the availability of land and willingness of landowners</p>	<p>Expansion of village envelopes at Elwick and Hart introduced to meet needs of village because of lack of sites within envelope and to support sustainability. Plan takes into account appropriate growth for villages for 15 year live of plan</p> <p>Noted</p>
80 (E)	Disagree	Only if road and pathways are developed to support this	See planning obligation policy INF1
82 (E)	Strongly Disagree	There should be no development at all in green gaps. Development should be restricted to brownfield sites and only take place in greenfield sites in exceptional circumstances	No development at all could damage rural economy eg. agriculture. Policy aims to identify exceptional circumstances
84 (E)	Agree	The situation of existing residents should also be taken into consideration	Noted – consultation process

85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	You are consigning the villages within this plan to the loss of amenities, employment, and new homes. At a stroke you have sliced 80% off the value of land with the introduction of proposed green gaps. 'Will be permitted' appears 4 times in these 12 lines of copy, and means 'will not be permitted'. You are tying the hands of HBC who will be unable to attract outside investors into Hartlepool due to the inward looking, restrictive nature of this proposed plan.	Expansion of village envelopes at Elwick and Hart introduced to meet needs of village because of lack of sites within envelope and to support sustainability. Plan takes into account appropriate growth for villages for 15 year live of plan
86 (H)	Disagree	Green gaps disappearing. Hart being joined into town	Green gaps policy aims to address loss of village identity
87 (H)	Agree	There is far too much green areas being absorbed	Agree – hopefully addressing
88 (H)	Strongly Agree	I am opposed to any more housing development that essentially will make our village a suburb of Hartlepool	Agree – hopefully addressing
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	This policy needs to be water tight to avoid the erosion of the countryside and the value it has to the borough	Noted
90 (H)	Agree	This agreement does not include traveller communities	Noted
97 (?)	Disagree	Think green belt should be protected, also agricultural land. Planning permission already granted for more housing in Hart and quite a few houses for sale. More houses would destroy village life.	Expansion of village envelopes at Elwick and Hart introduced to meet needs of village because of lack of sites within envelope and to support sustainability. Plan takes into account appropriate growth for villages for 15 year live of plan

POLICY GEN2 – DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Synopsis

- Maintain village character
- Design should be in keeping with village character
- Developers should engage with local people
- Higher standards of design should be expected in conservation areas especially regarding energy efficiency

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
2 (DP)	Strongly Agree	The villages need to be kept in character - especially the original historical centres - strongly agree especially with point 3	Noted
3 (DP)	Agree	Design criteria should include the development and enhancement of social / community spaces within the villages to enhance the living environment for all	Look to section 106 agreements and any funding via renewable projects (windmills, etc.) to do this
8 (DP)	Strongly Disagree	Parking very important, most new developments do not have adequate parking	In policy point 7

9 (G)	Agree	In principle I agree but with limited land to build on will the builder afford to fund so much. Also is mobility access and surface water management already covered by legislation	Builder to provide viability assessment. Above and beyond building regs. on mobility
18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No developments anywhere	Noted
19 (G)	Strongly Agree	There is always room for improvement and development in villages. In my case this would be Greatham	Noted
28 (G)	Strongly Disagree	Is 'where possible' a cover all for future plans providing a get out clause	Agree – take out 'where possible'
35 (G)	Strongly Agree	Developers in particular must be willing to engage with local people to respond to local character rather than impose their idea of local character	Developers must liaise in accordance with statue and N.P.P.F.
38 (G)	No Answer	In Greathan - village design statement blend in with buildings in village with same colour bricks as surrounding buildings	Noted
44 (NB)	Agree	High standards of energy efficiency should be carefully matched to cost	Agree – viability testing will allow this
47 (NB)	Strongly Agree	As Newton Bewley is on the busy A689 the number of cars exiting properties onto this busy road should be restricted from the new builds	Noted
60 (E)	Disagree	Flannel	Noted
61 (E)	Agree	Higher standards of design in conservation areas. Protect and enhance but council must comply as well as residents	Noted

63 (E)	No Answer	Whatever development is proposed should be in keeping with the character of the village in question	Noted – addressed in points 1 and 3
64 (E)	Strongly Agree	Affordable housing is necessary, suitable for people to downsize and families take over the larger houses	See policy H2
65 (E)	No Answer	Properties to be built in the area should contain a mix of starter homes for young couples, family homes and some for those of retirement age	See policy H2
66 (E)	Disagree	Need a variety of houses	See policies H1 and H2
71 (E)	Agree	House designs to compliment village environment	Agree
72 (E)	No Answer	With granting very small development builders will need to build large expensive properties to be viable, will this further enhance social equality? The principal of GEN2 are agreeable. Developments have to be accessible to people with mobility difficulties, this policy is already in place	Viability assessment would be needed Noted
83 (E)	Disagree	Run off is into sewer system in North Close	Noted – Northumbria Water responsibility
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	The list of design principles seems very comprehensive	Noted
85 (E)	No Answer	These aspirations must be a given, but again, you must ensure that there is sufficient monies available to a house-builder to leave them with a profit, and take care not to create a structure that means any new houses built can only be afforded by those of great means. If these houses are the only method you have of raising the money that you have spent throughout the rest of your plan, then you must make them affordable to build - as well as own.	Viability assessment would be needed

87 (H)	Strongly Agree	We also required disposable surface water to aid pipe cleansing	Noted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	A very good policy that covers all areas	Noted
96 (?)	Strongly Agree	The housing proposed at the former RHM site would accord with these objectives	No housing proposed at R.H.M. site
97 (?)	Disagree	Very ambiguous	Noted
102 (E)	Strongly Agree	Community building project could be of interest to our rural areas	Noted

POLICY H1 – HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Synopsis

- Access to sites being considered for development
- Consideration for Types of houses relating to the types of people who require them
- Comments on proposed number of houses required in each villages vary
- Question marks over some sites that have been proposed with in some villages

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
2 (DP)	Agree	Need to clarify Dalton Piercy policy	Infill only – less than 5
5 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Housing need alone should not guide development. For example, although there may be a need for family homes, there is little point in attracting lots of families with children to an area such as Dalton Piercy as it lacks the amenities and transport infrastructure that would be needed	Other than infill of less than 5 no sites allocated to Dalton Piercy
8 (DP)	Strongly Disagree	Very important to encourage new younger families into the villages to keep them going	Agree but villages without facilities have sustainability issues
9 (G)	Agree	So approx. 170, therefore 2 houses in each area per year. Also it would be good to know what the type and tenure of the allocated houses are	Type and tenure would be at planning stage when influence of neighbourhood plan policies would engage

18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No new developments in Greatham	Within existing village envelope only
19 (G)	Agree	To my knowledge Grove House Nursery is not available for development - currently a garden centre	Plan for 15 year period – should proposal come forward site would be appropriate subject to neighbourhood plan policies and other planning requirements
20 (G)	Strongly Disagree	As I live in 15 High Street Greatham I would love to know how you would be able to build 6 new homes in my garden where my children play, and how you would get the access to said proposal. There is plenty of more accessible sites in the village i.e. the allotments on Station Road which are disused and will not invade anyone's gardens and outlooks; I have had no information on this proposal. How would you like houses built in your back garden?	Plan for 15 year period – should proposal come forward site would be appropriate subject to neighbourhood plan policies and other planning requirements
22 (G)	Disagree	Think Grove House Nursery should not be built on. Greatham would benefit from some expansion, not infilling, to maintain services	Plan for 15 years. Greatham has enough sites within village envelope to meet need without need for expansion
23 (G)	Disagree	No social housing	Noted
25 (G)	Strongly Disagree	I believe that these green areas and spaces should be retained in order to preserve the feeling of a village. If extra land is required for development then the strikes garden nursery could be used to provide an extensive area of housing similar to the development with outline planning permission on Station Road	Strikes site would be in green gap therefore loss of distinct identity (feeling) of village, also adjacent to industry
27 (G)	Agree	But no social housing as the clientele is often undesirable. Greatham has enough rented properties	Noted

28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Where is the access for the proposed developments? The odd side of the High Street is severely congested with parked cars and the bus stop is surely to be affected. Can't imagine how this plan has been passed. Mellanby Lane - again where is the access?	Access to sites would have to be acceptable in planning terms In Greatham only Station Road site has any form of existing planning permission.
30 (G)	Strongly Agree	Number of properties allocated to Greatham is disproportionate for a small unique village when brownfield sites could be developed elsewhere. Leave conservation areas alone	Noted – limited incremental growth sought to assist sustainability of village facilities.
34 (G)	Strongly Disagree	The proposed number of developments is far fewer than I believe are necessary for natural development and growth. Two or three times this number of new properties over the 14 year period would not be unreasonable	Housing deemed enough to meet rural needs. Limited incremental growth sought to assist sustainability of village facilities.
35 (G)	Agree	Should this policy say permission will be granted rather than identify site suitable for housing	Not within remit of plan
38 (G)	Disagree	Garden rear of 15 High St - unviable adjacent private property at rear of garden of 15 High St and 13 High St. Site held back by high retaining wall at south side and boundary hedge and high retaining wall to west side - should not build near wall or hedge which belong to private property adjacent to site. No building should overlook into windows or property of neighbouring site	All subject to a planning application should one come forward and policy Gen2
39 (G)	Strongly Agree	Greatly concerned by numbers of homes to be built on greenfield sites that extend the Hartlepool town boundaries on the south west and west side of the borough	Noted

41 (G)	Agree	My concern about the 4 sites in Greatham is the access into these sites	Noted
42 (G)	Agree	Although Greatham should be able to take 10-20 more houses than suggested	Noted - seeking limited incremental growth
47 (NB)	Strongly Agree	The owner of Grove House Nursery was surprised to hear of the proposed 6 new builds on his property	15 year plan – site appropriate should situation change
50 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Access roads into and out of village are not suitable to support extra housing - either during building or on completion - because of extra traffic caused by additional urbanisation	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities
52 (E)	Agree	Worried about the increase in traffic in Elwick and onto a busy twisting country road. Already much traffic accessing the A19 morning and evening does not abide by the speed limit. The Elwick road takes all traffic from the middle of town as the A179 is too far north and the A689 too far south of our long thin town	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities
56 (E)	Disagree	Any development will cause more traffic through the village. Facilities are not provided for this	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities
59 (E)	Agree	Mostly 2 bed for starter houses or downsizing. Plenty of family houses already in the village - and at the moment for sale	Noted
60 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Elwick is a contracting village i.e. no public bus service, the PO/shop is in danger of closing down and the two public houses are not financially viable and frequently change hands	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities. See also policy RE2

62 (E)	Agree	In Elwick 25/30 homes represents approx. 10% of current village size. Development beyond this number should not be considered	Noted
63 (E)	No Answer	To accommodate anticipated population growth more dwellings are necessary	Noted - seeking limited incremental growth
64 (E)	Agree	Especially safeguard the villages	Noted
65 (E)	No Answer	I think that over the time period 2015-2030 170 properties is too small and more will be needed to be built, these should only be built close to the village centre	Noted
66 (E)	Disagree	Taking in population growth many more houses needed	Noted - seeking limited incremental growth in villages. Strategic sites like South West Extension allowed for
68 (E)	Agree	Bit airy fairy - further information to be added etc. This is very open ended	Noted
70 (E)	Strongly Disagree	New housing developments must be aligned with the existing housing stock mix. To have any other mix will change the community, and character of these small villages. The latest evidence of housing needs will sadly be skewed dependant on who is questioned and the questions that are asked. Fatally flawed.	Policy asks for mix of housing types. Will also be guided by need – housing needs survey was sent to all residents in rural area.
71 (E)	Agree	Major problems with housing developments near Elwick that will mean extra traffic through village - road is not designed for heavy traffic	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities

72 (E)	Disagree	Over a 15 year period these numbers appear too small. Some areas of the map show areas already with ne house building sites	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities. Limited incremental growth
73 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree with Elwick proposal until prior works agreed and conducted to modernise current sewerage systems that are directed to local stream	Noted
74 (E)	Agree	Should be affordable for village residents	Noted
76 (E)	Strongly Agree	Plus infill development in keeping with the character and amenity of the area	Noted
77 (E)	Disagree	New housing should reflect the housing in the existing village	Noted – policies do seek to do this
78 (E)	Agree	As long as road access is good. Sewage and drains are not overloaded. A bus service is guaranteed. A post office maintained in Elwick village	Noted
79 (E)	Strongly Agree	Concern with regard to more properties in Elwick village - volume of traffic and school places already at peak! Considerable amount of properties on the market for sale and not selling. Do they need more new builds?	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities
80 (E)	Agree	Again only if roads and pathways are improved and bus service reinstated	Noted – limited number of housing seeking to assist sustainability of village facilities

82 (E)	Strongly Disagree	How can residents of Dalton Piercy be expected to comment when the policy document fails to specify the number of potential developments? Dalton Piercy has been adversely affected by totally inappropriate development.	Policy does specify - infill only – less than 50 for Dalton Piercy
84 (E)	Agree	If any proposed developments included bungalows this would encourage older people to remain in the villages, so releasing larger properties for younger people so they too would remain in their villages. This assumes the bungalow design would be appropriate. In Elwick, I would personally dislike the 'town' houses in North Lane, especially there being so near the village green. Similarly the old house in North Close is inappropriate.	Noted – see policy Gen2 for design principles
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	This list is already out of date. The fact that Dalton Piercy cannot agree a site is also a problem - why is there no list to discuss? The western extension also forms part of the proposed rural plan area, as does the site between Sainsbury's and Hart Village. It goes without saying, but must sadly be said; we trust no member of the rural plan working group is set to benefit directly from the allocation of housing as we are sure you will agree it is a conflict of interest. Similarly we trust no landowner who is a member of this group has been able to exclude their property from this proposed green gap. Please confirm this is the case. And who has determined this list? Is there any evidence available to support those included and not?	Dalton Piercy has little in the way of facilities and is therefore an unsustainable location for anything other than infill. Allocation of sites determined via consultation exercises, need and desire for limited incremental growth in sustainable locations. Hartlepool Borough Council SHLAA and further consultation provided evidence to support.

87 (H)	No Answer	The villages have lost their identity, the likes of Greatham and Hart, once rural and places to visit are now joined up to Hartlepool. Since 1967 Hart has added four housing estates with numerous site proposals for this year alone	Noted
88 (H)	No Answer	As previously stated I am strongly opposed to any further housing development	Noted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	There seems a good option for carefully planned growth in the village. My concern is the amount of unplanned speculative planning applications that have been put in since the local plan was withdrawn by HBC	Noted and agree – part of motivation for Rural Neighbourhood Plan being developed.
90 (H)	Agree	In respect to Hart Village although we agree a major survey of the existing foul water infrastructure would need to be undertaken. Following major modifications to the existing foul water system to accommodate Nine Acres, major problems exist in Butts Lane with odour and leakage. Unless these new homes are being planned with the village community in mind, village life will be eroded. There are already more homes being built at the other end of the village.	Noted
96 (?)	Strongly Disagree	The former RHM site should be developed for housing to help meet the housing deficiencies in Hartlepool	Better located sites are available
97 (?)	Disagree	If these proposals go ahead Hart will no longer be a village. What is wrong with brown sites nearer town where people will be closer to their work	Plan seeks limited incremental growth at Hart with green gaps to protect identity of village
102 (E)	Agree	Restrict development in countryside to an absolute minimum. Integrate communal green spaces and new builds. Incorporate renewable energy equipment in new builds.	Noted

POLICY H2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Synopsis

- Affordable housing is questioned as viable without sufficient amenities
- Fear that affordable housing may encourage a breakdown in the social makeup of the village
- Guarantee that units provided remain affordable (when the 2015 Government manifesto made a commitment to extend the right to buy to tenants in HAs to enable more people to buy their own homes)
- Right choice of affordable housing

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
9 (G)	No Answer	Is that one affordable house in every 5? Also is affordable housing sensible or practical in villages with little or no transport or shop. So we should improve transport but that means roads with larger buses on move	Yes 1 in 5 is correct. Villages unlikely to see large developments therefore small number required to seek some affordable housing. Aim is to provide housing for rural residents seeking to stay in their community.
15 (G)	Agree	More emphasis needs to be made on social housing especially with the price of property being out of reach of many people. Young people especially should be encouraged to take an interest and look after dwelling provided by a registered provider	Noted

18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No affordable housing in Greatham	Noted Greatham is better provided than most
20 (G)	Strongly Disagree	There are much better sites in Greatham to build houses or any other property that will not disrupt people's lives where the ones you have put down will	Noted – sites put forward during open consultation
21 (G)	Agree	Most affordable housing should always be in town centres close to local amenities and not in new large greenfield site developments. However there is a case for a small number of this type of housing in our villages for first time buyers	Noted
22 (G)	Agree	Think Greatham has more affordable than Dalton Piercy or Elwick	Noted
23 (G)	Disagree	No social housing	Noted
27 (G)	Strongly Disagree	Affordable housing attracts undesirable people and landlords renting it out to them. We have enough rented properties and undesirables in Greatham. Put them in Elwick?	Noted
28 (G)	Strongly Agree	So in layman's terms does this mean for every 5 houses that are of a price that local families could not afford there will be one that may be affordable to a young family or pensioner	Yes
30 (G)	Strongly Disagree	What a load of gobbledegook, is it beyond the remit of HBC to use plain English to its residents? Is my council tax being used to pay consultants to write this legal drivel	Noted – not produced by H.B.C.
35 (G)	Agree	Care needs to be taken to provide the right sort of affordable housing for each village	Noted

38 (G)	Disagree	Affordable housing in Greatham between Hill View and Saltaire Terrace	Noted – but mix preferred
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	But with local authority backing. Developers are not the ones to provide plans and policy	Noted
49 (E)	Agree	Very important for the future of local people who understandably want to live in their birth village	Noted
50 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Not enough amenities in village to support extra urbanisation - and cost effective housing will devalue properties and may bring unwanted social problems to peaceful village life	Noted – some growth may support village facilities. Aim is to provide opportunity for rural residents to remain in their communities
51 (E)	Disagree	There are countless available sites and houses already building in rural / semi-rural locations is driven by developer greed and financial purpose	Noted
56 (E)	Disagree	I do not like the idea of so much new building in the village, it will become so large that it cannot be called a village and that will be devastating	Noted – aim is limited incremental growth that might support village life
59 (E)	Agree	Affordable houses are required not exec type around Elwick	Noted
60 (E)	Disagree	Gobbledegook! The price of a house is dictated by the price of the land. In Elwick green site land will be at a premium i.e. houses will be expensive for the builder to make a profit	Noted – viability testing by Hartlepool Borough Council
65 (E)	Agree	Within all the villages there is a varied price range of properties on the market so this should be reflected in the type of housing needed	Noted

66(E)	Agree	Will help people stay in villages if they get first choice	Noted
67 (E)	No Answer	The villages have expensive and less expensive properties, unfortunately the facilities which are currently available would deter people from considering to live in a village	Noted
68 (E)	Agree	With the new government's intention to force housing association to sell off property this means within a short time affordable houses could be sold off and we would be back to square one	Noted
70 (E)	Strongly Disagree	<p>Forcing developers to supply over a quarter of any development as affordable housing onto the very limited available building land around the villages will restrict the likelihood that any development will occur, if this is the ultimate goal of this quango then please come clean.</p> <p>Incorporating affordable housing where there was previously very little will change the demographic and hence the communities, altering the character and feel of the villages, so if this social manipulation is the aim of this plan, then please again come clean. Public transport to the surrounding villages range between scarce to non-existent. This has been implemented by HBC as a result of financial constraints placed on them. Affordable housing must be located close to modern amenities or have extremely good and sustainable public transport links; neither of these is true of the outlying villages.</p> <p>There are very few if any employment opportunities in the villages, and coupled with the poor transport, there will be a danger of effectively trapping residents of affordable housing in a vicious cycle of poverty</p>	<p>Figure is actually 20%</p> <p>Aim is to enable rural residents, including the young, to stay in their own communities</p> <p>No Hartlepool village is that far from employment opportunities though the neighbourhood plan does also seek to attract some employment to the rural area and improve transport</p>

72 (E)	No Answer	It is agreed that there is a need for affordable housing and promote an inclusive community. Currently all of the villages have a mix of properties. How can we guarantee units provided remain affordable when the 2015 Government manifesto made a commitment to extend the right to buy to tenants in HAs to enable more people to buy their own homes? Hart and Dalton Piercy have no shop and Elwick and Dalton Piercy a very poor part time bus service. This will not make it attractive for affordable housing tenants	Trying to ensure affordable housing continues to be in the mix as part of new developments More people able to support more facilities. Aim to enable rural residents the opportunity to remain in their communities.
73 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Village areas are housing saturated and sufficient brownfield remains unused in Hartlepool. Fragments of local countryside should have increased protection	Noted though plan has identified sites Green gaps offer some increased protection
81 (E)	No Answer	We need affordable but there is more emphasis on affordable subsidised housing with much less on encouraging all housing to encourage more robust communities and economy, which Hartlepool needs with such poor services are we not exacerbating the social divide - no bus, no shop, no decent paths to walk or cycle to shops on	Noted - policies are trying to address some of the problems identified
82 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Policy H2 is far too flexible and will lead to a proliferation of 'executive' houses totally inappropriate for rural villages. There should be a fixed non-negotiable quota of affordable houses for every proposed development.	Policy is for 20% affordable housing in development of 5 or more. Policy points 1 & 2 for figures

84 (E)	Agree	This is obviously a complicated situation but it is necessary that affordable housing should be available for local families or the villages will become 'commuter land' for higher earners. It goes without saying that builders will find a way of getting the maximum profit out of a site, particularly a village.	Noted Policy point 5. Add definition for 'future eligible household'.
85 (E)	No Answer	That there needs to be housing in the village of all types that all people can afford goes without saying - however it is curious that there is flexibility built into this proposed policy, but none under GEN1 village envelopes. Here affordable housing can be shunted off-site and not necessarily even appear in the same village. We've had a look on the Rightmove website and the house values in Hart range from £600k - £125k, in Elwick from £600k - £160k and in Dalton Piercy from £1m - £200k. Undoubtedly at the top end only the seriously well off can afford to move into these villages but at the bottom end, these appear much more affordable. But none of these villages have a shop or guaranteed bus service; if you can only afford affordable housing you do not choose a village in the rural plan area as there are no services to support you.	Policy point 4 puts some limits on flexibility and preference would be for in same village as development Some rural residents do wish to remain in their communities even if they have limited means
87 (H)	Strongly Disagree	The mix of social housing usually means less care, brings down the standards of their neighbours	Noted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	Another good strong policy that is distinctive to the rural area	Noted
94 (?)	Strongly Disagree	Hartlepool has more than enough band A properties	Noted – plan deals with rural area

97 (?)	No Answer	Bishop Cuthbert development almost reaches this village, lots of houses empty there	Noted
--------	-----------	---	-------

POLICY H3 – RURAL EXCEPTIONS FOR LOCAL NEED

Synopsis

- Potential back door route for the destruction of the proposed rural corridor separating urban development and the villages. Concern for the protection of the village envelope
- Are restrictions set out in this policy sustainable
- The understanding of “exceptional circumstances for local needs”
- Interpretation of local needs

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
3 (DP)	Disagree	The proposal seems to be a potential back door route for the piecemeal destruction of the proposed rural corridor separating urban development and the villages. The eventual outcome of multiple exceptions will be the same as major developments increase and is less likely to make cohesive sense. Much stronger safeguards are needed	Noted – points have been considered and offers only very limited extra housing in exceptional circumstances backed up by local need. Exceptional need should not lead to multiple exceptions.
9 (G)	Agree	Is this not in conflict with the government’s plan to sell off affordable houses to tenants	Noted
18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No new developments	Noted
19 (G)	Agree	Very important for any plan / development	Noted

22 (G)	Agree	Would rather have expansion of 25 houses than infill, some fields east of village have little value	This policy does not concern infill. Fields east of village maintain separate identify of village
27 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No affordable housing	Noted – for rural residents wishing to stay in their community
30 (G)	Strongly Disagree	Please, please someone tell me what this means in layman’s language?	Noted
38 (G)	No Answer	No build outside Greatham boundary or village envelope to keep village status - village should be always surrounded by green belt	Noted – exceptional circumstances to meet local need
42 (G)	Agree	Those who provide rented accommodation should be asked to spell out their policy	Noted – beyond remit of plan
44 (NB)	Agree	Occupancy will be restricted? Could lead to nepotism and a lack of fresh ideas	Noted
50 (E)	Agree	Houses for local residents / families with need	Noted
51 (E)	Agree	Is this survey meant to be baffling?	No
52 (E)	No Answer	10 dwellings or fewer in statement 2 is not consistent with that policy H1 re Elwick	Policy H3 is an exceptions policy – exception to policy H1 to meet exceptional local need
60 (E)	No Answer	Unworkable - would you buy a low cost home knowing that should you have to move in say 10 years, then you would not be able to sell at a profit, although the market may have risen considerably	Noted – established policy in other rural areas. If only opportunity to buy at affordable cost in own community then it is likely to be worth considering.

62 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Re Elwick whilst the above sounds reasonable I suspect the practicality of implementation of these restrictions, conditions in perpetuity will not work. Affordable housing should be included in the limits listed in policy H1 schedule	Noted – policy H1 would operate this policy allows for an exception to meet specific local need
65 (E)	No Answer	Who decides these policies?	Neighbourhood Plan in consultation with residents and stakeholders
66 (E)	Agree	As long as locals benefit	Very much the aim of this policy
67 (E)	No Answer	I do not understand what an exception might be. There is no local employment (apart from farmers - sons - pub staff). The main employer is Mr Perry and will expand and need more staff not less	Answers own question
68 (E)	Agree	Current proposals at Elwick are for schemes of more than 10 houses	Noted – any current schemes are not using this exceptions policy
70 (E)	Strongly Disagree	This sounds a lot like social engineering and looks almost impossible to police, creating a bureaucratic nightmare with the extreme likelihood of litigation by disgruntled applicants who are not deemed to meet the flaky criterion. The actual effect of cross subsidy is to effectively raise the cost of the non-subsidised housing out of those with the genuine aspiration to live in the villages	Noted – established policy in other rural areas
72 (E)	Disagree	This sounds rather fanciful, there is very little need for local workers and if the rural plan is adopted this will always be the case	Working is not only requirement – wording is working or resident

73 (E)	Strongly Disagree	As per response to previous question (<i>Village areas are housing saturated and sufficient brownfield remains unused in Hartlepool. Fragments of local countryside should have increased protection</i>)	Exceptions policy to meet local need within parishes
81 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Who will meet the criteria and who decides it	If need identified then those who are identified will need to fill criteria as listed which will be decided as part of planning process which will involve parish councils as statutory consultees
82 (E)	Strongly Disagree	This policy will result in development in greenfield sites	Possibly but only in order to meet local need
85 (E)	No Answer	We understand so little about this we cannot assist, but we would say the following; again, the affordable housing is to be shunted off to 'within the parish'. How are you to determine 'local'? With no real employment being developed how is anyone to describe 'need'? Are you expecting a local landowner to gift land for these projects?	Within the Parish but adjoining village envelope. Local is the parish see point 6/resident or working in the relevant village point 5. Not reliant on working can also be resident but plan does seek to increase employment. Gift of landowner is one option or purchase of land
87 (H)	Agree	Our planning situation is a disaster and totally out of control	Noted
89 (H)	Agree	It is important that such a policy is not abused by developers using the cross subsidy model	Noted and agree
94 (?)	Disagree	Cross subsidy? Open book viability assessment? Speak normal English please?	Noted - need to use correct terms

96 (?)	Disagree	Whereas the thrust of the policy is agreed and the former RHM site could deliver a significant number of affordable units, the restriction to sites of no more than 10 units is not supported as the RHM site could deliver significantly more affordable units	Noted but policy not aimed at RHM site which does not adjoin village envelope. RHM site is remote and near heavy industry.
99 (E)	Strongly Agree	What is affordable housing, and who is eligible to buy it?	See glossary and policy

POLICY H4 – HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

Synopsis

- Use of unused farm out buildings and abuse of the right to build on such sites
- Types of controls and the ability to monitor any planning.
- The understanding of exceptional buildings/housing. Present criteria used is subjective and more guidance is to be provided

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
2 (DP)	Disagree	Needs to be controlled strictly - fed up of this being abused for mansions to be created in countryside	Noted – aim is to control
3 (DP)	Agree	Care is needed with point 1 - how are these judgements to be made. There is the impression that this justification had been used vexatiously in the past	Noted
5 (DP)	No Answer	Strongly agree with 2,3 and 4.1 is only appropriate when there is no other local option and this policy should be strictly enforced	Noted
9 (G)	Agree	Unfortunately in the area around Dalton Piercy this seems to be an exception to the rule with numerous developments not linked to farming or forestry	Noted aim is to improve control

18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No new housing	Noted
19 (G)	Agree	This may need to be flexible in the villages	Applies outside village envelopes
20 (G)	Strongly Disagree	If it goes ahead it will interrupt not only my privacy but my views also the outlooks of the people who live next to me but also to the side of me	Policy seeks to restrict new housing in countryside comment does not appear to relate to this policy – no allocation of sites
28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Will it also ensure that buildings are not left to decay just so that they can be knocked down as a cheaper way of managing existing housing	Policy point 2 would allow re-use of buildings so avoiding decay. Policy point 3 restrict size of new building to being not materially larger than that it is replacing
35 (G)	Agree	Point 2 - reuse existing rural buildings where these buildings are unused or no longer serve their original purpose. Would not wish to see traditional agricultural building being converted to housing large portal framed buildings. Point 4 - who decides what is exceptional quality or innovative?	Agricultural portal buildings are permitted development so cannot prevent whether existing is reused or not. Hartlepool Borough Council planning committee/Rural Neighbourhood Plan. Will look at providing some guidance on exceptional quality or innovative nature (Grand Design type, renowned or award winning architect, carbon positive, etc.)
38 (G)	No Answer	No new housing outside village envelope taking up too much rural green land especially surrounding Greatham	Noted
47 (NB)	Strongly Agree	New housing should reflect the character of the village	Noted
51 (E)	Agree	Point 4 is most likely I feel	Noted

60 (E)	Disagree	Item 4 - a great loophole for a wealthy person to bypass regulations as present existing	Noted - Will look at providing some guidance on exceptional quality or innovative nature (Grand Design type, renowned or award winning architect, carbon positive, etc.)
61 (E)	Agree	3 should account for modern living standards in its justification of materiality	Noted
65 (E)	Agree	Properties should be allowed for agricultural-workers	Noted – point 1
68 (E)	Agree	Any houses built should fit in with the existing houses, this still gives plenty of scope	Noted
72 (E)	No Answer	Housing in the countryside has always been a consideration for HBC planning dept., the true meaning was a person working as a farm worker who needed a local property, in Hartlepool this has changed and now means a small plot of land put up a few stables and a caravan and then after a period of time a permanent residence appears on the landscape. If the plan prevents this to spread across the borough I am in full agreement. However looking at the map of the plan that area appears to be out of the green gap. The green gap is so extensive in part that there will be little or no development. This will also have a negative impact on diversification of the genuine agricultural holding which litters the area.	Noted Green gaps intended to retain distinct identity of villages from each other and adjacent towns.

73 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Labour etc. needs are available in Hartlepool	Contrary to good social mix of rural communities, also desirability of enabling rural residents to remain in their communities
81 (E)	Agree	Again who decides	Ultimately Hartlepool Borough Council planning committee decides. Seek clarification of terms to be included in glossary
82 (E)	Strongly Agree	Again, this policy will result in development within green belt areas. The current system is widely abused. There are numerous brownfield sites in the Hartlepool areas.	Policy would limit development to exceptions listed but any system open to abuse – but plan does try to address
84 (E)	Agree	Our concerns are with No 4 - while I appreciate this is in the NPPF - the problem arises when value judgements have to be made - which can differ from person to person. Additionally there will also be a reflection of personal interest or gain. It is vital surrounding residences are taken into account.	Will look at providing some guidance on exceptional quality or innovative nature (Grand Design type, renowned or award winning architect, carbon positive, etc.)
85 (E)	No Answer	If this is an attempt to stop the proliferation of houses on bare land via liveries, chalets, fishing lakes, boar farming, woodworking, and caravan parks, then the planners at HBC should actually enforce the present legislation	Noted
89 (H)	Agree	Caution regarding point 2 where any modern farm building could be used. It should only be for historical buildings to avoid developers using this loophole. Experience of farmers trying to ?? The conversion of modern shed type farm buildings	Noted – modern farm buildings would require extensive alteration/rebuilding to make habitable

92 (?)	Strongly Agree	If a farm requires a house / bungalow for a family member to work on farm. Then they have the site and if they have funds let them build for own use not for profit	Noted
94 (?)	Agree	There must be a clampdown on stables built on small fields, followed by a planning application for a house. This has ruined such areas as Dalton Piercy and north of Claxton	Noted
96 (?)	Strongly Disagree	The RHM site is a brownfield site that has previously been occupied by large industrial buildings and is therefore considered to be appropriate for housing. Developing this site will help preserve other more sensitive sites from development	Noted – better sites available
102 (E)	Agree	I don't agree with point 4 unless point 1 also applies	Noted – However would not be in line with NPPF

POLICY H5 – HOUSING DEVELOPEMENT ON THE EDGE OF HARTLEPOOL

SYNOPSIS

- Maintaining the flow of traffic within the rural area may require further planning
- Protect villages from over development
- Villages should be protected from an increase of traffic
- Build the access roads before any housing development

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
3 (DP)	Agree	8.53 Care needs to be taken not to encourage traffic flow through the villages towards the A19. These junctions are already claiming lives and the rural roads are already dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians	Noted
4 (DP)	Strongly Agree	We are particularly concerned regarding traffic flow through the village	Noted
5 (DP)	Strongly Agree	New roads should be in place before any new development	Noted
8 (DP)	Strongly Agree	It is of great importance to families already in the villages that no increase in through traffic is created. New roads must be built. The villages need to remain as villages not swallowed up by new developments	Noted

9 (G)	Agree	This hasn't happened to the development near Tunstall School as lots of traffic goes through Elwick and I can't see it changing	Noted
15 (G)	Strongly Agree	As stated green gaps should not be compromised and new road infrastructure needs to be considered carefully	Noted
16 (G)	Disagree	Use suitable spaces within Hartlepool	Noted
17 (G)	Agree	Community centre, shops etc. must be in centre of development, so it does not affect our village centre and shops	Noted
18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No new housing	Noted
19 (G)	Strongly Agree	Housing mix is a necessity. This is a priority in Greatham - lack of private bungalows	Noted
21 (G)	Strongly Agree	Flood measures need to be carefully monitored as history has shown developers have seriously underestimated the problem and/or have cut corners	Noted
22 (G)	Strongly Agree	Particularly important is cycle ways / paths in new housing, Claxton could provide a cycleway link	Noted
26 (G)	Agree	Totally against bump strips as calming measure	Noted
27 (G)	Strongly Disagree	We don't need more housing in Hartlepool. The marina is stood empty. But if it must go ahead then I would have to agree	Noted

28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Has anyone really looked at the road networks? The A689 A19 roundabout is a joke at peak times. The A689 is the only route in and out of town and when there is an incident I have grave concerns about its safety - is anyone going to look at opening up the old steelworks road from A689 to Brenda Road especially in cases of emergency. We are going to need it when Claxton is developed	Noted
38 (G)	Disagree	Use brown land. Any new housing on edge Hartlepool should not build on green land making large estates off A689 would make too big impact on A689 with more congestion to get to a19. Need another road made to cope	Noted Policy does seek mitigation if urban extensions proceed
42 (G)	Agree	Although every effort should be made to keep the good agricultural land in use	Noted
44 (NB)	Strongly Agree	Traffic increase major issue	Noted – see point 9 of policy
51 (E)	Agree	Gibberish	Noted
59 (E)	Strongly Agree	Very important the buffer zone and reduce the traffic through the villages if new building large sites in Hartlepool	Noted
61 (E)	No Answer	Elwick? Line for traffic leaving north of Hartlepool. New development should not create significant / unsympathetic traffic solutions for the village	Noted – see point 9 of policy

63 (E)	No Answer	Existing similar communities struggle to provide adequate amenities. Any future developments should be annexed to existing communities	Noted. Urban extensions are annexed to Hartlepool but annexing such large developments to villages would overwhelm those communities. Add 'existing adjacent communities' to point 6 about links
64 (E)	Strongly Agree	This area needs to be watched	Noted
65 (E)	No Answer	We do not need new distinct communities when they are plenty of good existing village surrounding Hartlepool with the necessary facilities, incorporating small new developments within these areas will help to improve schools, shops, public houses, churches and local community groups. Road improvements should be addressed by Hartlepool highways, however the proposed green gap is going to prevent any of this taking place	Size of developments suggested would overwhelm existing villages – seeking limited incremental growth in main villages New/improved roads can go through green gaps
66 (E)	Disagree	If rural plan development should be on edge of villages	Noted – limited incremental growth sought for main villages
67 (E)	Disagree	Use already established communities - build on what we have that already works	Noted – limited incremental growth sought for main villages
68 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Houses should be allowed to creep into the rural areas at all	Noted
73 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Use brownfield	Noted
74 (E)	Strongly Agree	Especially about traffic through Elwick to the A19	Noted – see policy point 9

77 (E)	Strongly Agree	Real concern about green gaps between urban area and villages and extra traffic using minor roads through the villages. Don't think you will manage this	Noted – see policy point 9
78 (E)	Agree	There should be a lower speed limit of 50mph on the Elwick Road from Hartlepool to Elwick village. It is a rural road; winding and safe overtaking spots are few. Signage of 50 should be displayed clearly. There is also a blind spot dip in the road motorists should be made aware of this	Noted – speed limits would need liaison with Hartlepool Borough Council engineers
81 (E)	No Answer	In theory a mini Peterlee may work but with 5 villages why not use them and increase their population which will enhance facilities and community	Size of developments suggested would overwhelm existing villages – seeking limited incremental growth in main villages
82 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Housing development should be primarily on brownfield sites, only in exceptional circumstances should this be allowed on greenfield sites and only after environmental impact surveys	Noted
83 (E)	Disagree	Not without employment opportunities	Noted
84 (E)	Agree	Agree, but hopefully there really should be little need for development on the edge of Hartlepool. There are sufficient brownfield sites which could be used. Also it is estimated that there are 700+ empty houses at any time. The population is not growing. Regarding access roads - to 70mph speed limit should be enforced regardless of what changes are to be made.	Unfortunately not sufficient brownfield land to accommodate requirements. Key strategic sites required by Hartlepool Borough Council. Rural plan seeks to maintain some element of control and mitigating measures

85 (E)	No Answer	<p>You are being disingenuous, all housing needs to be built with care and with the occupiers to the fore - parks, community centres, play areas, shops, an adequate highway system and so on; however you cannot have the proposed green gaps - which have appeared without landowner consultation - and expect a vibrant community as you have suggested. Instead of simply saying what you will only accommodate, why not say what the plan must do to address the inevitable?</p> <p>With new homes there are two cars each, so the highway network within Hartlepool Borough will have to alter significantly, a bypass for Elwick and/or the closure of the 3 access points in the central reservation on the A19, for example. The need for another school, community centre, church, graveyard, network of cycle paths, bus services, employment, provision for the builders to employ locally and so on. We believe new house builders would have provided the highways network required, but they will choose not to invest in Hartlepool, as you have proposed those thousands of acres of green gap which actively prevent any development other than your very short list.</p>	<p>Key strategic sites accommodated by plan and green gaps will be those know to be coming forward. Green Gaps are intended to maintain vibrant village communities while allowing limited incremental growth.</p> <p>Highways England response indicates supports for neighbourhood plan</p>
87 (H)	Strongly Agree	Our local authority spent vast amounts on the cycle path between Hart and Middlethorpe Farm - it was not finished.	Noted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	Very good policy	Noted
99 (E)	Strongly Agree	Excellent idea with community facilities - may be able to benefit nearby villages if connected by reliable and regular bus service	Noted

100 (E)	Agree	How do you stop the traffic from the new developments using the minor roads to avoid congestion on the main roads? Big problem for the future	By highlighting problems in rural plan and seeking improvements/ better alternative routes
102 (E)	Strongly Agree	Any major developments should not have access to the A19 through the villages especially Elwick, as this is already a major problem and has a negative impact on village life and safety for residents. New roads accessing the A19 should be built before the development in order to accommodate building traffic	Noted

POLICY EC1 – DEVELOPEMENT OF THE RURAL ECONOMY

Synopsis

- Improvements to technology and communications infrastructure very badly needed now
- The green gap has no consistency and will discourage many investors
- Increased investment and employment will have an impact on traffic flow.

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
3 (DP)	Agree	Rural economy could be enhanced by encouraging work from home in the villages. There is no high speed internet broadband connectivity to Dalton Piercy making this almost impossible for most. This would ease traffic issues, be environmentally beneficial, promote vitality within the villages and promote community safety by encouraging working age people to work / be present in the villages during daytime	Noted – include broadband for Dalton Piercy
4 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Cycleways would be particularly welcome	Noted
5 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Improvements to technology and communications infrastructure very badly needed now	Noted
8 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Super-fast broadband for Dalton is needed to encourage sale of houses and improve life of villages here now	Noted – include broadband for Dalton Piercy
9 (G)	No Answer	Will this restrict all new and old businesses and how would it be decided which or who's business is allowed	Policy seeks to support all businesses old and new

19 (G)	Agree	Unfortunately businesses are not attracted to village life - but this is understandable	Noted – but there are some businesses locate in the villages so why not new ones
28 (G)	Strongly Agree	This is an interesting policy - which one of the villages is going to support a garden centre / farm shop? Aside from developing business by improving communications can consideration be given to improving communication infrastructure per se? In 2015 a lot of people work from home and I know that prospective buyers of houses expect a decent network. You are ignoring the current home and workforce need by just applying this policy to new builds / expansions	Any village may support garden centre or farm shop if appropriate to location. Superfast broadband provision has been priority and most of rural area now covered – Dalton Piercy notable exception. Point 3 cover live-work units (home workers) and small scale units
32 (G)	Strongly Agree	How can communications improve if Hospital of God will not allow fibre optic cables to be laid?	Superfast broadband already being provided in Greatham, optic fibres only going to main village box.
35 (G)	No Answer	Do agree with support for rural economy but - expansion of existing agriculture but for other businesses may need to be limits reuse supported but concerned about replacement of buildings. Point 4 - again concern at unlimited expansion of existing buildings. Location in urban areas = loss of business to rural economy	Policy does have controls on new buildings (point 4) and re scale, not being detrimental to nearby residents or local highway network.
38 (G)	Disagree	Need to update road networks where A19 at standstill traffic leave A19 and go through Billingham or via Seal Sands to get to Middlesbrough. Traffic on A689 gets held up way back sometimes nearly to Greatham now without impact new housing estate have enough small units in area and retail units including plenty garden centres without more	Noted support for rural economy but policy is mindful that should not result in significant impacts on local highway network.
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Though much will need to be done to improve broadband	Noted

43 (G)	Strongly Agree	Need to try and keep Post Office	Noted
63 (E)	Disagree	Are suggested businesses allowed to construct premises on green gap land	Can build in green gaps if meet requirements of policy
64 (E)	Strongly Agree	Computer connections are still poor	Noted
65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Large tracts of land suitable for all the suggested development of the rural economy seem unworkable because of the amount of land in the proposed green gap, some of those areas not in the green gap around Dalton already look like a shanty town	Development must be of a scale appropriate to setting and enhance the local landscape character
66 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Enough varied business in area	Plan seeks long term sustainability and varied employment for vibrant rural economy
68 (E)	Strongly Agree	We need work on a small scale offices, work from home etc. But not industrial estates	Noted
70 (E)	Disagree	Like all industries, agriculture has experienced intensification and mechanisation during the industrial revolution, unless we return to the dark ages, agriculture is not going to become a mass employer even if it is in a rural plan. The contradictions in these statements beggar belief. Creating business units without increasing traffic flow, how? There are a multitude of small business units and shops vacant within the town, the occupation of these should be the councils priority	Agriculture still vital to rural economy – policy seeks to support with diversification which might bring new employment. Also encouraging re-use of redundant buildings. Balancing this by recognising need to look at impact on local highways. Rural plan is not being developed Hartlepool Borough Council, but is concerned with seeking to keep villages alive and vibrant.

72 (E)	No Answer	The green gap has no consistency and will discourage many investors. Some of the villages have no surrounding green gap. With others there is a wall of green gap for at least 2 miles. I agree with your suggestions but fear you have no way of implementing them. Is this in conflict with the Governments policy on diversification within agriculture? Again the strong emphasis on the attractiveness to come here depends on good quality communications and internet, however the green gap prevents further development these services will not be needed	Green gap does not exclude appropriate development as outline in policy and which would benefit the rural area. Extent of Green gaps will be reviewed
73 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Similar provisions have previously allowed property developers to con local planners	Noted
81 (E)	No Answer	Again an excellent theory - for farmers to exist they have built up and worked hard and run a very tight business, how do you feel you can help expand their business	Noted – policy seeks to support farmers by providing for diversification
84 (E)	Agree	Policy seems fair enough - Para 3 is very important	Noted
85 (E)	No Answer	All these rural employment opportunities are going to have to be largely on the other side of the A19, since none will be allowed in the thousands of acres you have effectively devalued within the green gap - and made them unattractive to investors, banks and any grant source. We will be unable to continue to invest in our business and so will every other farmer trapped within this proposed green gap.	Green gap does not exclude appropriate development as outline in policy and which would benefit the rural area. Extent of Green Gaps to be reviewed
87 (H)	Strongly Agree	The closure of the PO / shop in Hart has had a major impact on the village	Noted

89 (H)	Strongly Agree	A good local policy	Noted
96 (?)	Disagree	This policy should also include reference to the reuse of brownfield sites	Noted – see policy point 2
100 (E)	Agree	However farm shops / garden centres are near saturation point	Noted

POLICY EC2 – RETENTION OF SHOPS, PUBLIC HOUSES AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Synopsis

- Build more houses in villages to keep community viable
- Plan should reflect the need to encourage and develop such businesses
- Some of these comments do not align themselves with a free market economy
- Shop, public house etc. keep villages alive

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
3 (DP)	Agree	The plan should reflect the need to encourage and develop such businesses too	Noted
8 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Elwick needs its shop and PO. Sales of houses are slow, this will be something else to put people off if it closes	Noted
9 (G)	Agree	Village shops need to stay	Noted
15 (G)	Agree	Main points already addressed above. Shops disappearing because of competition elsewhere and viability of the business, also people shopping centrally in Hartlepool	Noted
19 (G)	Agree	3 is too many public houses in Greatham but we do need to keep the Post Office for the community as a whole	Noted
27 (G)	Strongly Agree	Something needs to be done to the Smiths Arms. A restaurant, turned into 2 homes or apartments perhaps	Noted

28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Please let change of use happen when buildings have been empty for a period of time - no one wants to live or move into a village that looks run down and deserted	Noted
33 (G)	Disagree	In Greatham, the Hospital of God own most of the land and buildings so any new businesses must meet their criteria	Noted
39 (G)	Strongly Agree	It's essential that the villages of rural west maintain their shops, pubs, businesses and other services	Noted
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	And here we rely on outside contacts and visitors to use facilities	Noted
43 (G)	Strongly Agree	Try and keep local Post Office	Noted
44 (NB)	Disagree	Some of these comments do not align themselves with a free market economy	Noted – trying to influence for the benefit of the rural area
50 (E)	Strongly Agree	Elwick must retain shop / PO to keep the heart of the village alive. A lot of older or immobile residents need this service as no credible bus links are in action at this time	Noted
63 (E)	Agree	Employing local people	Noted
64 (E)	Strongly Agree	Shop, public house etc. keep villages alive	Noted
65 (E)	No Answer	If the villages were allowed to increase their house building allowances it would give more support to the shops, public houses and community facilities rather than have derelict buildings	Plan seeks limited incremental growth suited to each village
66 (E)	No Answer	Build more houses in villages to keep community viable	Plan seeks limited incremental growth suited to each village

67 (E)	Agree	It is important that every available resource / support be made available to retain community facilities - as I previously stated - build on what is already established	Noted
68 (E)	Strongly Agree	Shops in villages are mainly not viable. The big supermarkets won't touch them. An alternative needs to be found pub/shop?	Noted
70 (E)	Disagree	If a business is unviable then simply because it is the only such business in a village and the community do not want it to close, then the business should and I suggest could not be forced to stay open	Noted – policy seeks to ensure every avenue is explored to keep vital facilities open
72 (E)	No Answer	BE1 is all about spending vast sums of money to enhance before this should be considered we need to find a way of supporting the shops and public houses already in situ. The villages need to be developed to maintain the current facilities	Plan seeks limited incremental growth suited to each village
84 (E)	Agree	Sadly, local amenities such as shops are being lost to the detriment of the quality of life and convenience of the residents, particularly the elderly. Village shops are also a social place where residents meet up with one another.	Noted
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Instead of saying what you will and will not agree to - why not say that you will work with who-ever it is that is attempting to open a shop, develop a community facility or manage a failing pub? We already have a Borough Council; why do you not attempt true community spirit by providing support? It could be advice, assistance with grant applications, volunteering; there must be any number of opportunities to promote living and working here.	Add to policy justification para.8.66 that the Parish Councils would endeavour to offer advice and assistance along with Hartlepool Borough Council and other partners and will work with prospective business owners to find solutions

89 (H)	Strongly Agree	A good policy for the rural area	Noted
99 (E)	Strongly Agree	Very important for Elwick shop and Post Office. Present situation - very few goods for sale, few village residents now using it - lack of newspapers causes serious decline in trade - community very willing to support a shop and PO - essential for survival of village.	Noted
100 (E)	Agree	Without a village shop etc. there is no heart in the village	Noted

POLICY EC3 – FORMER RHM SITE TO THE SOUTH OF GREATHAM STATION

Synopsis

- Reopening of Greatham station could increase traffic through village
- Park and ride as above
- Use of Cerebos area for building houses.
- Leisure facilities including hotel or craft shops
- Use area for building more homes
- Solar farms.

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
9 (G)	Agree	It is a lovely idea to open the station but if it means bussing people in then should be bus to Seaton or Billingham stations	Noted
15 (G)	Strongly Agree	Would a park and ride increase traffic flow through the village? Distance wise it may be easier just to drive near the town centre	Noted – policy does recognise need to avoid a significant increase in traffic through the village
18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	Only if entrance is via the coast road and not through Greatham village. The road is too narrow for heavy traffic and is on a bend. An accident waiting to happen	Route from coast road is very unlikely. Policy does recognise need to avoid a significant increase in traffic through the village

19 (G)	Agree	This could be successful like many other similar sites nearby - dependent one use / facility	Noted
22 (G)	Strongly Agree	Feel Greatham Station could be an exceptionally useful station of south Hartlepool and Wynyard due to car park feasibility, failing that build on RHM site	Noted
25 (G)	Strongly Agree	Whilst I strongly agree with the first two points I strongly disagree with a solar energy installation which would provide no positive benefit to the village and would not function correctly at this northerly location without being overly large due to the solar power delivered here	Noted Plan seeks to support clean energy options. Solar panels can operate in this location.
28 (G)	No Answer	What does the solar energy installation look like? Strongly agree in principle but it also makes a mockery of knocking down a building of historical and architectural interest.	Rows of solar panels Factory building has already been demolished.
33 (G)	Strongly Agree	Where is the solar energy installation going to be?	Noted – largely on the footprint of the factory building
34 (G)	Disagree	I cannot imagine circumstances in which the reopening of Greatham Station would be economic. A visitors' centre sounds nice, but again I'm not certain about the economics. I would support a study into the options for development of the RHM site	Opening of Greatham station is inspirational. Policy indicates developments which would be supported should a viable scheme come forward
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Develop for use of naturalists and historians	Noted
47 (NB)	Strongly Disagree	Don't think solar energy installation will be more of an eyesore than an attraction to the countryside	Both less of an eyesore than former demolished factory site
63 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Will encourage too much traffic in Greatham to facilitate viable Park and Ride	Policy recognises need to avoid a significant increase in traffic through the village

65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Can any of the ideas be sustained, an influx of traffic through Greatham to catch the train, just what the villagers don't need, we have an excellent station in Hartlepool. Why not turn it into a residential development as there are plenty of birds at Seal Sands and Greatham Creek	Policy recognises need to avoid a significant increase in traffic through the village. Some traffic would help support village shops, etc. Better sites available for housing
66 (E)	Disagree	Build hotel with leisure facilities will help employment and tourism	Noted – accommodation could be an element of visitors centre.
67 (E)	Strongly Disagree	There is a greater need for homes and businesses	Better sites available for housing and businesses (former factory was marketed for business units without success)
68 (E)	Disagree	Who do you think will go to RHM site for leisure facilities that already exist in Hartlepool?	Leisure uses such a walking, bird watching and similar
70 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Whilst some of the ideas floated in this document may justify some discussion I am sure this has been slipped in here as a joke, well it is not very funny. The location does not lend itself to a park and ride and if the demand for a park and ride did exist then it would flood the area with traffic destroying a peaceful village. There is a good reason that the train station closed. Lack of demand. There are two excellent train stations in the town which service the area admirably. Why is this brownfield site not being considered for residential development?	Re-opening of station is aspirational. Policy recognises need to avoid a significant increase in traffic through the village. Some traffic would help support village shops, etc. Better sites available for housing

72 (E)	Strongly Disagree	<p>Where is the evidence that this is a good use of public money - is there evidence of need. How can a visitor centre not attract traffic? Greatham has a bypass road to the delight and pleasure of the residents I can see that they will not want this project because they will be returning to the days long gone. When they suffered with the noise and inconvenience of traffic, it is ludicrous to have one without the other. If the site is not suitable for housing why not use it for small office developments. Thousands of pounds will be used to create a new station, again where is the evidence that there is a need. Hartlepool is a small compact town with 2 excellent stations serving the community well. You say it will be served by a new car park. But will not increase traffic, so do we fly in , these statements are polarised</p>	<p>Policy recognises need to avoid a significant increase in traffic through the village. Some traffic would help support village shops, etc. Former factory was marketed for business units without success</p>
81 (E)	Strongly Disagree	<p>Why not use this site to meet some of the house or small business unit needs</p>	<p>Better sites available for housing and businesses</p>
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	<p>This could lead to exciting possibilities, which would recognise the contribution the works on the site made to the local economy instead of the site being left as wasteland.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	<p>We cannot believe this is the extent of the thought given to this site. Why are we to be pickled? This site has all the facilities, all the services, links to the road and even to the defunct station. Be brave; suggest homes, craft centres, small office units, try to address the potential needs of the future instead of looking back. There will be funding available to start this kind of project, it would bring employment, new people, and keep the village alive. Of course it needs to be managed but that is the role of the HBC and Greatham PC.</p>	<p>Better sites available for housing and businesses</p>

93 (?)	Strongly Agree	Greatham Station will not reopen	Reopening off station is aspirational
96 (?)	Strongly Disagree	As highlighted in the attached letter, the site should be brought forward for housing in addition to the uses highlighted in the policy	Better sites available for housing

POLICY EC4 – SERVICE STATIONS & TRAVEL RELATED DEVELOPMENT

Synopsis

- Speed control
- Service stations, motel and shops receive varied comments regarding safe positioning and further hazards caused by vehicles turning in to such areas.
- Is there a need for more service stations etc on the outskirts of Hartlepool on A689?
- Would help increase employment

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
9 (G)	Agree	That is the case now is it not?	More guidance provided
14 (G)	Agree	The 20mph speed limits in the villages should be removed. When Catcote Road with all its schools, shops and businesses manages with a 30mph limit, it is ridiculous that the villages should have a 20mph limit	Not relevant to plan
15 (G)	Strongly Agree	This is a fast stretch of road with a history of multiple accidents. The least slow-filter roads joining the better	Noted
19 (G)	Agree	This seems to be working already	Noted
22 (G)	Strongly Disagree	These are a danger, service areas should be at interchanges	Policy seeking to control development. Highways England would have to approve safety

28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Can we have a Marks and Spencer food store on the A19 petrol station?	Noted
38 (G)	No Answer	Do not need any more service stations into Hartlepool along A689 plenty nearby areas would be hazard. Lots of traffic often goes too fast and road gets congested more so peak times. Need better transport links in/out Hartlepool	Plan does not propose any on A689. Wording to be looked at to clarify and clearly identified on map
50 (E)	Strongly Agree	Traffic calming through the village is essential. Review parking outside school at drop off / collection times. As a resident of North Close getting into / out of the street at this time is difficult and a danger due to careless parking. Also address traffic calming / quietening noise from A19	Not relevant to policy
60 (E)	No Answer	A hotel on A19 petrol station land has long term been on the books	Hotel site included in services site identified on map
65 (E)	Disagree	Already has planning for hotel / motel and Sunday outlets	Hotel site included in services site identified on map
66 (E)	Disagree	Has its future as on A19	Comment not understood
67 (E)	Disagree	A19 services presents as a very well run business, how can the rural plan improve this?	Rural plan seeks to support the A19 services site
70 (E)	Agree	Why this needs to be said is beyond me. That said if the filling station or café become unviable they will close	Noted
72 (E)	Disagree	I believe that Mr Perry will be in a much stronger position to safeguard the service that this service station provides. Also when there is a hotel on site this will provide more local employment	Aim of policy is to support this site

81 (E)	Disagree	This is a thriving business which has expanded over the years - it provides local people employment and serves the community and motorist very well. It is always tidy and well kept	Aim of policy is to support this site
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	Currently access road to southbound petrol filling station is not long enough for the types of vehicles which use it and the road in general. How there have not been more accidents is amazing.	Noted
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	You have outlined the present use of A19 services, they have planning permission for a motel; are you suggesting that you will restrict any development there when it would bring monies into the local community and employment? We think we can safely leave the highways management to the Highways Agency.	Hotel site included in services site identified on map. Aim of policy is to support site Noted

POLICY T1 – IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HIGHWAY NETWORK

Synopsis

- Worries regarding the increase volume of traffic in villages
- Improve highway network to deal with any increased traffic
- Speed humps / traffic calming needed
- Improve A19 junctions

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
2 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Major problems with increased traffic through villages from new housing developments - especially on very narrow country roads and intersections with A19	Noted
3 (DP)	Agree	Junction re-designs of A19 / village access should include southbound only access from Dalton Piercy and Elwick and access to the villages should be denied from northbound carriageway. Emphasis needs to be placed on safety of non-car users on the rural roads of Hartlepool - promote sustainable transport - reduce CO2 emissions	Noted Policy T3 aims to support alternatives to car
4 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Strongly agree, particularly regarding the impact of new developments on traffic volume	Noted
5 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Strongly agree so long as improved junctions does not mean closures	Noted

8 (DP)	Strongly Agree	New roads needed to discourage through village traffic. Speed humps / traffic calming needed in Elwick and Dalton, 20mph is not working. Need to stop U turns at Dalton A19 turn off. Very dangerous, even HGVs have been seen doing this. Improvement to bridge in Dalton needed	Noted – plan does seek to address problems experienced in villages
15 (G)	Agree	Would this result in additional delays for trains? I'm thinking if long haul journeys that may stop at multiple small stations	This will be addressed in policy T2
18 (G)	Agree	Why build new developments in Greatham when the roads are windy and narrow	Policy seeks to improve road network
19 (G)	Agree	If this would improve traffic flow and access as well as safety any such measures would be appropriate	Noted
22 (G)	Disagree	Close all crossovers of A19 between A689 and A179. Increase tree planting on A689 to reduce traffic noise. Need a cycleway crossing of A19 at Elwick	Highways England known to be investigating. See policy T3 point 1
24 (G)	No Answer	Discourage traffic from using minor roads, speed restriction measures are needed i.e. speed ramps due to children playing through village of Greatham. Traffic is exceeding the 20mph limit, up to 40mph	Policy point 5 Not planning
27 (G)	Strongly Agree	Greatham should not be impacted by this development	Noted
28 (G)	Strongly Agree	As long as the improvements actually improve the highway network - please learn some lessons from existing improvements before tackling this one	Noted

30 (G)	Disagree	This statement assumes new development has already been agreed for Greatham, Hart and Newton Bewley and an increase in traffic is inevitable - wonderful.	Plan aims to anticipate future development and address problems
35 (G)	Strongly Agree	Point 4 - does stating new developments in Hartlepool cover urban expansions which policy H5 states should be distinct new communities?	Policy does cover urban expansions
38 (G)	Disagree	Any new junction on A689 would cause more congestion and hold ups. If Claxton built may or may not improve access into Greatham - do not need more traffic along back road into Greatham need to turn Sappers corner at traffic lights. Highway network needs big improvement, needs another road built from intended Claxton development onto A19	Policy is trying to address problem junctions and policies T2 & T3 is looking at alternatives. Sappers Corner is already an option but plan also seeks improvement to A689 junction at Claxton – adjust point 3 to cover all village approach roads
45 (NB)	Strongly Agree	Appointments between 8-9am and 4.30-6pm outside Newton Bewley cannot be made due to the huge volume of traffic east and westbound. Driving west from Hartlepool to Newton Bewley and trying to turn right across carriageways onto our driveway is extremely dangerous due to the ignorance of many drivers who almost collide into rear of our car, then flash lights. Beware local traffic turning signs might help. The 50mph signs and flashing speed signs are ignored. A fixed camera is required and police enforcement.	Have recognised what is a major problem for Newton Bewley and sought to address in point 4. Will review to see if any specific alleviating measures can be suggested.
47 (NB)	Agree	How can they alleviate the impact of the increase in traffic through Newton Bewley?	Noted – policy highlights and tries
51 (E)	Strongly Agree	Access to and from Elwick to A19 is dangerous and improvement is long overdue. The fixation with 20mph limit in Elwick is a far lower concern but appears to receive greater priority	Noted

54 (E)	Strongly Agree	Would object strongly to any attempt to close off the Dalton Piercy and Elwick junctions to the A19	Noted – Highways England investigation
59 (E)	No Answer	Improvements important but not to cut off access to the villages to the A19 and therefore increase costs of journeys to work etc.	Noted – Highways England investigation
60 (E)	No Answer	Impossible to regulate who uses what road - Elwick - traffic calming already in place (20mph). Can 20mph be enforced - speed bumps work but unpopular and wouldn't stop anyone from short cutting on/off A19	Noted
61 (E)	Strongly Agree	Discourage Elwick through traffic rather than try and manage it with crude calming infrastructure. Elwick has become noticeably busier in last 10 years. New development could further exacerbate the situation	Noted – policy trying to address
62 (E)	Strongly Agree	Traffic should be very much discouraged from using minor roads through the villages. Traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, speed cushions, chicanes etc. - should be avoided because their construction make the villages more urban and less like a village	Noted
63 (E)	Agree	Elwick is being used as a rat run for everyone. Emergency services and commuters alike 20mph speed limit, ha	Noted
64 (E)	No Answer	If as has been mentioned, that the Highways Agency is closing openings on A19, please note the speed of traffic coming down near Sheraton bridge area	Noted

65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	A bypass is needed for Elwick village as it has already been done at Hart, Greatham and Wolviston	Noted – Highways England investigation
66 (E)	Disagree	These are too numerous to have them all adopted	Noted – aim for what we can
67 (E)	Agree	Long overdue	Noted
68 (E)	Strongly Agree	There are rumours that ground drilling has been taking place for a new bridge across the A19. If this is so, surely this should have been included in the rural plan	Noted – Highways England have been consulted
70 (E)	Agree	Largely common sense, although very few improvements over the last 25 years	Noted
72 (E)	Agree	I feel confident that the Highways department are well versed with the traffic problems. We need plans to ensure motorist safety on all roads, the A19 gaps are dangerous and closing them is a current and future need. I agree use of traffic calming as a short term means of slowing traffic. The increase of traffic is a national problem with more people owning cars and fewer local jobs, your plan is unlikely to provide more employment	Noted Plan does seek to support rural employment
78 (E)	Agree	To make the junctions onto the A19 from Elwick safer there should be speed cameras to the north of junction and cameras to south past Dalton junction. Motorists using A19 do not keep to 70mph, if they did, joining the A19 would be much easier. 70mph is the speed limit and should be maintained. Speed kills.	Noted – Point 6 added – measures that promote good behaviour such as speed cameras

82 (E)	No Answer	There have been numerous fatal accidents on the A19 between Dalton Piercy and the service stations. How many more lives will be lost before traffic is prevented from crossing the dual carriageway to travel north? The majority of accidents involve traffic crossing the dual carriageway	Noted – Highways England investigating
84 (E)	Agree	Again the 70mph speed limit should be enforced. Cars actually accelerate coming to the red strips.	Noted – Point 6 added – measures that promote good behaviour such as speed cameras
85 (E)	Disagree	The central reservation turning gaps on the A19 at Dalton Piercy and Elwick need to be closed before anyone else is killed. Think outside the box; a bypass for Elwick - is that what you want? If it is, start making the case, in terms of traffic management for example instead of reacting, start on a list of things that need to be in place in 20 years' time.	Noted – Highways England investigating. Policy point 6
99 (E)	Agree	Please - no traffic humps - cars need to cross these frequently if you live in village - shock absorbers cost money!	Noted – reference to traffic calming removed from point 5
101 (E)	Agree	Would object to any plans to close off the junctions to the A19 from Elwick and Dalton	Noted – Highways England investigation

POLICY T2 – IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Synopsis

- Increase bus services to villages
- Greatham station reopening could be expensive and waste of money

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
9 (G)	Disagree	Sounds expensive. It would make Greatham busier though good idea to have a station for local people to walk to	Aspirational policy
11 (G)	Strongly Agree	I would like the 36 bus to serve the whole village because a lot of OAPs cannot walk to the top of the village	Noted
15 (G)	Agree	I'm all for getting cycles onto cycleways that are proper cycleways and not afterthought bolt on lanes on roads that are often obstructed and totally unsuitable	Noted
18 (G)	Strongly Agree	Brilliant. I would definitely use the railway station for work instead of using my car	Noted
19 (G)	Agree	I don't see this as being detrimental in any way. A train service may be advantageous to some	Noted
22 (G)	Strongly Agree	Would love to see this open, would use it to get to James Cook every day for work	Noted
27 (G)	Strongly Agree	Traffic calming measures along High Street would be essential if this happens, as cars already speed	Noted

28 (G)	Strongly Agree	This is an interesting plan; don't know how sustainable it will be. As for traffic - remember there is permission for 29 new houses that will feed straight on to the main road to the station so there is going to be an increase in road traffic	Noted
30 (G)	Disagree	No requirement / demand for a railway station	Aspirational policy
33 (G)	Strongly Agree	Will the park and ride service just be for the new development or will people be able to use it to go into the centre of town	Park & ride principally suggested for those catching trains. Would expect bus link to also pick up through village.
34 (G)	Strongly Disagree	For a bus service from Greatham station to be viable it would have to run at frequent intervals through the day and be used. By definition that means more road traffic	Park & ride principally suggested for those catching trains. Would expect bus link to also pick up through village but timed to link with trains.
35 (G)	Agree	Requirements 1 and 2 are essential	Noted
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Nurture 36 bus, find some public transport for Hill View and Saltaire	Noted
47 (NB)	No Answer	How many trains will stop at Greatham Station to warrant park and ride and where is Hart Station	Aspirational – level of service arranged with service provider. Hart Station= North Hartlepool
52 (E)	Agree	What about the lack of public transport for the ageing population of Elwick?	Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2

65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	This will be a complete waste of public money making Greatham rat run after spending millions diverting the A689 away from the village and why a park and ride at Hart Station? What are they going to see and where?	Park & ride at both locations aimed at those using trains. Point 1 of policy seeks control on traffic. Coastal line links Teesside to Newcastle. Near Greatham offers commuting possibility eg. Queens Meadow and eco-friendly access to wildlife sites
66 (E)	Disagree	Good railway station in town need better bus service for whole region	Plan seeks to improve opportunities for rural area. Support for local bus services added to policy T2
67 (E)	No Answer	We need improvements to public transport. More local buses. Ensure that the two rail stations continue to remain open	Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2
68 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Re-opening Greatham railway station with no increase in road traffic is not reasonable. If HBC can afford Park and Ride facilities why can they not subsidise a daily service for Elwick	See 8.84 for traffic levels (former factory attracted traffic including heavy goods vehicles). Rural plan not Hartlepool Borough Council. Park and ride to principally to serve train use
70 (E)	Strongly Disagree	What a barking idea. An unjustifiable waste of money, a financially unviable rail station with no demand and, any demand would detract from the existing stations, create an increase in traffic and ruin Greatham, where did this crackpot idea originate. Yet more talk of new bus services after years of running the bus services to the outlying villages down. If the council see the transport infrastructure as a problem then perhaps more bus routes that service the villages to the existing stations	Aspirational policy. See Policy point 1 and paragraph 8.84 for consideration of traffic. Policy based on consultations and former Tees Valley Metro plan. Rural plan not produced by Hartlepool Borough Council Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2

72 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Spending thousands of pounds to create a new station, again where is the evidence that there is a need. Hartlepool is a small compact town which is being served very well by two rail stations why have a third. You state it will be served with a new car park but this will not increase traffic, do we fly, these statements are polarised. The same applies to the reopening of Hart station	Re-opening of station – platforms already there. Aspirational policy. Plan seeks to improve opportunities for rural area. Policy point 1 says not increase traffic that would be detrimental to road safety or quality of life in Greatham village
81 (E)	Strongly Disagree	This I feel is not a good use of money - either for HBC, Government funding or anywhere. The town cannot support an extra rail station we have 2 - this will dilute them and may risk a closure - or Hartlepool becoming unmanned, there must be more improvement needed	Aspirational policy. Plan seeks to improve opportunities for rural area.
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	Seems sensible	Noted
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	That's it? Opening Greatham railway station? It would take millions of pounds and where is the demand? Have you stimulated any? Or are there thousands of people required to justify it coming to see the heritage of the former RHM site? Let's please start with some basics - get a bus service into the villages and Hartlepool first.	Aspirational policy. Plan seeks to improve opportunities for rural area. Coastal line links Teesside to Newcastle. Near Greatham offers commuting possibility eg. Queens Meadow and eco-friendly access to wildlife sites
96 (?)	Strongly Agree	The reopening of Greatham Station can be in part facilitated by developing the former RHM site that can provide a park and ride facility in addition to housing development. Housing on the site would have excellent access to the station and therefore would not have significant impact on the local highway network	Noted Better locations for housing

99 (E)	No Answer	Present suggestions irrelevant to Elwick, but Elwick must have some regular frequent daily bus service. Surely the service which covers Naisberry estate could run into Elwick once an hour	Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2
100 (E)	Agree	Has a study been carried out to see if people would use the above if re-opened?	Noted – aspirational policy
102 (E)	Agree	Bus services should be subsidised by HBC not the parish councils. A regular bus service is crucial to support those without cars including the elderly and teenagers - the absence of a regular service can dissuade people from wanting to live in a village	Noted Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2
104 (E)	Strongly Agree	A local bus would be very nice every day, even 2 a day	Noted Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2

POLICY T3 – IMPROVEMENT & EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC & PERMISSIVE RIGHTS OF WAY NETWORK

Synopsis

- General agreement regarding improving the footpath and bridleway network
- Worries regarding cost
- Some negativity regarding bridges over A689 at Sappers corner and Cowpen Bewley
- Improve the present Paths and safeguard
- Could improve tourism in area

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
4 (DP)	Strongly Agree	We particularly support the development of off-road routes	Noted
8 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Cycleways between villages excellent idea. Maintenance most important, very poor at present time, Dalton to Elwick still poor after recent strimming	Noted
9 (G)	Disagree	Some good ideas though could be costly especially if not used much	Costs may be achieved through developer contributions and other funding streams
17 (G)	Agree	I agree if cycleways are used in town they do not use	Noted

18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	No new bridge at Greatham. Why fix what isn't broken? The whole village can cross the road perfectly well at the moment. Why compromise the beauty of the village with a concrete bridge	Pedestrians crossing at traffic junction rather than at pedestrian light controlled point. Some use traffic light control for cyclists. Route part of national cycle route. Links to this crossing part of plan for South West Extension of Hartlepool. Village school children use crossing to go to Manor School. Route. Bridge offers safer option. Concrete not only option for construction of bridge.
19 (G)	Agree	I don't see a necessity for traffic lights and crossing point at Newton Bewley. Insufficient pedestrians and not an accident black spot	Village divided by dual carriageway.
21 (G)	Agree	Any new or improved path / cycleway or bridlepaths must have measures built in to prevent / stop misuse by scramblers, off road bikes and quad bikes	Noted
22 (G)	Strongly Agree	I wish I could safely ride or walk my children from Greatham to Saltholme. Excellent ideas, a new bridge over the A19 for cyclists and road users at Elwick is a must, the interchange should be closed. Must be a cycleway provided on A178 between Greatham Creek and Saltholme	Noted
26 (G)	Disagree	I live in Newton Bewley and a traffic light crossing point is not needed. Noise levels and exhaust emissions from heavy good vehicles would increase if traffic is halted. A crossing point rarely used would increase danger for pedestrians and traffic	Village divided by dual carriageway. If implemented properly should not cause problems of safety – and should improve pedestrian safety.

28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Quite an ambitious plan. Will the vegetation that overgrows the new footpaths be cut regularly? It appears to cost quite a lot to maintain the paths that we already have. And if we have more cycle paths is there anything going to be done about cyclists who use the main roads and pathways instead of the cycle routes. The A689 and Catcote Road are quite dangerous especially when it is dark due to cyclists ignoring the cycle routes	Noted
31 (G)	Strongly Agree	Could not see the Greatham footbridge on the proposed plan	Noted – improve map
32 (G)	Strongly Agree	Safety is paramount on the road crossings at Greatham and Newton Bewley	Noted
34 (G)	Strongly Disagree	There is no need for a bridge over the A689. The traffic lights at Sappers Corner are perfectly adequate. I don't believe there is adequate demand for pedestrians to cross A19 at Elwick to justify a bridge	Pedestrians crossing at traffic junction rather than at pedestrian light controlled point. Some use traffic light control for cyclists. Route part of national cycle route. Links to this crossing part of plan for South West Extension of Hartlepool. Village school children use crossing to go to Manor School. Route. Bridge offers safer option. Concrete not only option for construction of bridge. Aspirational for safety reasons but other options may be feasible.

38 (G)	No Answer	Horses should not be ridden on footpaths as it then becomes unsafe for pedestrians passing or in path narrow and long are pedestrians expected to walk on road instead which is dangerous. Also if ground soft on bridlepath churn up soil making path difficult for walkers or cyclists should take care coming out onto Main road and ensure they look both ways as many don't	Noted
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Already welcomed - more would use the area for walking and nature - liaise with farming community	Noted
45 (NB)	Strongly Agree	We fully support these proposals	Noted
47 (NB)	Strongly Agree	Strongly support a new traffic light controlled safe crossing point on the A689, Newton Bewley	Noted
50 (E)	Agree	Roads are not wide enough for additional cycle paths. Roads are also a major disgrace for potholes	Noted
53 (E)	Strongly Agree	This would be brilliant for cyclists in Elwick. We can then access Castle Eden railway cycle path safely	Noted
59 (E)	Strongly Agree	By all means improve rights of way but only continue with present ones open - don't create more as they can be a nuisance to farmers and their livelihood as no control on who uses them - poachers for instance are regular users	Noted – new routes only opened in consultation with landowners
60 (E)	Strongly Agree	Existing users i.e. walking across A19 one 83 year old woman - cyclists who live in Elwick, 6-15 users - cost? Will never happen	Noted
61 (E)	Strongly Agree	Good luck with this in current public sector financing situation	Noted – various funding streams not restricted to public finance.

62 (E)	Strongly Agree	Very much support safer cycling and walking routes	Noted
63 (E)	Disagree	Since existing routes are misused are more required	Most new routes are along highways to improve connectivity and safety for villages.
65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	These new and improved routes do not come cheap, who pays for them, who maintains them. Many footpaths / cycle / bridleways are already misused by quads, poachers and off-roaders	Various funding streams including developer's contributions Policy INF1 point 8. Hartlepool Borough Council officer could advise on furniture that may minimise misuse.
66 (E)	Disagree	Plenty of routes in area but cycleways alongside A roads could benefit worker travelling to jobs	Noted most routes are existing for which improvement is sought.
67 (E)	No Answer	Excellent but how to fund and maintain	Noted – various funding options
68 (E)	Agree	New bridges for pedestrians, horses etc. not required. You would be encouraging traffic on minor roads with no footpaths. If you want to spend money put a footpath from Elwick to Hartlepool	Proposed bridges serve to existing routes for improved safety over increasingly busy roads. Elwick to Hartlepool route part of policy – point 3
70 (E)	Agree	Whilst I agree with some of this, new bridges over the A19 and traffic lights at Newton Bewley, exactly who has asked for these? There is already an extensive network of underutilised footpaths, I am not sure that the council's vital resources are best spent on additional under used facilities for a minority	Policies results from consultations and know proposals. Various funding streams including developer's contributions Policy INF1 point 8. Most routes are existing for which improvement is sought.

72 (E)	No Answer	Any improvements are to the benefit of the community, however I ask the question who or how will these improvements be funded and maintained. More footpaths and bridleways opens the countryside which is beneficial to the genuine walker however this also makes more of the countryside accessible to those who have no respect for the countryside which is of concern to the farmers in the area.	Various funding streams. Concerns noted. Those with no respect liable to access anyway – increase footfall on improved routes could improve security
81 (E)	No Answer	Again in theory very good - but with no builders putting money in how will this be funded?	Key infrastructure linked to developments can often be paid for and maintained by developer. Various funding streams available to assist with aspirations. Add above sentence to para 8.91
82 (E)	No Answer	There should be a system of bridleways from Hartlepool to Elwick via Dalton Piercy. Those used to exist but have been closed due to the self-interest of a small number of farmers	See policy point 6
84 (E)	No Answer	Generally agree but no necessity for bridge over A19 at Elwick. Not viable for numbers of pedestrians, cyclists. Probably at Greatham as it would link the cycleway. Coal Lane not particularly suitable for cyclists or pedestrians.	Bridge over A19 sought to improve access and open up wider network. Improve safety for motorists removing walkers from crossing A19.
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Again you are being disingenuous. No building work in the potential green gaps means no money to fund any of this. Footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways don't simply appear - they must be bought. Any landowner interested in this must be willing to allow public access and then it has to be paid for, built and managed.	Any building in rural area has responsibility to improve connectivity. Work with landowners and Hartlepool Borough Council on all proposals.

87 (H)	Strongly Agree	Finish the construction of the Hart cycleway before we have more considered. This area is strongly supported by cyclists it has been like this for over 3 years	Noted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	This would be excellent for boosting rural tourism and encouraging healthier lifestyles	Noted
96 (?)	Agree	The development of the RHM site will facilitate new and enhanced public rights of way through the site to local amenities including the nature areas	Noted – better housing sites available
99 (E)	Agree	Bridge over A19 should carry cars - could be small vehicles only	Noted
100 (E)	Agree	Would people really use the above to get to local shops and community facilities - I doubt it. Good idea - but don't think it would be greatly used	Noted
102 (E)	Strongly Agree	The road from Hartlepool to Elwick is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. As a traffic calming measure and to promote recreational activities this road could be narrowed for cars, the remainder designated for cyclists and pedestrians. Footpaths in Elwick are in dire condition and need upgrading to enable wheelchairs to use them	Noted

POLICY C1 – SAFEGUARDING & IMPROVING OF PLAY AREAS, SPORTS & RECREATION FACILITIES & ALLOTMENTS

Synopsis

- Existing facilities are not adequately maintained
- Villages need financial support to do this.
- Where will these areas be located and will the land need to be purchased
- Safeguarding existing facilities must take priority, new schemes need to be better financed as with only a few properties per year being built it will take forever

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
9 (G)	Agree	Where will these areas be located and will the land need to be purchased	See policy. Most already exist, new locations to be determined.
18 (G)	Strongly Disagree	I can't find a proposal map on here so will disagree, apart from improvements to Greatham community centre. But leave our fields alone	Noted
19 (G)	Agree	Unless there is increased demand for allotments the open spaces should be cleared for alternative use	Noted. Hartlepool Borough Council has identified a demand in the borough
22 (G)	No Answer	As chair of Greatham Sports Field we feel the community would benefit from new play areas here	Noted

27 (G)	Strongly Agree	Greatham play areas is in dire need of updating to be more like Elwick's which is in keeping with a village	Policies C1 & INF1 aim to assist in ensuring village facilities are maintained/improved
28 (G)	Strongly Agree	This one isn't rocket science - buildings need to be maintained and the villages need financial support to do this. Don't wait until they are beyond repair or refuse funding based on technicalities help maintain what we already have	Noted
33 (G)	Agree	Would the improvements in Greatham include upgrading the swings and play area at the top of Hill View	Possibly
40 (G)	Strongly Agree	Village hall, the community centre requires major improvements in Greatham	Noted
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Making it available to for people from housing estates	Noted
59 (E)	No Answer	Regarding Elwick a car park for St Peters is a necessity - parking along the road is not very safe	Policy point 3
60 (E)	Agree	Considered by the PCC a few years ago when it was decided the existing arrangements were adequate except for only once or twice a years	Noted
63 (E)	Disagree	Existing facilities are not adequately maintained	Policy seeking improvement
65 (E)	No Answer	Safeguarding existing facilities must take priority, new schemes need to be better financed as with only a few properties per year being built it will take forever	Noted
66 (E)	Agree	Looking after those already in use should come first	Noted
67 (E)	No Answer	Excellent but how to fund and maintain	Various funding streams

70 (E)	Agree	I believe on of the conditions placed on the sale of the old schoolhouse at Elwick was that a car park was created	Noted
72 (E)	Agree	All will agree that this is commendable however where is the land for these facilities and who and how will they be funded	Noted – various funding streams
81 (E)	No Answer	Excellent ideas - welcome to reality	Noted
82 (E)	Strongly Disagree	I strongly disagree with a children's play area in Dalton Piercy. The current children's allotment / play area is used purely as a private garden by one allotment tenant	A well designed and located play facility in Dalton Piercy encouraged to enhance village life.
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	Pretty comprehensive	Noted
85 (E)	No Answer	We feel certain no one will disagree that these are not required, but how are they to be provided? Those landowners who are being considered for building within the villages do not own the land required for the car parks, pitches and play areas on your list. How are you going to persuade them that they can provide the solution when their land is in your proposed green gap area and unavailable for development?	Various funding streams including contributions eg. community benefits from renewable energy schemes and through grant aid will also be sought as appropriate to fund the projects proposed.
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	This policy for sport and community facilities is long overdue. Hart Village has been desperate for these facilities for decades. This would boost the entire village massively.	Noted
90 (H)	No Answer	With respect to the priority scheme allocated to Hart we would need information on location and the scope of the proposal before we could comment	Noted

96 (?)	Agree	Such facilities could also be provided on the RHM site	Noted
99 (E)	No Answer	Elwick residents should have bus to Hartlepool for use of facilities there	Opportunities to support local bus services added to policy T2 However would still seek to support facilities in villages in support of community life
102 (E)	Strongly Agree	I would like to see a community garden in Elwick rather than individual allotments. This could have an educational value as well as strengthening community bonds and healthy eating. Could enough be produced for a farmers market?	Community Garden could come forward separately, community are welcome to do this

POLICY NE1 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Synopsis

- environmental impact assessment in order to determine the effects of the development on local wildlife
- improvement of the environment over the whole rural plan area
- Ref 8.101 states 25 local sites meeting agreed criteria. Why do we need more?

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
15 (G)	Strongly Agree	The relevant legal requirements must be adhered to in this instance	Noted
19 (G)	Strongly Agree	This seems in line with some current policies	Noted
22 (G)	Strongly Agree	Not enough woodland in rural west	Noted
35 (G)	Agree	The overall aim should be the improvement of the environment over the whole rural plan area. Any compensatory measures or offsetting must be as close to the locality as possible so as to ensure improved environment locally	Noted Add to policy 1a “compensatory measures should be as close to the original site as possible”
42 (G)	Strongly Agree	Guard and develop	Noted Policy seeks to protect , manage and enhance

63 (E)	Disagree	Ref 8.101 states 25 local sites meeting agreed criteria. Why do we need more?	Policy is largely concerned with preserving existing sites but point 2 does seek to encourage enhancement and to link sites into an integrated network.
65 (E)	No Answer	Natural England, Defra and local landowners are already doing their part, but this is all time consuming and expensive so constantly needs help	Noted – plan seeks to support and encourage.
66 (E)	No Answer	Already many projects in area	Noted – plan seeks to support and encourage.
72 (E)	No Answer	Again this is not new several government publications and local policy	Noted – plan seeks to support and encourage.
78 (E)	Strongly Agree	Grass cutting along verges and green areas is far too often and in some areas soil is exposed. This will lead to erosion of the soil and cause banks and hills to collapse. The increase in sharp heavy rainfall adds to this danger	Noted – not in remit of plan, Parish Council to investigate
82 (E)	Strongly Agree	Prior to any development there should be a thorough environmental impact assessment in order to determine the effects of the development on local wildlife	Noted
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	Sadly, some farmers, particularly those who are not residential but have land in the area have removed hedges and trees to push for greater production and therefore profit. The planning system regarding their sheds - particularly near residences should be revised.	Noted Not in remit of plan to revise planning system – many agricultural buildings fall into permitted development

85 (E)	No Answer	Again, no one would disagree with these lofty ambitions but by whom and how are these sites going to be 'protected, managed and actively enhanced'? Surely that is not your job? Surely that is the job of HBC, EA, DEFRA and NE? All of these safeguards are already built into legislation.	Noted – plan seeks to support and encourage. Stakeholder indicated have been consulted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	An excellent policy that will benefit the rural area massively	Noted
96 (?)	Agree	The development of the RHM site would protect the nearby nature areas and would facilitate improvements to on site biodiversity	Noted – better housing sites available
99 (E)	Strongly Agree	What does 'relevant legal requirements' mean or permit?	Planners would know legal requirements too many to stipulate in plan

POLICY NE1 – RENEWAL & LOW CARBON ENERGY

Synopsis

- No more wind turbines
- EU policies may restrict decisions
- Government subsidise will be important in the decisions regarding renewables
- Solar panels preferable
- providing the schemes make economic sense
- This is part of the National Planning Policy Framework

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
19 (G)	Agree	There is a big but here as we still require energy and industry and we still need power stations for the future of this country	Noted
35 (G)	Agree	Consider landscape impact - mitigating measures	Noted
38 (G)	Disagree	No wind turbines - not efficient enough and are unsightly and bad impact / eyesore on land and sea. Do not give enough benefits to community. Do not generate enough output	Policy seeks to ensure renewable energy development benefits rural area without significant negative impact

52 (E)	No Answer	Noise in Elwick from the A19, particularly from the prevailing west wind still horrendous. The road surface gets higher whenever it is re-surfaced so we can now see much of the wheels of vehicles meaning noise carries easily over any hedges	Not applicable to this policy
54 (E)	Disagree	No more wind turbines please	Policy seeks to ensure renewable energy development benefits rural area without significant negative impact
60 (E)	No Answer	Coincidence? This arose with wind powered turbines. 99.9% vote against them being installed in Elwick - result political influence by London on labour council	Policy seeks to ensure renewable energy development benefits rural area without significant negative impact
62 (E)	Agree	Always providing the schemes make economic sense	Noted
63 (E)	Disagree	Government policy dictates what is installed	Rural Neighbourhood Plan can direct to where installations can be located
65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	This is an EU policy which cannot be decided by your rural plan, but now more renewables should come from the sea	Rural Neighbourhood Plan can direct to where installations can be located
66 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Not very economic those in area often not working use of water i.e. sea or rivers would be better	No sea or rivers in rural plan area
68 (E)	Agree	I would not support more wind turbines but if people want to install energy saving equipment on their roofs as these are expensive, I would support it - though it could drastically change the village	Noted

72 (E)	Agree	This is part of the National Planning Policy Framework, Department for Communities and Local Government is responsible for making sure buildings in the UK meet standards required by the EU Energy Performance of Buildings Directive. The development of schemes is also part of a National rather than local task	Noted Rural Neighbourhood Plan can direct to where installations can be located
74 (E)	No Answer	No more wind generators affecting Elwick and Hart	Plan will seek to allow only in existing clusters
84 (E)	Agree	This is a difficult one particularly with wind turbines and solar farms - however one feels that the Government attitudes towards these and the subsidies involved are changing	Noted
85 (E)	No Answer	We don't believe this is within your remit either - the HBC and national energy providers are tasked with this role, and indeed do you have the capacity to manage this? If you had suggested that they could equally be accommodated within Hartlepool town, then you would have had our support.	Rural Neighbourhood Plan can direct to where installations can be located. Government delegates to Neighbourhood and Local Plans
86 (H)	Disagree	Already have 3 wind turbines near Hart - do not want any more in area	Rural Neighbourhood Plan can direct to where installations can be located.
89 (H)	Disagree	I feel that the rural area is at capacity with renewable energy schemes. I would suggest a moratorium on further new build to protect landscape character and rural amenities	Rural Neighbourhood Plan can direct to where installations can be located.
101 (E)	Agree	No more wind turbines please	Noted – group will review numbers of medium to large scale wind turbines
102 (E)	Agree	Fracking should not take place in this area	Noted

POLICY BE1 – ENHANCEMENT OF HERITAGE ASSETS

Synopsis

- monies should be spent wisely for any enhancements where really necessary
- heritage is an undervalued asset - more detail required
- In Elwick existing dwellings and other properties have a mixture of designs, what is considered appropriate and a priority
- Why reduce traffic signs which are in place to help the safety of the villages?
- who is the final arbitrator of good taste and decides on the 'appropriately designed windows, doors, boundary features and other domestic features'?
- the villages are a huge asset to the Borough. They should be more aware of their importance and support their conservation.

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
9 (G)	No Answer	Most signs are for safety, so don't agree. Lots of 20mph signs have recently been put up are they now going to take them down?	Policy seeks to reduce unnecessary clutter
19 (G)	Agree	But some of the above are not a priority and monies should be spent wisely for any enhancements where really necessary	Noted

27 (G)	Strongly Agree	Great news for Greatham	Noted
28 (G)	Strongly Agree	Greatham in particular needs to be considered the quality of the windows and doors it uses the paint for these and other parts of its buildings owned by the Hospital of God. If better quality materials or even UPVC were used the heating costs of residents would improve and the constant replace / repair costs would reduce.	Noted Rural Neighbourhood Plan appreciate conflict but would want to enhance heritage assets
35 (G)	Agree	This needs closer consideration - heritage is an undervalued asset - more detail required	Noted
50 (E)	Strongly Agree	Roads at present are dreadful for potholes and chips flying up onto car and damaging paintwork	Noted
59 (E)	Strongly Agree	But also using common sense	Noted
61 (E)	Agree	Council must be consistent in its advice	Noted – Rural Plan is not a Hartlepool Borough Council plan
63 (E)	Disagree	In Elwick existing dwellings and other properties have a mixture of designs, so what is considered appropriate	Policy seeks to reflect positive aspects of design
64 (E)	Strongly Agree	But with common sense	Noted
65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Many of the projects named are either too expensive or not your concern, not everything has to be the same. Who decides who can have what?	Policy seeks to ensure local distinctiveness is maintained and enhanced. Rural Neighbourhood Plan Group, Hartlepool Borough Council and residents will have opportunity for input

66 (E)	Strongly Disagree	More leeway needed	Heritage assets are a valuable community asset
67 (E)	Disagree	Monies must be spent on more essential facilities in the rural areas. Spend money on cycle paths to link villages to town	Money can be directed to both – various funding streams
68 (E)	Strongly Agree	This is largely down to planning dept. to make sure that alterations are in keeping with the village. Resin bonded gravel has been proven not to work in various places in Hartlepool	Noted
70 (E)	Disagree	This sounds like a list made by someone who has come into a lot of money and have dreamt it up for no particular reason than they can. The roads are full of potholes if there is money to spend please do not waste it on resin bonded gravel. How will you encourage more appropriately designed windows and doors, bribe them, threaten them? What next, the type of plants in their garden, the clothes they wear, how late they can be out on the street	Money can be directed to both – various funding streams Conservation area policies and village design statements
72 (E)	No Answer	What does encourage mean and what is appropriate and who makes this decision? Currently the villages are an eclectic mix of buildings with many different styles of doors, windows etc. this is what makes the villages attractive and interesting. Will an expensive surface round the Elwick village green really enhance the environment? There are areas of Elwick with no footpaths, is that not more beneficial. Will the Hospital of God give financial support to fund improvements? Will the diocese fund the area around the church? Why reduce traffic signs which are in place to help the safety of the villages?	Planning, Hartlepool Borough Council and community make decisions. This policy seeks to protect heritage assets other policies seek to address other points. Various funding streams Policy seeks to reduce unnecessary clutter

81 (E)	Disagree	Some of the road network around Hartlepool is no better than farm tracks - full of potholes no edging etc. In fact part of Worset Lane has been repaired using dolomite / gravel directly from the quarry	Noted
82 (E)	Strongly Agree	Dalton Piercy should be made a conservation area, it has more listed buildings than Elwick and has already been adversely affected by inappropriate development	Rural Plan does not seek to designate whole village as a conservation area. While recognising the value of the listed buildings there is much modern infill.
83 (E)	Agree	Footpaths	Noted
84 (E)	Strongly Agree	If only the Borough Councillors knew it, the villages are a huge asset to the Borough. They should be more aware of their importance and support their conservation.	Noted
85 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Where to begin? At one end of (one of) the villages you may consider the development of affordable housing - but may choose to locate it 'within the parish' - and at the personal cost of an indulgent landowner, and at the other end you have effectively increased the personal costs of everyone who is fortunate enough to live in a conservation area, whilst simultaneously re/devaluing their properties. Who is going to want to buy into ' environmental enhancement' when it is at their cost? Will this be a one off cost or will you charge an annual levy? And who is the person who is the final arbitrator of good taste and decides on the 'appropriately designed windows, doors, boundary features and other domestic features'? And what will happen to these owners of properties in the conservation area if they don't like your choice?	Affordable housing comment unclear No evidence conservation area devalues a property Rural Neighbourhood Plan Group would welcome clarification of comments
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	A good thorough policy	Noted

POLICY INF1 – INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES

Synopsis

- Interesting ideas as to how developers can support rural life
- Developers will struggle to be able to provide new facilities if nowhere to build houses and make the necessary profit
- General feeling that it is important to support present facilities through Developer contribution
- Grant funding

Respondent No & Village:	Response:	Comment:	Group Response:
2 (DP)	Agree	Though quite how there will be any developer contributions in Dalton Piercy when no developments being allowed	Infill may be allowed and rural businesses. See 8.128 & 8.130 for number of funding sources (contributions from developers may also come from neighbouring parishes and urban extensions).
3 (DP)	Agree	This should include technology infrastructure. Fibre optic connectivity for villages including Dalton Piercy	Broadband for Dalton Piercy to be added
4 (DP)	Strongly Agree	A play area for Dalton Piercy would be particularly welcome	Noted
8 (DP)	Strongly Agree	Improvement to roadway over bridge by re-routing natural stream should be considered	Noted – Rural Neighbourhood Plan Group to encourage Parish Council to investigate

9 (G)	No Answer	If there's not many houses being built then not a lot of contributions though some good ideas	See 8.128 & 8.130 for number of funding sources
19 (G)	Agree	Grant funding will be required for many of the developments, I have no doubt	Noted
35 (G)	Strongly Agree	Village facilities have been overlooked for too long	Noted
39 (G)	Strongly Agree	Greatham's community centre needs all the help it can get to upgrade and repair the important village facility	Noted
50 (E)	Agree	Do not let village shop die. Improve road surfaces / pavement surfaces. Do not build properties and devalue village	Noted
60 (E)	Agree	I agree that funding should be outside ratepayers funding but a full circle now that low cost development will not produce the funds required with the result developers will get their planning permission and sometime in the unforeseeable the improvements will be done	Noted
61 (E)	Agree	These contributions should also go towards the cycleways from Elwick to town	Noted
63 (E)	Disagree	Why do we pay such high council taxes? If developers are to provide these facilities	Not only developers – various funding streams available. See 8.128 & 8.130
65 (E)	Strongly Disagree	Developers will need to be able to build more properties before 2020 if they are expected to fund all of these	Not only developers – various funding streams available. See 8.128 & 8.130

66 (E)	Disagree	More houses and businesses needed sooner than later to help fund these	Not only developers – various funding streams available. See 8.128 & 8.130
68 (E)	Strongly Agree	There will have to be a heck of a lot of development to cover the costs of the items listed. Contributions do not come out of profits, they are added on to the original cost	Not only developers – various funding streams available. See 8.128 & 8.130
72 (E)	No Answer	These proposals are all excellent and I am sure that developers would agree however with the green gap covering many acres of land and the proposal of so few houses the amount of funding from the builders will be nowhere near the amount required to fulfil the community infrastructure.	Not only developers – various funding streams available. See 8.128 & 8.130
82 (E)	Strongly Agree	Dalton Piercy Parish Council has wasted thousands of pounds. Local taxpayers should not be subsidising the village hall or play areas. There is no need for play areas - the current kids allotment / play area is not used	Facilities identified as desirable in consultation process
85 (E)	No Answer	The 106 agreements with those house builders who are to be permitted to build within the village envelopes (we feel sure) will willingly contribute to this list.	Noted
89 (H)	Strongly Agree	Excellent list of suggested facilities	Noted
96 (?)	Agree	In accordance with adopted policy, the development of the RHM site for housing would deliver significant financial contributions that could help deliver the community benefits referenced above	Noted - better housing sites available

99 (E)	Agree	<p>Unfair allocation to Elwick. The road behind green could be widened - delivery vehicles need to get to pubs and shop.</p> <p>Council must keep road drains clear - weekly clean out to prevent further flooding - especially drain opposite school. Please instruct staff not to blow leaves into gutters. Also periodic clearing of branches falling into beck running under North Lane</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Not remit of plan</p>
--------	-------	---	---------------------------------------

GENERAL COMMENTS

Respondent No & Village:	Comment:	Group Response:
85 (E)	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed Rural Plan. Your colleagues may recall we wrote on a number of occasions during 2013 about the Rural Plan and received in reply a very unhelpful response from your then Chair.</p> <p>We are extremely disappointed that we have to write to your organisation again, on this occasion drawing your attention to our major concerns about Green Gaps, the process (again) and your organisation.</p> <p>Green Gaps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please remove all our property from your Green Gap - that is Naisberry Farm and Lambs House Farm. You have included our property in your Green Gap area without any consultation with us whatsoever. We have owned these properties for 99 years and 52 years respectively. It is not in the ownership of Hartlepool Borough Council, Elwick, Hart or Dalton Piercy Parish Councils. It is privately owned by my family and will continue to be so. 2. Your proposed Green Gap appears to cover thousands of acres. Have you consulted with any of the owners of these properties? How are you able to go out to consultation on an area without consulting directly with those affected before you go public? Defra's guidance suggests you consult directly with landowners in advance of this process. 	<p>Green Gaps, these are a response to concerns widely expressed during earlier consultations of the danger of villages losing their identity and the strong distinct communities which so many value. The Green Gaps are part of the consultation which has gone out to all within the Rural Plan area including landowners. As with all the policies that regarding Green Gaps will be revisited in the light of all responses received.</p>

	<p>3. As the Parish Council's are aware, areas of your proposed Green Gap are already subject to outline permission and/or full planning permission with the Hartlepool Borough Council and it appears the Highways Agency is already testing land for a proposed bypass of Elwick. Some of these applications are over one year old; why produce a map that is clearly out-of-date as well as misleading?</p> <p>4. As we informed you in 2013, we manage our property within Defra, Environment Agency, Natural England and EU Guidelines; our land looks wonderful because we take pride in our work; but it is a business. How many businesses in the UK could run, at a profit, if a group of well meaning but unqualified individuals took it upon themselves to dictate the future shape of that business, in addition to any Local Authority and Statutory regulations?</p> <p>5. Our land is not SSSI, National Park, RAMSAR, AONB, ESA, NNR/LNR or Country Park; we are not in a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. We will protect our own property for our future generations.</p> <p>The Consultation Process</p> <p>1. We received no map with the consultation papers – one was sent to us via our Land Agent and yes, we are taking legal advice. We are unable to download the map on the website.</p> <p>2. Despite the fact that we have farmed here for 99 years this</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Planning Group are aware of major planning applications on the urban fringe. Green Gaps will be adjusted if required. The Rural Neighbourhood Plan is being supported by Hartlepool Borough Council</p> <p>Highways Agency, DEFRA, the Environment Agency and Natural England have also been contacted as part of the consultation process. Their responses will help shape the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>It is regretted you had difficulty accessing the map on the website. One other complaint of this kind was received and a map provided. Maps were available at the consultation events and at various locations in the rural area. Had you been unable to access these some other arrangement would have been made but we are pleased you obtained a map.</p> <p>No slight was intended in addressing the</p>
--	--	---

	<p>consultation was delivered to ‘the Occupier’. Who is providing the research for this? How can this be locally led, when one of the main landowners affected by it is not shown any courtesy?</p> <p>3. Again, as asked in 2013 – and to which we received no answer - why are only the ‘rural areas’ being included in this consultation – surely this is of relevance to the whole of Hartlepool as it effectively informs the whole of Hartlepool where they may and may not live and work for the next 20 years?</p> <p>4. Results of the previous consultations appear to be unavailable. There are no statistics, graphs, pie charts or quotes. Despite that fact that you offered public money to those who participated in earlier consultations (unknown in public planning consultations), no information appears on your website as to the responses to each question posed.</p> <p>5. As a consequence how can anyone know on what basis you are promoting this? Where is the public evidence that there is any requirement at all for a Rural Plan? How robust is your analysis?</p>	<p>correspondence to ‘the occupier’. To have individually addressed all the consultation letters would have been a very time consuming task for the volunteers involved. Within the villages envelopes were hand delivered and not addressed at all. The plan is being led by the Parish Councils in the rural area.</p> <p>The nature of Neighbourhood Planning is that it should represent those within the area it seeks to provide a plan for. To do this the rural area must be the focus of the consultation process. We have however consulted numerous national and local stakeholders including neighbouring authorities, adjacent residents associations and other local interest groups. Throughout the process we are being guided by Hartlepool Borough Council, Planning Aid England and other professionals.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This will be tested as part of the Neighbourhood Plan Process</p>
--	---	---

	<p>6. Where was the question in the previous consultations about a Green Gap? Where is the evidence that this Green Gap is required? How can you decide if the whole of Hartlepool wants this when the inclusion of it amounts to stealth? To all intents and purposes it has simply appeared.</p> <p>Rural Plan Working Party Composition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who are you? There are no details of the membership to be found. Please assure us that the 22 members required properly reflect the mix of business owners, residents and landowners, who must all live and work within the proposed Rural Plan boundaries, as required by legislation, and that it does not consist of Officers from either Public Authorities or associated quangos. There is a good reason for establishing this – the public of Hartlepool must know that you are not solely exercising powers in a way which is primarily for your own benefit and that you are truly representative of the area. 2. As far as I am aware you have no statutory responsibilities, if you do, please direct me to the appropriate information. Which then leads to the question of accountability; who is assessing your use of public monies to establish the progress you have made? How are you justifying your use of public money with no figures available underlining the decisions made so far? 3. We understand you will expect the Hartlepool Borough Council to adopt this plan. We would advise caution to those Councillors and Officers at the Hartlepool Borough Council 	<p>Green Gaps, these are a response to concerns widely expressed during earlier consultations of the danger of villages losing their identity and the strong distinct communities which so many value. The Green Gaps are part of the consultation which has gone out to all within the Rural Plan area including landowners. As with all the policies that regarding Green Gaps will be revisited in the light of all responses received.</p> <p>The Localism Act 2011 which facilitates the production of neighbourhood plans provides for these to be produced by Parish Councils. Parish Councils are statutory local authorities with duly elected councillors. In the case of the Hartlepool Rural Plan a group of parish councils have come together to produce a single plan. The requirement for a minimum 21 members relates to neighbourhood plans being produced in areas without Parish Councils where Neighbourhood Forums can be formed to guide the process.</p> <p>Hartlepool Borough Council is fully engaged in the production of neighbourhood plans in its area of which the Rural Plan is one. The</p>
--	--	--

	<p>who would be required to manage this, as we believe the process has been unsound from the beginning and will be challenged.</p> <p>Before I close I would like to say that planning must be more than simply defending the existing heritage and village envelopes, it must deal with demands arising from population change and growth. The planning of a neighbourhood must have regard to future potential needs rather than just the preferences of existing residents. How do you expect Hartlepool Borough Council to satisfy the housing and business needs within Hartlepool Borough over the next 20 years? How are we to attract new businesses to recruit and employ local people? Or are we simply to remain as we are? If the Rural Plan in its present form comes to pass in Hartlepool, the social inequality in Hartlepool will simply increase at the expense of us all.</p> <p>We look forward to a considered reply to each of our questions raised, and the removal of our property from ‘your’ plan.</p> <p>Second Letter 85(E)</p> <p>Before we begin to comment on individual policies we would like to make a few additional comments here.</p> <p>Some of these proposed policies are clearly within your interests to manage – for example the spending of 106 funds in the villages sourced from building homes within the villages -others on this ambitious list are beyond your control. There are areas within your proposed rural plan will cause inequalities for years to come. You are planning on deciding the appearance of individual’s private homes</p>	<p>Borough Council have been part of the process from the very inception. The Rural Plan area was designated in 2012 following the process laid down in the Localism Act and with guidance from Hartlepool Borough Council.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Your property cannot be removed from the plan area not least because it is clearly an integral part of the rural area in question.</p> <p>Noted. Uses of 106 funds are of interest to the communities involved. It is the nature of the planning process to address the points you make – the Neighbourhood Plan attempts to bring those decisions closer to the communities involved</p>
--	---	---

	<p>and the future direction of every farm business within the proposed green gap – we believe it is completely inappropriate for you to do so.</p> <p>We believe you are making grave errors – you must have a plan that is manageable, within your capabilities and flexible, that can react to changing circumstances, and because you cannot see into the future, you cannot commit the next generation to meet your rural-proofed approach to progress.</p> <p>Any new business tempted here by HBC will find they are unwelcome within the proposed rural plan area as there is no in-built flexibility; no new roads, no new homes to be encouraged except within the villages, and any monies raised via 106 agreements will be spent only within the villages.</p> <p>There will be no opportunity to attract grant funding by the HBC to support any project within the proposed rural plan green gap area in addition to those businesses already here. You are committing us all to be 20 years behind the rest of the Tees Valley.</p> <p>There is no welcome here, only requirements to build expensive homes (albeit to the latest requirements), some via complicated gifts from landowners, in the villages. Hartlepool as a whole will be bypassed, not by a road (as there are none envisaged) but because of an inflexible approach to progress.</p> <p>The proposed green gaps will effectively see off any possible investment in our rural businesses, there will be no opportunity to attract grant monies or any financial investment to them. Surely that is not your aim.</p> <p>Have you imagined a scenario where a large employer is tempted here by HBC? Where will the business be accommodated, will they expect to train and employ local people? Would they play a part in developing the road infrastructure, secure the future of the FE College, expect their workforce to live in the locality? As soon as they understand your requirement to re-strict house building and by</p>	<p>Noted – the group will do its best to represent the best interests of all within the designated neighbourhood area.</p> <p>The group believes HBC will ensure allocation of sufficient employment land within the Borough. The neighbourhood plan seeks support the future vitality of the rural area including supportive new businesses.</p> <p>Our vision for the Rural Area of Hartlepool for the next 15 years is: “To maintain and enhance the quality of life for all sections of the community and vibrancy of the villages, ensuring that the area retains its rural character and historic and environmental assets, maintains the links between all of its small settlements, adjoining parishes and the urban area of Hartlepool, and develops in such a way as to meet the present and future needs of the rural community”.</p> <p>Noted – sure HBC will address as part of the Local Plan the neighbourhood plan</p> <p>Neighbourhood planning provides a means for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their</p>
--	--	--

	<p>extension business building, they will disappear. There will be no opportunity to draw down government funding to support a move to this Borough.</p> <p>You must be a part of change – a positive, exciting future, not the rural proofing of existing HBC requirements, not added layers of ‘what cannot be done’.</p> <p>Further, we believe business/financiers seeking to invest across the country will study the rural plans drafted and in place, in the areas they shortlist. They will look at them to see if it is a forward looking plan, ready to embrace change and demonstrating a willingness to meet and shape a local healthy community. We don’t believe the proposed rural plan for Hartlepool does that. We believe you are missing a major opportunity to play a positive role in promoting Hartlepool as a place to live and work nationally.</p> <p>Why not try to encourage small businesses and people to locate here, why not try to influence positive change and progress, supporting existing businesses, and breathing life into these village communities instead of dictating what is not possible, what is ‘not permitted’ with no method or mandate to fund, manage or police? What legacy do you want to leave?</p> <p>Once again, remove our property from your proposed green gap.</p>	<p>community where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. This is what the Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan Group is trying to do and part of that is promoting the rural area itself as a valued place to live and work and part of the tapestry that makes Hartlepool as a whole and attractive place to live and work.</p> <p>The plan does seek to encourage business and homes within the rural area in a way that does not destroy that which might attract them in the first place.</p> <p>To maintain and enhance the quality of life for all sections of the community and vibrancy of the villages, ensuring that the area retains its rural character and historic and environmental assets, maintains the links between all of its small settlements, adjoining parishes and the urban area of Hartlepool, and develops in such a way as to meet the present and future needs of the rural community”.</p> <p>The green gaps will be reviewed in light of all responses to this consultation</p>
--	---	--

105 (E)	Regarding the green gap policy, we at North Farm, Elwick have not been consulted about our land being included in your future Rural Plan. We have been at farm for over 70 years and it is owned by our family. We are not a National Park but a viable business run without your assistance under guidelines laid down by DEFRA, Natural England and E.U. policy. We request consultation to remove/negotiate North Farm, Elwick from the green gap.	North Farm was included in the consultation process – hand delivered in Elwick and events advertised widely. DEFRA and Natural England have been contacted as part of the consultation process. Their responses will help shape the neighbourhood plan. The green gaps will be reviewed in light of all responses to this consultation
---------	---	--