

CABINET ITEM COVERING SHEET PROFORMA

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO CABINET

4 JANUARY 2007

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

CABINET DECISION/COUNCIL DECISION

Regeneration and Transport – Lead Cabinet Member – Councillor Cook

SPD4: THE CONSERVATION AREAS AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FOLDER SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

1. Summary

This report presents to Members the “Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder” (available in Member’s Library) that will inform and add value to the existing policies set out in the Adopted Local Plan. The Borough’s rich history of the built environment is brought together for the first time here in this draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder. Whilst the Folder is aimed at the development industry for use in preparing planning applications, it is hoped that it will also be used as a point of reference for local people to understand where their towns and villages have come from. As Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder will sit within the Council’s Local Development Framework. The Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder (CaHEF) has undergone a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) also to be endorsed and Adopted, and published as part of the main SPD.

2. Recommendations

Recommendation to Cabinet: -

Consider and approve the content of the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder so that it may be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and become a material planning consideration in determining planning applications.

3. Reasons for the Recommendations/Decision(s)

The Borough’s rich history of the built environment is brought together for the first time here in this “Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder”. The Folder is divided into sections covering all aspects of historic sites, buildings and monuments in the area, and seeks to simplify the legislation surrounding them, the role they play within the Borough, and what may be done to maintain them for future generations to enjoy.

It is a requirement of Planning Policy Guidance note 15: "Planning and the Historic Environment", Sept 1994 (PPG15) that Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans are prepared, and this coupled with the fact that the existing advice leaflets are in need of updating, has led to this comprehensive document being prepared.

Having undergone full public consultation, the revised SPD has been prepared and is put before Cabinet for approval and subsequent Adoption for use in determining planning applications.

4. Members Interests

Members (including co-opted members with voting rights) should consider whether they have a personal interest in the item as defined in the Council's code of conduct (paragraph 8) and, if so, declare the existence and nature of that interest in accordance with paragraph 9 of the code.

Where a Member regards him/herself as having a personal interest in the item, he/she must then consider whether that interest is one which a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest (paragraph 10 of the code of conduct).

A Member with a prejudicial interest in any matter must withdraw from the room where the meeting is being held, whilst the matter is being considered; not exercise executive functions in relation to the matter and not seek improperly to influence the decision about the matter (paragraph 12 of the Code).

Further to the above, it should be noted that any Member attending a meeting of Cabinet, Select Committee etc.; whether or not they are a member of the Cabinet or Select Committee concerned, must declare any personal interest which they have in the business being considered at the meeting, and if their interest is prejudicial, they must also leave the meeting room during consideration of the relevant item.

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO CABINET

4 JANUARY 2007

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

CABINET DECISION/COUNCIL DECISION

**SPD4: THE CONSERVATION AREAS AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FOLDER SUPPLEMENTARY
PLANNING DOCUMENT**

1. Summary

This report presents to Members the “Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder” (available in Member’s Library) that will inform and add value to the existing policies set out in the Adopted Local Plan. The Borough’s rich history of the built environment is brought together for the first time here in this draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder. Whilst the Folder is aimed at the development industry for use in preparing planning applications, it is hoped that it will also be used as a point of reference for local people to understand where their towns and villages have come from. As Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder will sit within the Council’s Local Development Framework. The Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder (CaHEF) has undergone a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) also to be endorsed and Adopted, and published as part of the main SPD

2. Recommendations

Recommendation to Cabinet: -

Consider and approve the content of the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder so that it may be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and become a material planning consideration in determining planning applications.

DETAIL

Background

3. Members will note the “Draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder” Cabinet Item of 20 April 2006 (Minute Number 41). It is a requirement of Planning Policy Guidance note 15: “Planning and the Historic Environment”, Sept 1994 (PPG15) that Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans are prepared, and this coupled with the fact that the existing advice leaflets are in need of updating, has led to this comprehensive document being prepared.
4. The Draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder is intended to complement and enhance legislative protection and policy requirements set out in the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local

Plan (1997), and any Planning Policy Guidance and other legislation relating to the historic environment. It is aimed at the development industry for use in preparing planning applications and it is hoped that it will also be used as a point of reference for local people to understand where their towns and villages have come from, and perhaps where they are going.

5. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework. This Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder will therefore be given "substantial weight" as a material consideration for the purposes of decision-making. This weight would be attached because the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder has been given consideration in a democratic process of consultation and subsequent Member approval. However, where there are material circumstances, it may be set aside.
6. The Folder is divided into sections covering all aspects of historic sites, buildings and monuments in the area, and seeks to simplify the legislation surrounding them, the role they play within the Borough, and what may be done to maintain them for future generations to enjoy.

CONSERVATION AREAS AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FOLDER

7. The draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder and associated draft Sustainability Appraisal were published for a six week consultation period which ended on 3 July 2006. A number of comments were received from interested parties, and these have been duly considered and used to inform the preparation of the final version of the SPD and SA. Attached at **Appendix 1** is a "Consultation Statement" setting out the Council's consultation steps, together with a schedule of responses received to both the CaHEF document and also to the SA document, presented with the Council's responses. This schedule forms part of the SPD. Given the size of the SPD document, it is considered uneconomical to include all of the document as an appendix to this report, and so Members wishing to read the revised final draft of the CaHEF will find copies in the Members' Library, Planning Reception, or from Fiona Short (contact details below).
8. Having considered the responses received, some minor amendments have been made, however there are just two significant changes proposed to the CaHEF content:
 - a. the proposed 'blanket' application of Article 4 Directions which remove certain Permitted Development Rights from buildings in Conservation Areas. English Heritage suggest a cautious approach and advocate further consultation before applying additional controls on households in the form of Article 4 Directions. It is considered that this is a sensible response, and so the Management Plan has been amended to undertake further consultation regarding this issue, as opposed to simply applying the controls.
 - b. The intention was originally to prepare 4 smaller "folders", however it has proven from the consultation process that a single folder made up of individual documents is preferred, and therefore the CaHEF will be published in such a format.

Future Steps

9. Having undertaken a 6-week consultation period and considered the responses with reasons for accepting or rejecting them given, there is no right of appeal to its content or to have it tested via an Independent Examination, although the underlying principles of 'soundness' still apply. Upon adoption, a statement of consultation must be prepared setting out a summary of the main issues raised in the representations and how these main issues have been addressed. This is included in the SPD and in **Appendix 1** of this report.
10. Following Cabinet endorsement, the CaHEF and SA will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and published for use in determining planning applications.

11. The proposed Local List has received a number of nominations in Eaglescliffe, but few in other areas. It is felt that additional time should be given to allow further nominations for this list, and then the process set out in the document for Adopting the list can be followed. A report will be made to Planning Committee and Cabinet for approval in due course.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

12. N/A

COMMUNITY STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

13. Within the Stockton Community Plan, the following specific actions are identified which are germane to the preparation of the draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder: -
- Involving the Community in local land use planning
 - Improve the quality of the built environment.

CONSULTATION INCLUDING WARD COUNCILLORS

14. English Heritage and Tees Archaeology were involved in the preparation of the draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder. Full consultation for 6 weeks took place from 22 May to 3 July 2006. A full consultation statement is included at **Appendix 1** to this report.

RISK ANALYSIS

15. It is considered that there is no significant risk associated with the adoption of the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder as upon adoption it cannot be challenged through the planning process, although a legal challenge is possible within three months of Adoption.
16. Conversely, if the Council does not adopt the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder, it may weaken in its stance in refusing any inappropriate planning applications.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services.

Contact Officer : Andy McMillan/Fiona Short

Telephone No. : 01642 – 506056 / 526721

E-mail address : andrew.mcmillan@stockton.gov.uk / fiona.short@stockton.gov.uk

Background Papers

Stockton on Tees Local Plan, Planning Policy Guidance note 15, Planning Committee minutes of 19 April 2006 (Minute Number 82), Cabinet minutes of 20 April 2006 (Minute Number 41), Council Decision minutes 3 May 2006 (Minute Number 59), Planning Committee minutes of 15 November 2006.

Education Related Item?

NO

Ward(s) and Ward Councillors:

ALL

List of Annexes

Appendix 1: Schedule of representations and Council Responses, and Statement of consultation.

Note: Main Documents are held in the Members' Library (Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder Document and Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder Supplementary Planning Document)

Appendix 1: Conservation and Historic Environment Folder Consultation representations and Council responses

Representation	Council Response
<p>Michelle Robinson, Development Plans Officer, Stockton Borough Council</p>	
<p>I have spoken to Mary Edwards at GONE to discuss the emerging Conservation and Historic Environment SPD and the fact that part of the SPD (i.e. local list) does not have an adopted policy. I also mentioned whether we can attach a draft SPD to an emerging RSS policy (in this instance Policy 34g) given that this will be part of the LDF although PPS12 does say "expand policies in development plan document."</p> <p>Mary has given us an "unofficial ok" to pursuing the whole document as SPD providing that the local list will only be a small part of the SPD, may be a requirement of adopted RSS in due course and we set out our intention to pursue local lists through the Environment DPD.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder can be Adopted as SPD, and that the Local List is soundly based on the emerging RSS Policy.</p> <p>At the time of writing, the RSS Panel Report has been published, and it proposes to maintain the Policy with only minor amendments. Therefore, the Council is confident that the Local List will remain part of the RSS. The Council will also develop a Local Policy in the Environment DPD to give greater weight to the List.</p>
<p>Mrs N. Farish n.farish@btinternet.com</p>	
<p>I would like to comment on some parts of the report. It states that Eaglescliffe is a desirable place to live. This is because, as the report states, the area layout is rare- unique to Stockton Borough. It has pleasant surroundings created by the buildings, spaces, trees, historic street patterns and historic relevance. If this has been stated in the report then how can it be refused a conservation status if it is rare and has historic street patterns and historic relevance?</p>	<p>Eaglescliffe has not been refused Conservation Area status. The most 'special' areas have been included in the boundaries of the Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area. It is acknowledged in the Appraisal that the remainder of Eaglescliffe is attractive and desirable, but is not 'special', and detailed analysis of the area in the boundary review sets out the justification for maintaining the current boundary. When the Conservation Area was proposed, it was described as 'borderline at best', and as there have been no significant improvements, it must be assumed that this is still the case. Nowhere is it proposed to delete the Conservation Area, but to monitor its progress and work with developers and residents to effect positive change.</p> <p>Insert text: <i>"It is hoped that the production of this Conservation and Historic Environment Folder will serve to give advice to prospective developers and create a common agreement for the preservation and enhancement of this area."</i></p>

The report mentions in several areas that there have been unsympathetic alterations. Station Road has not been looked after over the years and looks out of place. May I comment that these unsympathetic alterations have been approved by the council and many have been approved since the Conservation Status was given including agreement from the conservation officer. This is not the fault of the majority of residents who are trying to keep the very surroundings that the report has stated.

The report also mentions a maintenance plan which includes changing the shop colours on Station Road to a more sympathetic colour and work on the Station. I think this is an excellent idea. It seems sensible to work with what we have and improve it rather than take it away and let it deteriorate. Why then remove the conservation status when something can be done about preserving the very nature of the area?

I believe the Conservation Area should be looked at as a whole not just a part of Eaglescliffe. It is a historic area with the original Stockton to Darlington railway line running through it. It is the area that should be preserved.

Moorhouse Lane houses were built for workers who had contracted TB. This is the Stockton end of Eaglescliffe. The church has mouseman carvings, was originally built as a church hall as a church plant from St Peters, Stockton to cater for the new railway and the business that it brought- and their workers.

The school still has many original features. We have Preston Hall, Quarry Farm, Some of the houses on Teesbank were lived in by well known merchants.

Ashville Avenue is a fine example of a Victorian leafy street. The Avenue has many fine houses. Going down to the Yarm end of Eaglescliffe are again many fine houses. The Victorian Terrace opposite the golf course used to be the club house. We have the cenotaph, the railway, apparently the ticket office used to be

It is acknowledged that some recent developments have been carried out with the Council's approval, however there are many more that do not require any form of planning consent and together they collectively harm the Conservation Area. The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is designed to encourage sympathetic development so that the Conservation Area retains its best assets, and over time any unsympathetic work can be removed and replaced. The Council is eager to work with developers and local residents and business owners to achieve the best for the area.

Insert text: *"The responsibility for making improvements lies with the cooperation between residents, businesses, developers and the Council."*

Support for the management plan welcome. The issue of de-allocating the Conservation Area status is dealt with above.

The Conservation Area is a particular part of Eaglescliffe that is recognised as something special. There are inevitably other parts that are pleasant, have historic interest or both. It is not possible to make everywhere a Conservation Area. Nevertheless, the surrounding parts do have a part to play, and each Conservation Area appraisal sets out some of the history, surrounding development and other information explaining these, as appropriate. The Conservation Area should not be considered in isolation, but the part inside the boundary is considered the best of the area.

Additional information is most welcome. As above, the importance of the Conservation Area setting will be increased in the document, and where appropriate the information submitted will be used. However, the Conservation Area Appraisal sets out clearly the reasoning for the

at the top of the ramp! Railway Terrace were the first houses. The houses at Pinewood and Myrtle were built to house the workers. There is historic significance to Elmwood and Beechwood too. Not forgetting The Vicarage which was built in 1932 (on the cow byre of Quarry Farm, the church was to be built next to it) and has had a vicar in since it was built. We are also part of the Teesdale way which runs past The Vicarage and Quarry Farm. All this I believe makes for looking at Eaglescliffe not just in part a conservation area but as a whole giving an insight to an area that was set up to meet the needs of a variety of peoples, from the workers to the gentry, the church, the school, the P and E club, the golf course and the station are all integral to the history of The Stockton to Darlington Railway.

I sincerely hope that consideration will be given to this request as we have more and more developments which are causing unsympathetic designs in our area. We need to preserve our character.

boundary, and the justification for retaining the existing line. There will inevitably be other features or properties outside the boundary that could warrant inclusion, but it is not always practical to do so. Nevertheless, the inclusion of more detail such as that suggested will serve to raise awareness of the settlement pattern and character of the wider Eaglescliffe area.

Insert text: *“There is much history associated with Eaglescliffe and the wider area is all an important part of a settlement that grew quickly out of nothing because of the railway. Some notable buildings are present such as the Preston and Eaglescliffe Club and its impressive ballroom, and the houses on Moorhouse Lane to the north supposedly built to house railway workers who contracted Tuberculosis. Eaglescliffe with Preston has a rich and varied surroundings that help to support the character and appearance of the central part that is the Conservation Area.”*

The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is intended to give more guidance for developers to ensure that new developments are sympathetic to the historic areas. The preservation of Eaglescliffe With Preston and indeed all of the Borough’s Conservation Areas’ character is the primary goal of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder. The role and responsibility of Conservation Areas, together with the aspirations is set out in the generic Conservation Area chapter.

The Theatres Trust
Rose Freeman, 22 Charing Cross Road, London WC2H 0QL
Tel: 020 7836 8591
Fax: 020 7836 3302
rose.freeman@theatrestrust.org.uk

The Theatres Trust is an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body and a Statutory Consultee on planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre and was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 *'to promote the better protection of theatres'*. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies.

<p>We are pleased that the consultation document highlights the importance of Stockton's built heritage and we support conservation policy EN25 and the general content of Chapter 6a. We would strongly advise against setting policy that creates disharmony in the built environment, and whilst applauding the use of new design, this should be sympathetic to the surrounding architecture as stated in the sentence <i>New buildings should look new but not out of place</i>. We recommend the recent publication <i>Heritage Works</i>, a developers' tool kit published by English Heritage, which provides guidance on how new design can be integrated with heritage assets.</p> <p>We commend the Medium Term Aim within Conservation Area 8 Stockton Town Centre to develop and market Green Dragon Yard as a Stockton's Cultural Quarter, and are pleased to see that <i>The Globe Theatre</i> is within the Stockton Town Centre Conservation Area.</p> <p>We note the section on Shop Fronts and Signage in the Stockton Town Centre and would advise against any restrictive generic signage policies related to theatres within the SPD as they can stop a theatre from advertising itself on the streetscape and can have a significant impact on a theatre's economic viability. A special case could be made for public and landmark buildings where it may be more appropriate to allow more specialised signage.</p>	<p>Support for the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder most welcome. Theatres Trust contact details included in the Useful Contacts section</p> <p>Support welcome</p> <p>The guidance on shop fronts is developed further in the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 1: Shop Front Design. The theatre's signage must be in accordance with the principles of appropriate and sympathetic design, but it is not the Council's intention to be unduly restrictive. Each application will be judged on its merits at the time of application. Reference to SP1 included in text.</p>
<p>Egglecliffe Parish Council, Helen Rennison egglescliffepc@btconnect.com</p>	
<p>EGGLESCLIFFE CONSERVATION AREA:</p> <p>a) General Overview - Egglecliffe was established long before the 17th Century</p> <p>b) The Pill Box needs to be specified as Type FW3/23 built in 1940/41. Northern Command: 59 Division. Reserve Stop Line from Malton to Northern Divisional Boundary</p> <p>c) Development Opportunity sites - It is the Old Hall in the background of the photo which is listed - not the barns</p>	<p>Typographical error, the report should read the 11th Century, as the settlement was mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p><i>Additional detail on the Pill box welcome.</i></p> <p>Partially agree – the Hall is the Listed structure, but according to the Legislation, anything attached to it or within its curtilage is also Listed</p>

<p>d) Cleveland Bay public house should have been mentioned also Layfield House on Urlay Nook Road</p> <p>e) The coal drops - this needs updating following the removal of some of these for development</p>	<p>It is not necessary to name every building in the Appraisal</p> <p>Agreed, although the draft Conservation and Historic Environment Folder was published before these changes, the coal drops have altered significantly in recent weeks and this should be noted in the report. Text added: <i>“Summer 2006, work was necessary to remove and stabilise various parts of the Coal Drops as they were found to be in a very poor state of repair.”</i></p>
<p>Tees Archaeology Peter Rowe, Sites and Monuments Officer Tees Archaeology, Sir William Gray House, Clarence Road Hartlepool, TS24 8BT Direct Dial: 01429 523458 Fax: 01429 523477 website: www.teesarchaeology.com</p>	
<p>Thank you for the draft copy of this impressive document.</p> <p>I have a couple of minor points to raise which I set out below: -</p> <p>P. 17 - The Historic Environment Record is referred to as the 'Heritage Environment Record'.</p> <p>Scheduled Monuments Section - The term 'Ancient' has now been dropped to reflect the more modern structures such as World War I defences that are now Scheduled.</p> <p>P. 25 - Countryside Stewardship is now known as Environmental Stewardship and is ran by DEFRA rather than the defunct MAFF.</p> <p>Images of Scheduled Monuments - I am sure we can provide some better mages of the Roundhill and Newsham sites for you.</p> <p>As this is such a major piece of work I have to confess that I have been unable to give each chapter the attention I would be able to give were they published as</p>	<p>Agreed, report amended.</p> <p>Agreed, text amended to reflect this. Add: <i>“As such, the word “ancient” has been dropped.”</i></p> <p>Agreed, report amended</p> <p>Support welcome</p> <p>Support welcome</p>

separate reports. However I have read the document thoroughly and did not find anything objectionable within the content.

Colin Blackburn
Planning manager
The North East Assembly
0191 261 3921

colin.blackburn@northeastassembly.gov.uk

The Draft Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPD was discussed at the Assembly's Development Board on 28 June. The Assembly welcomes the production of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder. RPG1 and RSS encourage the production of Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPDs and other types of related work at the local level. The principles outlined within the SPD are what would be expected as a consequence of the Policy frameworks outlined in RPG1 and the emerging RSS.

The publication of the Draft Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPD is welcomed, and its publication is in accordance with the Borough Council's timetable in the LDS.

The SPD is a comprehensive document covering historic sites, buildings and monuments in the Borough. The Draft SPD sets out how the content of the document relates to Policy 34 (Historic Environment) of the emerging RSS and to policies in the existing Local Plan.

There are some areas of the SPD that are not supported by Policies in the Local Plan or the emerging LDF. The Assembly would support the production of policies that relate to these areas in the forthcoming LDF.

The SPD sets out the key characteristics of the area and the key principles that will protect and enhance it. The key local planning policies that will facilitate this approach are also identified. Many of the issues are of local detail and local importance and it would not be appropriate for the assembly to comment specifically. However the document provides some of the evidence and work that would be helpful to the local authority in protecting the character of such

Support welcome

The Council is satisfied that the SPD is soundly based on Policies as set out in the introduction chapter, however through the production of new LDF documents it is intended to review adopted policies and strengthen them.

Support welcome

<p>areas, which is welcomed.</p> <p>RPG1 and the emerging RSS recognise the importance of the protection and enhancement of Conservation Areas and the built environment in general, by promoting a regional renaissance and they include policies that aim to optimise the re-use, protection and enhancement of the historic environment and promote high quality design.</p> <p>Recommendation: Members are requested to endorse Annex A as the Assembly's response to the local planning authority on the general conformity of this planning document with RPG1 and emerging RSS.</p>	<p>Support welcome</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">The North East Assembly Rachel Ford Policy Officer (Rural and Sustainability) North East Assembly, Guildhall, Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3AF Tel: 0191 261 3932 Fax: 0191 232 4558 www.northeastassembly.gov.uk</p>	
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning document. The Assembly's Development Board considered this planning document on 28 June 2006. A copy of the draft report to the Development Board is also enclosed for information.</p> <p>The Assembly welcomes the production of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPD. RPG1 and the emerging RSS encourage the production of Conservation and Historic Environment SPDs and other types of related work at the local level. The principles outlined within the SPD are what would be expected as a consequence of the policy frameworks outlined in RPG1 and the emerging RSS.</p>	<p>Support Welcome</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">English Nature Alex Staddon Conservation Officer English Nature Northumbria Team Alex.Staddon@English-Nature.Org.UK</p>	
<p>It would be useful to highlight the issues of protected species in buildings</p>	<p>Agreed, reference to protected species included and the importance of</p>

<p>particularly those where restoration, conversion, extension or demolition is proposed for any building, property or structure where protected species have their roosts, nests or other places of shelter. Government Circular ODPM 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system' sets out the statutory provisions with regard these issues. Bats are perhaps the most likely protected species likely to be affected, with summer maternity or winter hibernation roosts in, for example, residential properties, derelict structures, historic monuments, outbuildings, bridges etc. Other species including great crested newts, otters and water voles should be considered where open water or associated habitats might be affected.</p> <p>It may be useful to set some of the Conservation Areas in their wider environmental context by highlighting the nature conservation features they contain; particularly Eaglescliffe, Thornaby Green and Yarm through their location adjacent to waterways. Additionally Wynard Park will undoubtedly contain some nature conservation interests.</p>	<p>buildings for roosting, nesting or shelter. Advice also included to promote consultation with Tees Valley Wildlife Trust in considering development. Text added: <i>“Historic buildings and sites are often good nesting or roosting sites for wildlife of all types due to the embellished design of buildings. Overhanging roofs offer shelter to birds for example. Together, the trees and other vegetation coupled with buildings and structures provide a rich potential wildlife habitat, and therefore any works, particularly demolition should be carried out carefully to avoid damaging these habitats. Te Tees valley Wildlife Trust will be pleased to offer advice if habitats are encountered during construction or other works.”</i></p> <p>Agreed, the environmental context is important to the character of the Conservation Areas and text is included in the introduction to each Conservation Area to highlight this (as above).</p>
<p>Kathryn Gibson Conservation Officer, North of England The Garden History Society, 70 Cowcross Street, London, EC1M 6EJ</p>	
<p>Thank you for consulting the Garden History Society on this documents. On the basis of the information available to us we do not wish to comment at the present time. However we would encourage your Authority to consider drawing up a local list of historic landscapes to ensure that these sites are also protected from inappropriate development.</p>	<p>The Local List is not exclusively for buildings and structures – landscapes and more broad areas may also be included wherever they may be justified as having any special local interest worthy of protection. The Council would welcome nominations.</p>
<p>Cllr John Fletcher Tel 01642 787652 or 786456 Fax 01642 657138 Alternative e-mail: sfletcher@cix.co.uk</p>	
<p>Egglescliffe Conservation Area Appraisal</p> <p>Under "General Overview of Egglescliffe Conservation Area" the 3rd para. says that historians believe that Egglescliffe was 1st established in the 17th century. If only because the Church dates from the 12th century, this must be an error.</p>	<p>Typographical error, the report should read the 11th Century, as the settlement was mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p>

At the end of the section headed "Hole of Paradise", the entry about the coal drops might need revision in the light of the attached exchange of e-mails with Cllr Cherrett.

"I have just had a call from Mr Basford of Sunny Mount, South View alleging that the developers are not complying with the conditions to maintain the historic coal drops etc. Could you please check and confirm your findings with Mr Basford?"

"I have now carried out a site inspection and discussed the matter with the Councils Historic Buildings Officer miss Fiona Short.

Miss Short has informed me that when the render was removed from the arches they were in a very bad state of disrepair and in danger of collapsing.

A structural survey was therefore carried out and following consultations with Tees Archaeology and the Councils Building Control department, it was decided that the tops should be removed from the arches and capped off for safety and aesthetic reasons."

Under "Development Opportunity Sites" there is an incomplete caption "Listed barn should lead any".

The barns in the picture are not Listed Buildings. The ruined Egglecliffe Old Hall in the picture is Listed.

Under "Roads and Footpaths" it says "The farms are accessed along unmade roads", giving as an example the lane in front of Wells Cottages. That lane is not the vehicular access to any farm. Both farm houses and farmyards in the Village are accessed by metalled, adopted roads.

Under "Walls" the 2nd Para. mentions "churches". There is only 1 church.

Eaglescliffe-with-Preston Conservation Area Appraisal

Agreed, although the draft Conservation and Historic Environment Folder was published before these changes, the coal drops have altered significantly in recent weeks and this should be noted in the report. Text added: *"Summer 2006, work was necessary to remove and stabilise various parts of the Coal Drops as they were found to be in a very poor state of repair."*

Typographical error.

Partially agree – the Hall is the Listed structure, but according to the Legislation, anything attached to it or within its curtilage is also Listed

Agreed, text amended to cite Wells Cottages and not the farm: ~~"The farms are accessed along unmade roads, shared by some houses. This is especially evident in the lane in front of~~ Wells Cottages in the East of the Conservation Area are accessed via an unmade road."

Typographical error

<p>Under "Urban Form", Swinburne Road is mis-spelt "Swineburn".</p> <p>On the same page, a more up-to-date photo of Station Road is needed, as the wall has been reduced in height and the fence removed pursuant to a Planning Inspector's decision which explicitly recognised the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Typographical error</p> <p>Photographs are library pictures – if more up to date ones become available prior to adoption they will be used.</p>
<p>Richard Pow Regional Development Officer, Forestry Commission, 1 Walby Hill, Rothbury, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE65 7NT e-mail: richard.pow@forestry.gsi.gov.uk Tel: 01669 621591</p>	
<p>Thank you for your recent correspondence regarding Stockton's draft Conservation and Historic Environment Folder Supplementary Planning Document. On this occasion we have no comment to make.</p>	<p>Support welcome</p>
<p>Ian Richardson 21 Osborne Road Oxbridge Stockton Borough Council TS18 4DJ</p>	
<p>Following a recent discussion with Rev Philip Ashdown (Vicar of St Peter's and All Saints Hartburn) Philip pointed out a couple of anomalies with the draft Conservation Area document in relation to Hartburn. The photograph of All Saints is labelled "School" and the Post Office is of course no longer operating as a business!</p> <p>Philip also pointed out the relative planning autonomy the Church 'enjoys' – and whilst they would not wish to knowingly flout any regulations it is the case that their relative autonomy thus their potential for difficulties are not actually considered in the Conservation Area document. Of course this may not just be an issue specific to Hartburn – other Conservation Areas may have a church or churches within their boundaries. In the interests of robust conservation policy perhaps this matter needs to be explored further?</p>	<p>Agreed – the captions are incorrect. Photographs reviewed and updated.</p> <p>This is specific to a building and therefore inappropriate for inclusion in the more generic Conservation and Historic Environment Folder Conservation Area Appraisal. The Church's planning autonomy is limited but very complex, and therefore the Council is always pleased to work with its partners and customers to ensure the most appropriate way forward in any development, and on a case by case basis. There is no need to mention this in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder.</p>
<p>ANN CAINS</p>	
<p>I was very surprised to read that there is only one Grade 1 Listed building – Church of St Mary the Virgin ruins. This must be confused with one of the other ruined churches in Stockton. Our vicar will also be very surprised!!</p>	<p>Agreed, the church is not in ruins and it is clear how this may be misleading. However, there are numerous remains of previous churches that have been built upon through the ages, and these form the bulk of the interest in the building. Text added: "The Church of St. Mary the</p>

	Virgin <i>rebuilt upon the various ruins,</i> ”
David Harding Dunottar House, Dunottar Avenue, Eaglescliffe TS16 0AB	
<p>Your work on this is very comprehensive and professional and I am writing to congratulate you on a job well done. I know that there have been many other demands on your time whilst producing this draft and I think your achievement is praiseworthy.</p> <p>Overall, as previously indicated, this is a first class draft and I commend you for it and thank you for the consultation opportunity. Hopefully your work will benefit as a result of the consultation comments and I hope that you receive many such contributions.</p> <p>The decision to charge £10 for a paper copy will however deterred many from commenting who may have wished to do so.</p> <p>It is not clear who will authorise the redrafting to select which comments to incorporate – I assume you will both redraft, and then your folder will go to the usual review by senior management before scrutiny by committee and then full Council?</p> <p>The arrangement of chapters is good and logical but I would prefer a stronger opening paragraph as to why Conservation is so important. Even above settled and contented communities, sense of pride and history, the most significant effect of Conservation is economic. Although you rightfully identify the economic benefits of tourism, even more</p>	<p>Support welcome.</p> <p>Support welcome.</p> <p>The charge for a personal copy is merely to cover the costs of printing the document. Copes were available for the public to view free of charge in Planning Reception, and in the Borough Libraries. Copies were available on Compact Disc in a variety of formats for £5, and were also available on the Council’s website free of charge. Therefore, it is considered that there was ample opportunity for anyone not wishing to pay for the document to be able to read it and make comments.</p> <p>The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder will be amended where appropriate following the consultation. This is then put before Planning Committee and Cabinet and full Council for their approval. The list of comments and the Council’s responses is included here as part of the SPD, and will also be scrutinised by the Council. This follows the advice issued by the Government to ensure that SPDs are robust and the Adoption process is transparent.</p> <p>Agreed, an acknowledgement of the role Conservation can play in securing economic prosperity will highlight its wider benefits. Insert text: <i>“The importance of Conservation cannot be over-estimated, as it not only forms an important link with our past and provides us with a window on historic way of life, but also provides very real economic</i></p>

important is the contribution made by the Conservation Areas to the Borough's Unique Selling Point (USP). When all Local Authorities are competing not only to attract inward investment, but also in times of increasing workplace mobility retain what is already here, the Conservation Area are an important part, with good transport links of SBC USP. Research indicates that the most important factors in determining relocation decisions are good quality housing and schooling for decision-makers and enterprise owners' families. These factors outweigh even labour supply and economic incentives.

We are fortunate that the Conservation Areas of Norton (Red House School), Egglescliffe, Eaglescliffe With Preston and Yarm (Teesside High School and Yarm Grammar School) all provide good quality housing and schooling which does attract significant numbers of entrepreneurs and company directors on whom the future economic health of the Borough depends. The economic benefits of Conservation should therefore be emphasised more as a new first paragraph to your introduction. The rest of my comments relate to each of your chapters as follows:

Introduction: The River Tees is recognised in your introduction, but reference should also be made to the bridges and their importance to the settlements and growth at Yarm, the lowest sea-forward ford and bridge for hundreds of years (after the Roman ford between Thornaby and Preston Park) and the bridge at Stockton leading to large expansion and industrial/ship building developments in the 19th Century.

EN22: Eaglescliffe With Preston should be included as a priority for boundary revision of the Conservation Area, not least due to the excellent collaborative work carried out by EPAG and CPRE in conjunction with local residents in surveying the ward for buildings of special merit, trees worthy of TPO protection, and meritorious streetscapes worthy of inclusion in the Conservation Area. This work was undertaken by community activists in collaboration with Neil Cole, Acting Head of Planning, and Jane Elliott, Acting head of Strategic Planning, and represented an innovative and effective engagement with the community by Planning staff of the sort encouraged by the new evolving planning

benefits. Historic buildings and spaces carry a certain charm that people recognise and admire, and often these areas are found to be wealthy and sought after. This in turn assists in maintaining the areas to the highest standard. It is important therefore to continue our care and enjoyment for future generations so that they may also benefit from the architecture and history, but also from the economic benefits of Conservation."

The bridges and the ford at Yarm are mentioned in the individual Conservation Area Appraisals as appropriate. However the river crossings have played an important role in the shifting settlement pattern of the Borough and mention in the History chapter will allow better understanding of the way the Borough has developed. Insert text: *"and in particular to the many crossings that have developed"*

Policy EN22 is an Adopted Policy and is not able to be changed in this SPD consultation. The Policy states that priority will be given to some Conservation Areas, however the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder deals with all 11 Conservation Areas at once, therefore fulfilling and indeed surpassing the requirements of Policy EN22.

The public's interest and involvement in Conservation is welcome.

regime.

There is significant pride in the community at the Conservation status, with high levels of community active involvement. The first public meeting called by EPAG attracted 230 persons on a Friday evening last July, and many property owners in the terraced streets have painted their front doors to match those of their neighbours, with properties generally well maintained.

The explanation and representation of the new SPD with other planning policies including the RSS is first class and very helpful.

A Brief History: The most significant heritage from 30 miles from Newcastle, 40 from York is that both represent one day's journey by horse or stage coach – hence the large numbers of pubs with inner courtyards and horse stabling still to be seen in Yarm, Stockton, the former Witham Hall Farm across the railway from Dunottar Avenue (now demolished), and Copsewood and Preston Hall.

The legacy of “The Dice Players” by George de la Tour, valued at £6.5m should be mentioned as further evidence of the wealth and discriminative collecting by the Ropner Family.

John Walker's invention of the friction match should also be referred to, as assisting to the inventiveness and adaptability of Stocktonians, still

Support welcome

The History chapter's opening paragraph is intended solely to give details as to the location of Stockton Borough. The issue of Yarm being an important stop-over on the journey between York and Durham is made in the Yarm Conservation Area Appraisal where the point is explored in greater detail. It is considered that this is the most appropriate place to develop the point as Yarm was the principal benefactor from the location. However, the inclusion of details of the hotels, inns and stabling facilities is important and is emphasised in the Yarm Conservation Area Appraisal. Text added: *“Yarm had a key position on an important river crossing, which also happened to be a day's travel from both York and Newcastle – hence the numerous staging posts and inns.”*

Agreed, this important painting should be mentioned. It is most appropriate in the parks and gardens chapter which mentions Preston Park Museum and the Ropner family. Text added: *“The Ropner empire was vast, and the family were resident at Preston Hall, now a museum. Within the museum one may find “The Dice Players”, a painting by Francis de la Tour valued at over £6million – an indication of the Ropner's wealth and good taste.”*

Agreed, this important invention should be mentioned. Insert text: *“Stockton's famous sons include the Ropner shipping line, John Walker, the inventor of the friction match,,”*

Agreed, the wildlife benefits have been one of the greatest benefits of the cleaner river. Suggested text inserted.

evident today as they embrace new and innovative industry replacing the heavy chemical, steel and shipbuilding.

After “cleanest rivers in the country” insert “with salmon and otters flourishing once again”.

Archaeology: A very good overview – but please mention the Roman road and ford with settlement on the Preston Park side also.

In a house on the Green at Eaglescliffe is also a surviving “priests hole”.

Scheduled Ancient Monuments: Why is the track-bed and surviving railway buildings and structures of the Stockton-Darlington Railway not a Listed SAM, please?

Listed Buildings: The whole of Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area should be Listed as having **Group Value**, being representative of harmonised architecture gradated according to the historic class structure when built. Mention of this “Class Architecture” should be made in your report, as it features so strongly in many Conservation Areas.

Conservation Areas: EN22- “the boundaries...will be reviewed” should specify Eaglescliffe With Preston as included for priority review. Feeling locally is so strong about this that we are surveying the community to establish numbers in favour of extending the boundaries, and of seeking article 4 status.

Given the presence of the Roman Villa at Ingleby Barwick, it is quite likely that there is a road fording the Tees, however there is no evidence to locate it, and therefore it cannot be explicitly mentioned. However the importance of the numerous crossings is highlighted in the introduction.

Information gratefully received.

The Council does not designate SAMs, this like Listing Buildings is undertaken by the Department for Culture, media and Sport (DCMS). (The role may soon be Adopted by English Heritage). Tees Archaeology Service are working with the Council in pursuing greater recognition and/or protection for the historic route.

The Council does not designate Listed Buildings, this is carried out by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (The role may soon be Adopted by English Heritage). Nominations/suggestions for Listing buildings should be addressed to them, with information supporting the proposal. The purpose of Conservation Areas is –in effect – the Listing of a group of buildings for their group value. Although the process and procedure is different, the intention is to acknowledge those special buildings. It is unnecessary therefore to group list a Conservation Area. The class architecture is mentioned in the Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area appraisal.

As above, Policy EN22 is an Adopted Policy and is not able to be changed in this SPD consultation. The Policy states that priority will be given to some Conservation Areas, however the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder deals with all 11 Conservation Areas at once, therefore fulfilling and indeed surpassing the requirements of Policy EN22.

As part of the Management Plan, Article 4 status is to be pursued for all 11 Conservation Areas. Further consultation is required with residents and businesses so that people are fully aware of the implications,

Page 36: We can think of no good reason why only 2 of the 11 Conservation Areas in the Borough should not have Article 4 status – all should have Article 4 status.

Management Plan: Pg40 Generic issues to address: insert “urgently seek article 4 directions status for all Conservation Areas” (otherwise minor works, guttering etc remain unenforceable in 2 of the 11 in the Borough.)

Page 41 “Regular contact with community groups” insert “EPAG, CPRE and YPAG.”

General: identify recommended suppliers of traditional foot-scrapers etc for community sourcing.

Page 43 Article4 Directions: The proposed “blanket-applying across all land in each Conservation Area” is very welcome, but needs to be done urgently if further degradation by unsympathetic developers is not to occur. Article 4 directions for Eaglescliffe With Preston cannot wait on the many months before the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder achieved LDP status. Accordingly we are surveying the community to establish the level of support for urgent article 4 status.

Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area: “collectively this puts the

however this is a priority for action.

It is not considered necessary to insert the suggested text, as the text explains the Council’s intention, as opposed to explaining the role of Article 4 Directions. The Council is committed to strengthening its position regarding minor development works and the Management Plan provides the mechanism for this. Text added: *“In order to pursue this aim, the Council will organise information events and invite residents and businesses in the Conservation Areas to attend to explain the process and procedures of Article 4 Directions. These meetings will be held with a view to having the Article 4 Directions in place (where they are supported by residents and businesses) by the end of 2007.”*

There are many community groups that the Council works with, and it would be inefficient to name each individually.

Unfortunately the Council cannot endorse or recommend any third party suppliers or manufacturers of building materials. However, the Historic Buildings Officer will be pleased to comment on any such items that are proposed for inclusion on properties or in development proposals.

As above, As part of the Management Plan, Article 4 status is to be pursued for all 11 Conservation Areas. Further consultation is required with residents and businesses so that people are fully aware of the implications, however this is a priority for action.

The Committee Report that promoted the designation of the Conservation Area in the first place acknowledged that the area was “borderline at best”. This point is merely repeated in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder. However, nowhere is it proposed to delete the Conservation Area, but to monitor its progress and work with developers and residents to effect positive change. It is in everyone’s interests to ensure that Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area is

future of the Conservation Area in jeopardy unless more efforts are made to preserve the character” We are exceedingly surprised by this statement – the existing property owners demonstrate a pride of place and community by well-maintained properties which are decorated similarly and harmoniously with neighbours, especially in Albert, Clarence and Swinburne Roads, Dunottar Avenue houses are more individual, but well maintained.

The commitment to managing Conservation Area set out by the Historic Buildings Officer (HBO) is inconsistent with her role and recommendations as a Planning Officer, and we question whether the two roles are compatible in one person. We would prefer the HBO to devote full-time to managing her specialist brief, and for a Planning case officer concerned with a development application in a Conservation Area to refer to her for advice as if she were a “Statutory Consultee”.

All the developments jeopardising the Conservation Area are by one developer, William Gate, who seems to be treated with remarkable leniency by Planning Officers, since all his developments have been recommended for approval by RTPI qualified Planning Officers, including the HBO, Fiona Short, who recommended at 15 Station Road a development projecting more than 3 metres beyond the established Swinburne Road 1892 brick-built terrace building line, introduces rendered block work into a brick-built environment, approves uPVC windows which are less than 6m from directly-opposing living and bedrooms at 15 Swinburn Road, whose privacy they adversely affect, and approves a roof-height domineering the skyline, obstructing the light and especially sunlight to neighbouring properties, with an approved height of 9.5m adjacent to Swinburn Rd roofs of 7.3m height. Her recommendation for approval was supported by Barry Jackson, DC Manager who said at Planning Committee in response to questions from many distressed local residents “it complies in all aspects with the requirements for a rear extension”. To add further insult to injury, the

improved, and the works mentioned clearly show that the public are taking steps to this end. The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is the mechanism for working together to achieve this.

It is not appropriate for the role of the Historic Buildings Officer or the hierarchy of staff within the department to be debated as part of the consultation on the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPD.

It is not appropriate to debate specific planning applications as part of the consultation on the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPD.

It is not clear what change is being requested by this point.

Agreed, the photograph used was incorrect.

approved front doors are typical rustic farmhouse doors, when every other front door in the road is Victorian panelled, most painted alike in black; the farmhouse doors are in farmhouse brown.

At page 88, Urban Form, for Station Road the HBO notes “The street has seen most of the development, and much of it is unsympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area” (sic!)

Page 83: Railway Terrace. The photograph of a “former railway workshop” is actually of a farmhouse built as such. The railway workshop is actually the former original locomotive shed, now tastefully converted to Conservation Area status, to two cottages in brick to match the original, timber sash windows, slate roof etc.

Page 84. The decision to exclude Railway Terrace is understandable, but we believe it should be included for three reasons – 1) at the heart of our Conservation Area, Railway Terrace supports the importance of the railway history locally – many still remember railway workers stepping directly from their front doors onto the tracks, as there was no road or garden then. 2) by inclusion, the inappropriate decorations and uPVC windows can be managed by the HBO to more respectful of history and the Conservation Area. 3) inclusion is justified by reference to the group basis of the present Conservation Area, by demonstrating yet another example of building by social class, which already is so apparent, and is valuable to history.

Page 85 Important views...Victoria Park. The local name for this park is “Tittybottle Park” – this should be referenced as an important social history reminder of the wet-nurses and nannies who used to gather there with their charges when every house locally had servants.

Page 88 the semi detached housing shown north of Station Road is actually South.

Page 89 Land Use. Other uses should include mention of the P&EG club on Albert Road, which apart from bars has a large 1st floor ballroom for

The Conservation Area is defined as the area that has special character worthy of protection. As explained in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder, it is considered that while Railway Terrace has historic relevance, the unsympathetic alterations have removed its ‘special’ interest. If these properties were all restored with original/traditional features, then their inclusion in the Conservation Area would be reconsidered. This is included in the Management Plan as an aspiration, but the Council cannot force owners to undertake the works.

This is very useful local knowledge and is included in the text.

Agreed, the caption used was incorrect.

This is useful local information gratefully received.

It is likely to be a combination of factors that led to the deterioration of the setts including poor reinstatement after such works. However the Council Engineers suggest that the majority of damage is due to vehicle movements, often exacerbating the damage of poor repair.

dances and public meetings such valued by the community. Mention should also be made of the Village Hall, which with the P&E club and the Methodist Church on Witham Ave was gifted to the village by one benefactor.

Rear alleys: "have settled unevenly due to the weight of vehicles" This is incorrect. The settlement is due to utility companies trenching, and poor subsequent reinstatement. The rear service alley to Station Rd was tarmac laid due to representations from a lady short-term tenant of William gate, who resided at The Mews for only 12 months, but left her disadvantageous impact forever. In both these circumstances, more effective management of the area by the Council would prevent such abuses.

Article 4 Directions: we believe that the areas should be protected urgently by these, not yet in place.

Long term aim: Seek improvements to Station car park. The introduction of main-line services from Sunderland to Kings Cross in Dec 2006 prompts urgent negotiation with the new operator about this.

Page 212 contacts: A really useful list; well done.

Page 217 Glossary: also very useful.

I reserve the right to make further representations and comments as the document wends its way towards LDP status. I note the draft Sustainability appraisal closely mirrors the folder.

As above, As part of the Management Plan, Article 4 status is to be pursued for all 11 Conservation Areas. Further consultation is required with residents and businesses so that people are fully aware of the implications, however this is a priority for action.

The Council will work with its partners and customers to ensure the best development for the Conservation Area. However much of the necessary works are outside the control of The Council.

Support welcome

Support welcome

Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks Paragraph 4.42 sets out the required timetable of *not less than 4 weeks or more than six weeks* for comments. The Council followed a full 6-week consultation to ensure as many people as possible would have the chance to comment. Therefore it is not possible to reserve the right to make additional comments throughout the process. That said, until such time that the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is put before Council for Adoption, any additional comments will be considered and if possible incorporated in the revised draft of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder.

KENNETH LUPTON

I have read through the document and congratulate you on the content and presentation. I have noted a number of typographical and detail inaccuracies, addresses etc but would make the following detailed comments on the Hartburn Section.

Support welcome, and typographical errors are addressed in turn as they are found in reviewing the document.

<p>Street furniture: I agree this equipment does not enhance the look of the village and street lighting in particular should be changed to a more sympathetic design. This should be a recommendation. I have recently had the litter bins changed but again I think the design colour and siting should be a matter of overall agreement with all the stakeholders.</p> <p>Signing: there is no overall policy. A sign, of suitable design should be erected at the boundary of the Conservation Area identifying the area and its historic legacy, with perhaps some detail asking for appreciation of requirements eg Don't park on verges etc.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any mention of the Manor House and its connection with the Washington family. I think this link with the 1st President of the USA should be identified.</p> <p>Management plan: uPVC windows. I have no particular problem with this material as long as the design and colour are appropriate. There does not appear to be any conclusion on this matter in the document.</p>	<p>Agreed, the issue is relevant to all Conservation Areas and text is inserted in the generic Management Plan to highlight the point. Text inserted: <i>“Promote the removal of uncoordinated street furniture and the replacement with more appropriate harmonised pieces.”</i></p> <p>Agreed. This is mentioned in the management plan to explore the possibility of signage at gateway sites into Conservation Areas to emphasise and publicise the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Text amended to read: <i>“George Washington, the first American president, has strong links with this area, as his ancestors are thought to have lived in Hartburn at The Manor House.”</i></p> <p>The Council is committed to preventing inappropriate materials in the Conservation Areas, and uPVC is one such material that requires managing. The issue of uPVC is one of the most common conflicts in any Conservation Area. Text added: <i>“One of the greatest threats to the integrity of a Conservation Area is the introduction of modern materials which completely change the character of the historic environment. The most notorious material being uPVC windiws and doors. This is a modern material that has no place in Conservation Areas, and should nto be installed. Traditional windows, properly installed, will have far greater lifespan and aesthetic qualities than uPVC. The Council will not allow uPVC to be used in Conservation Areas where it has controls over such works.”</i></p>
<p>Derek and Win Campbell South Lodge Eaglescliffe</p>	
<p>I was active in lobbying for the original Conservation Area status here, and it was hoped that this could be extended to protect our big houses with large gardens from the ravishes of developers which is becoming evident. It would seem more of Eaglescliffe is at risk from day to day. You will notice that more and more residents are becoming more and</p>	<p>Public support and involvement in Conservation is welcome.</p>

more active in trying to protect what we all value.

Obviously there is a good mix of building styles, wooded areas, tree lined roads and bigger than average gardens, but older houses are in danger of being swamped by new development out of character with those existing.

It has been acknowledged by many that the three new houses in the garden opposite the golf course on Yarm Road have been a mistake. We must avoid making any more mistakes!

It is known that there is demand for larger than average houses with large gardens, and a shortage of executive homes in Stockton itself. The numbers of flats for sale in the area is evidence of the fact that expensive flats are not in demand, even if they are an opportunity for the developer to make large sums in the area. How can we attract high calibre professional people if we remove these executive homes from the equation. Highly qualified professional people who like traditional homes may have been attracted to our area, but will not be attracted to older traditional homes, with perhaps a block of high density flats next door. Or perhaps a three storey nursing home development in the planning? Social housing has to be a priority but building expensive flats in Eaglescliffe does not solve any housing problems for Stockton, and could in fact have serious economic repercussions.

The fact that the Council are very much aware that 'unsympathetic alterations' puts at risk the Conservation Area status, is very hard to understand. Surely the Conservation Area status itself should have been protection from any unsympathetic or inappropriate developments, and it is the Council's responsibility to protect it! To protect the areas character does not mean that it will have to be 'pickled in time', but householders should be encouraged to make sympathetic and in character alterations.

The Planning process is set up to ensure that any new development is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting. The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is a very thorough tool in adding value to the planning process, and gives much greater general and specific advice to potential developers. It is hoped that through the Adoption of this SPD that the standard of development will constantly increase.

It is inappropriate to debate a specific planning application in this consultation.

It is not appropriate to discuss demand for house types in this consultation. However, where proposals for redevelopment are submitted they are considered on their merits in line with the Adopted Policies, national and local guidance and any other material considerations. The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder will be one such material consideration to ensure that any new development is appropriate, particularly where it is proposed in a Conservation Area or involves a Listed Building.

It is acknowledged that some recent developments have been carried out with the Council's approval, however there are many more that do not require any form of planning consent and together they collectively harm the Conservation Area. The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is designed to encourage more sympathetic development so that the Conservation Area retains its best assets, and over time any unsympathetic work can be removed and replaced. The Council is eager to work with developers and local residents and business owners to achieve the best for the area. The responsibility to preserve and enhance our Conservation Areas is collective.

Also it is important that the problems of amenities and transport in our area are alleviated. It does not make sense to allow such high density developments when the local infrastructure is not able to support more. The simple fact that Eaglescliffe is a more affluent area means that more householders are also car owners. All these things must be considered. More high density development means more car usage and this in itself is extremely destructive in any area!

There is also the consideration that Developers can use the fact that some of these older houses may be in poor repair, but surely this cannot mean that demolition be allowed to be the favoured action. Who will define what is the criteria for reasonably economic repair, Developers can provide engineers reports to back up any suggestion, and there must be some more protection of our buildings of local importance than this. Again ownership should go hand in hand with responsibility. And we have all seen building allowed to fall into disrepair (the Grange is only one of them) as a ploy to obtain permission for demolition – steps should also be taken to prevent this kind of destruction of our older more historically important buildings.

I would hope that the Planning Department would give full consideration to the idea of extending our Conservation Area to more fully protect this area.

This comment is about the development of flats and is not directly related to the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder. The Council already has Adopted policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance, and Design Guides in place to determine planning applications where flats are concerned.

Where a planning application is submitted involving the demolition of a building, its economic state of repair is only one consideration in arriving at a decision. It can be reasonable to permit the demolition of a building in good repair, so the issue of poor repair is not of fundamental concern. If a building is beyond economic repair, the Council cannot reasonably refuse its demolition unless it is Listed. In exceptional circumstances, buildings that fall into disrepair and become dangerous may be served a Repairs Notice to make emergency repairs, however this must be stressed that this is in exceptional circumstances unless the building is Listed.

The Boundary Review in each Conservation Area Appraisal sets out the Council's consideration for any boundary changes. There is no large-scale extension proposed in any Conservation Area, and the reasons for this are set out in the Appraisals.

**Eaglescliffe Preservation Action Group (EPAG)
C/o 4 Ashville Avenue
Eaglescliffe
TS16 9AX**

The Appraisal contains a number of very welcome points. Firstly the recognition that "Eaglescliffe is one of the more desirable places to live in the Borough" of Stockton. We also agree that the Eaglescliffe with Preston Conservation Area is "characterised by its unique layout and the pleasant surroundings created by its

Support welcome

component parts". We applaud also the acknowledgement that the Conservation Area is a "leafy, green urban area on a simple grid layout with pattern and regularity". We also congratulate the Council on its public statement of intent to "preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area". We are delighted at the commitment to subjecting any new development proposals to "intensive scrutiny" and the decision that "any development of rear gardens shall not be permitted in a piecemeal fashion". Furthermore we welcome the statement that "there are no development opportunity sites available immediately in the Eaglescliffe with Preston Conservation Area."

EPAG agree that the Conservation Area does "suffer from unsympathetic alterations and additions" and that much of Station Road is "unsympathetic to the Conservation Area." Whilst acknowledging that some minor alterations are made to properties by owners irrespective of the dictates of a Conservation Area, the main problems which are now visible are largely attributable to the lack of stringent enough control exercised by Stockton Planning Department and the Enforcement teams on developers and their plans. This must be rectified immediately and indeed strengthened by the commitment to "intensive scrutiny" for new applications. EPAG look forward to seeing procedural evidence of how this scrutiny will be exercised. We contend that the "future of the Conservation Area is in jeopardy unless more efforts are made to preserve the character" and are shocked and dismayed at such an inference. This must not be allowed to happen and the onus is on the Council to ensure that it does not. Indeed this is the Council's "call to alms" as regards the Eaglescliffe with Preston Conservation Area; it must act now and take control.

As regards the inclusion or exclusion of certain properties in the Eaglescliffe with Preston Conservation Area, EPAG agree that the workshop on Clarence Road should be included.

However we disagree on the exclusion of Railway Terrace. These houses are unique in the size, style and importance to the history of Eaglescliffe and must be protected by the Conservation Area.

It is acknowledged that some recent developments have been carried out with the Council's approval, however there are many more that do not require any form of planning consent and together they collectively harm the Conservation Area. The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is designed to encourage more sympathetic development so that the Conservation Area retains its best assets, and over time any unsympathetic work can be removed and replaced. The Council is eager to work with developers and local residents and business owners to achieve the best for the area.

Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area has not had any Supplementary Planning Guidance before, and the production of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder will go a long way to assisting developers and Planning Officers make more sympathetic decisions with regards to development proposals.

Support welcome.

The Conservation Area is defined as the area that has special character worthy of protection. As explained in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder, it is considered that while Railway Terrace has historic relevance, the unsympathetic alterations have removed its 'special' interest. If these properties were all restored with original/traditional features, then their inclusion in the Conservation

We are saddened at the state of the station but agree that it should be reconsidered once it has been improved and upgraded as the Management Plan suggests.

However the Appraisal also contains a number of negative assertions and points with which we completely disagree as regards the boundaries of the Conservation Area. It would be very easy to bestride Yarm Road at the Burlington House intersection to include the south side of The Avenue. The houses on this south side are "exceptional" and do have a definable, bourgeois Victorian character. Together with those on Albert Road, Swinburne, Beechwood, Railway Terrace and Myrtle Road they provide the holistic view of the Victorian social strata of Eaglescliffe. None of these buildings can be truly understood without the others since collectively they evidence the social context. It is crucial for Eaglescliffe's history for the range of dwellings of differing social status to be preserved. Indeed for the Appraisal to state that "to jump Yarm Road to include a handful of houses in a piecemeal fashion is neither desirable nor practical" is to belittle the history and heritage of Eaglescliffe -it ~both practical and highly desirable.

If the extension to the eastern boundary is still immovable then EPAG would like a new Conservation Area to be designated to capture the south side of The Avenue. We have exchanged correspondence with both Mrs Straughan and Ms Short on this and have provided maps of how this could be done. We also refer you to the letter from Ms C Dewar, Historic Areas adviser, English Heritage of 1st February 2006. In this she states "our advice would be that some plots on the southern side of The Avenue and the eastern side of Tees Bank Avenue would be worthy of Conservation Area status."

Area would be reconsidered. This is included in the Management Plan as an aspiration, but the Council cannot force owners to undertake the works.

Support welcome

The whole of Eaglescliffe and Preston are considered attractive and pleasant places to live, however the Conservation Area is designed to protect those parts that have special character worthy of protection. As explained in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder, it is acknowledged that the wider Eaglescliffe was developed with a "Victorian social strata". The suggested areas do have an attractive character, but it is not 'special' nor is it a character shared with that found in the defined Conservation Area: it does not match the tight-knit Victorian grid-iron layout character of the defined Conservation Area. The Appraisal goes to great lengths to justify the boundary review, and no compelling evidence has been put forward to contradict the findings.

The letter supports English Heritage's lengthy involvement in the preparation of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder. Ms Dewar's comment corroborates Stockton Borough Council's opinion that there are some fine buildings in this area, and that some could be included in a Conservation Area. However Ms Dewar also notes the piecemeal nature of those plots worthy of a Conservation Area, and the difficulty in defining any Conservation Area. The Council is therefore reluctant to designate a new Conservation Area and instead considers more appropriate protection through the Local List to be the way forward. Those buildings worthy of greater protection should be put forward for Listing to the DCMS (contact details in Appendices).

**Hartburn Residents Association
 Kay Branch (Secretary)
 79 Hartburn Village
 Stockton on Tees
 TS18 5DR**

Page numbers make navigation and referencing the document easier

Overall the document was commended for its aims but we judged the lack of robust policy concerning policing, monitoring and sanctions etc a significant weakness. Examples of this are contained in a number of our comments below.

EN22 – Residents affected by reviews and “appropriate” adjustments to boundary changes should be consulted and or invited to comment.

EN23 - Given the timescale suggested in the document (10 years) and the stated priorities (Yarm and Cowpen Bewley) when will Hartburn feature in the scheme? We feel that any undue delay will inevitably result in an unacceptable decline in the quality of the current environment.

Even as we write a new owner in the village has commenced work on their property considerably at odds with the current proposed policy on conservation.

Archaeology – No mention is made of the mediaeval connection in Hartburn Village in particular that nos 95 (Hartburn Village) is part constructed from stone removed from the castle during the Tudor period.

Listed Buildings et al. A general view that the Policy not sufficiently proactive – for example EN27; what measures will be in place to prevent a Listed Building

Agreed. This was an oversight in the printing process.

Overall support welcome. The comment regarding the lack of robust policy is dealt with in each point below.

The proposed review and any boundary adjustments are set out in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder, and the consultation exercise on this document is the opportunity for residents to comment.

Policy EN22 is an Adopted Policy and is not able to be changed in this SPD consultation. The Policy states that priority will be given to some Conservation Areas, however the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder deals with all 11 Conservation Areas at once, therefore fulfilling and indeed surpassing the requirements of Policy EN22.

If there are concerns over any development occurring in the Conservation Area, contact should be made with the Planning Department who will then be able to investigate and where necessary take any appropriate steps.

The Archaeology Chapter is an overview of this vast topic. There are only seven examples in the Chapter, but over a thousand sites scattered throughout the Borough. It is not possible to mention them all. However, the use of Stockton Castle stone as a recycled building material has been mentioned numerous throughout the Conservation Area Appraisals, including Hartburn Appraisal.

Policy EN27 is an Adopted Policy and is not able to be changed in this SPD consultation.

reaching (deliberately or otherwise) a state of “beyond economic disrepair”? The original Stockton Arms fell foul of what might be described as “managed decay” resulting in demolition and thus a handy car park for the existing premises.

A discussion between one of our members and your Conservation Officer revealed that the number of listed buildings was inaccurate. In fact there are 14 Grade II and 1 Grade II* buildings plus the commemorative stone in the grounds of All Saints Church. Bearing in mind that no’s 95, being partially constructed from castle stone and having two Tudor chimney breasts, original beams and other features, thus possibly the only Tudor house in Stockton, should be awarded Grade II* status.

We recommend that historical facts need to be carefully reviewed as a number of inaccuracies were evident. The Manor House was built in 1650-1700 long after de Hartburn moved to Washington.

Note also the photograph titled Harlsey Crescent should read Harlsey Road.

Conservation Area and Article 4 Directions: policy considers costs and benefits of living in a Conservation Area and details obligations but says little about robust policing/implementation to prevent any inappropriate actions. In practice renovations have taken place, particularly fitting of uPVC windows and doors which clearly circumvent current policy. The Classes A-H make no reference to uPVC fitments!

The figure quoted in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder is incorrect. There are in fact nine Grade II entries and one Grade II* entry. However the entries often cover more than one individual building and in the case of Hartburn there are indeed 20 buildings covered under the List. Text amended to read: “*The Conservation Area has 9 grade II entries on the List covering 18 buildings and 1 grade II* entries on the List covering 2 buildings. The Conservation Area was designated in 1971 for its architectural value, and its historic origins as one of the earliest settlements in the Borough.*”

However, Stockton Borough Council does not designate Listed buildings or choose the Grade awarded. This is carried out by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). If there are any proposals for amending the Listing Grade, or indeed for proposing a new Listed Building, enquiries should be made to DCMS.

The Council has been unable to find conclusive evidence regarding this point, and so it has been rewritten. “*George Washington, the first American president, has strong links with this area, as his ancestors are thought to have lived in Hartburn at The Manor House.*”

Typographical error

The Article 4 directions remove specific rights, but not all rights. As part of the management plan it is proposed to review the Article 4 Directions across all 11 Conservation Areas, and this will be addressed. With regard to the policing of the area, the Council relies heavily on the public to report any inappropriate development as it is clearly not possible to patrol every building regularly to spot breaches of regulations. Text added: “*One of the greatest threats to the integrity of a Conservation Area is the introduction of modern materials which*

The negative aspects make reference to the spate of uPVC windows damaging the integrity of the Conservation Area – we agree – let’s be more explicit in the Article 4 Directions please!

We agree – the shops in Harper Parade are unsympathetic to the Conservation Area – what can be done about this to either improve the appearance or at the very least to prevent any further decline. A commitment should be explicit in this document.

We urge that the obligations required of the residents either existing or prospective, are clearly communicated and their responsibilities regularly (annually) reinforced. Essential that Estate Agents and related services should provide compulsory details to prospective buyers of the costs and benefits of living in a Conservation Area to the buyers can judge whether they wish to sign up before buying the property!

Recent planning applications affecting property in the village suggest that a little more joined up thinking is clearly articulated in this document – say between SBC Planning department and Conservation department! We suspect planning permission not even sought more from ignorance than avoidance (?) which brings us back to the point of proactive policy and policing.

completely change the character of the historic environment. The most notorious material being uPVC windiws and doors. This is a modern material that has no place in Conservation Areas, and should nto be installed. Traditional windows, properly installed, will have far greater lifespan and aesthetic qualities than uPVC. The Council will not allow uPVC to be used in Conservation Areas where it has controls over such works.”

Text added: “In order to pursue this aim, the Council will organise information events and invite residents and businesses in the Conservation Areas to attend to explain the process and procedures of Article 4 Directions. These meetings will be held with a view to having the Article 4 Directions in place (where they are supported by residents and businesses) by the end of 2007.”

The Council cannot instruct the demolition of the shops, nor any other works. The owners may be willing to redevelop the units and the Management Plan makes reference to the Council approaching them about this. However, it is impossible to commit to a timescale for any redevelopment as it is entirely out of the Council’s control.

The Management Plan makes reference to an open letter to various organisations regarding the responsibilities of living and working in a Conservation Area. The local Estate Agents would be a very useful group to target, however they are not obligated to pass on the information.

The Historic buildings Officer who is a consultee on planning applications in the Conservation Areas is based in the Planning Department. With regard to development carried out without planning permission, the Council relies heavily on the public to report any inappropriate development as it is clearly not possible to patrol every building regularly to spot breaches of regulations, deliberate or accidental.

Much is said in the document of the importance and obvious charms of mature trees in the village (and elsewhere in other Conservation Areas) but nothing is said about policy to maintain and replant! A number of trees were felled at the eastern end of the village due to disease but to date have not been replaced. If such lack of care remains unchecked there will be no mature trees left.

We agree wooden fences of post and rail are appropriate, however there are instances where brick is required due to the raised nature of the gardens above the footpaths. Manor House Terrace, immediately east of Harper Terrace is a good example of this.

The boundary map of Hartburn Village in the area of Harper Terrace and Manor House Terrace includes the houses but not the gardens to the rear of each! Also moving east from Manor House Terrace but before All Saints Church are two cottages (set back) not included within the boundary line – which should be.

Last but not least – we were asked by the Conservation Officer to provide a few legends – things that reputedly existed or happened. As a group we would be happy to assist any research and recording of these. Examples might include the legend that local gallows were sited behind the recently closed post office.

Flax was grown locally to supply rope for the shipping industry. The stone in All Saints church was used in processing the flax together with Rope Walk (Harper Terrace) to lay out the flax, pull and twist the lengths into rope!

The Appraisal sets out the importance of the trees, but it would not be possible to include a management plan for each tree. Trees are automatically subject to a group preservation order as part of the Conservation Area status, and so the safeguards associated with this should ensure their protection, health and continuance. If there are concerns regarding any of the trees then the Council Arborist in the Landscape Section should be notified.

Agreed, the brick retaining walls justify mention as a separate aspect of the boundary enclosure methods. It is made clear that the loss of timber fences to brick wall should be avoided. Text added *“Notwithstanding the above, some boundaries are indeed marked by brick retaining walls. However these serve the purpose of holding back the earthen gardens, and are not to be confused with simple brick walls.”*

Agreed, the gardens should be included in the Conservation Area boundary as a more logical on-the-ground marker.

Support and interest welcome. The topic of the Gallows is interesting and is included in the report.

This local knowledge is interesting and useful in the report. Text added: *“The village’s former life is hinted at in places such as Rope Walk (Harper Terrace)– where the flaxmen would lay out their rope and pull and twist it in to shape. Stone in All Saints churchyard was used in making this rope for the Stockton shipyards.”*

YARM RESIDENTS GROUP
C/O 20 Leven Rd
YARM
TS15 9JE

With regard to Yarm Conservation Area appraisal. It is much welcomed that the Council recognise Yarm is perhaps the Borough’s flagship Conservation Area,

Support welcome

and we would agree that residents, shoppers and workers in Yarm largely support the preservation of the historic qualities of the town.

One of the topics discussed in our meeting with Neil Cole and Jane Elliott was proposed extensions to Yarm Conservation Area and the department kindly provided excellent maps requesting that we mark on where we would like the extension of the Conservation Area to be implemented. We completed this request and again you provided us with maps using GIS, professionally displaying the existing and proposed Conservation Area boundaries. It is therefore particularly very disappointing to read in your appraisal that you do not intend to extend the Conservation Area in any way that we suggested, ie the length of Leven Road, along the banks of the river, including Goosepastures and The Spital. In fact the only extension you are proposing to make is to define the boundaries more clearly by including the traffic island at the junction of The Spital and Worsall Road. It is quoted in the appraisal that “most buildings outside the current boundary are not in keeping with the character of Yarm Conservation Area, and there is little or no significant historic value, therefore large scale boundary extension will not be engaged in.” We would agree that many of the buildings on Leven Rd are different to those in the current Yarm Conservation Area, with a mix of buildings of different periods. However the properties along Leven Rd are predominantly low density, large houses set in their own grounds which contributes as a whole to the attractiveness, ambience and character of the townscape of Yarm, being hugely attractive leafy, spacious suburbs which are equally important and worthy of protection as the High Street itself. There are several buildings of historic value, and also two Grade II Listed buildings (Clock House and The Mount). We enclose photographs, exemplary of the unique character of Leven Road.

Would it not be possible to designate a new Conservation Area along the lines of “Leven Conservation Area”? Just as the character of two and three storey buildings in long narrow plots is the predominant feature in Yarm Conservation Area so is the style of large houses in spacious grounds in the suburbs equally worthy of preservation showing a good mix of quality built heritage which blends together giving this area of Yarm its unique and unrepeatable character. If this new designation cannot be achieved, then emphasis on compilation of the Local List is of paramount importance as it is the only means of protecting this

The whole of Yarm is considered attractive and a pleasant place to live, however the Conservation Area is designed to protect those parts that have special character worthy of protection. The suggested areas do have an attractive character, but it is not ‘special’ nor is it shared with that found in the defined Conservation Area: the buildings suggested do not match the tight-knit Georgian Market Town layout character of the Peninsula. The Appraisal goes to great lengths to justify the boundary review, and no compelling evidence has been put forward to contradict the findings.

Insofar as designating a new Conservation Area to take in these areas, the Council is not of the opinion that there is any historic interest in Goospastures or The Spital, save that already included in the Conservation Area. Most development here is on 1960-1980 construction, with an occasional newer or older dwelling. There is no particular character or development pattern to pin a Conservation Area upon. Where there are individual buildings of merit, these would be better included on the Local List, rather than in a piecemeal Conservation Area. Whilst it is undoubtedly an affluent and attractive area, it is not possessed of any ‘special’ character.

With regard to Leven Road, there are more buildings that could be worthy of some protection as each is unique, set in large plots. Nevertheless there are also a number of unremarkable buildings present, and no real character save the fact they are in large plots. This does not constitute a ‘special’ interest and subsequently there is no merit in designating an additional Conservation Area. Those buildings considered of above-average quality should be nominated for inclusion on the Local List.

The Local List is a priority upon Adoption of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder SPD.

area of unique character and charm.

We are optimistically encouraged by many of the statements made in this chapter relating to “other non-designated historic areas” which states that the Council recognises that there is a “significant attachment from local people who value the character and/or appearance of their area” and that “the Council recognises that these places comprise a historic environment setting and strong character and community identity. Therefore any change or development should maintain this local character in the widest sense.” It is also extremely commendable that the Council have listened to the recent comments from the community regarding certain planning applications and have recognised that a strategic approach is not adopted then such developments (involving developments of large plots of garden land, demolition of large detached housing and the replacement with higher density development) will contribute hugely to the loss of character within such areas that can never be regained.

Whilst these statements recognise the importance of these areas, there is no Policy which provides any protection, and some of the statements in the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder are not specific enough and too open to interpretation. The statement “SPD are used in preparing and determining planning applications, but where there are overriding circumstances it can be set aside”. We feel that further clarification of the “overriding circumstances” needs to be included in this document to enable clear understanding from the public point of view.

We would also seek further clarification of the statement “where development proposals are contrary to any of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder advice, it must be demonstrated that the development will not harm the integrity of the Borough’s built heritage. How would you expect that to be demonstrated?”

Support for the ‘Other non-designated areas’ chapter welcome.

The status of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder as a Supplementary Planning Document is set out in the introduction. It is not Policy, and nor can it be considered Policy. It gives additional guidance on applying the established policies. SPD is written to be guidance, but must also be flexible enough to accommodate a range of possible development options. Where material considerations warrant, the SPD may be set aside, although it is not possible to list every potential eventuality where this may occur.

As above, the status of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder as a Supplementary Planning Document is set out in the introduction. It is not Policy, and nor can it be considered Policy. It gives additional guidance on applying the established policies. SPD is written to be guidance, but must also be flexible enough to accommodate a range of possible development options. Where material considerations warrant, the SPD may be set aside, although it is not possible to list every potential eventuality where this may occur. It is up to the developer to demonstrate that there is no harm from a proposed development and any evidence put forward will be scrutinised.

<p>It is encouraging to read that it is the Council’s intention to develop existing and new policies to give greater emphasis to our built heritage as we feel that current policy does not afford our built heritage including privately owned important green areas adequate consideration.</p>	<p>The policy framework is considered adequate, but dating rapidly in the context of newer Government guidance, case law and indeed the new planning legislation and the LDF system. The Local Development Scheme sets out the Council’s commitment to progressing new policies through to Adoption, and the continued involvement of the public is welcome.</p>
<p>CPRE C/o 26 Ashville Avenue Eaglescliffe Stockton on Tees TS16 9AX</p>	
<p>As we forecast would become the case 5 years ago, traditional Eaglescliffe is starting to disappear. Yarm Road is getting commercialised and is about to change forever. Through fighting sometimes bitter campaigns, the line has been held to a degree. The Garth and Witham Lodge have both very sadly gone, to be replaced by flats. Burlington House was only saved from demolition by the onset of the Conservation Area and then converted to flats. The domino effect is however already happening. The neighbouring property to the Garth, 690 Yarm Road, has an application in to build high density flats in the gardens. Slightly further along is the proposed new residential nursing home. There are as you are aware, concerns about the emergence of a second Yarm Road through backland development on its west side. The Whole of The Avenue junction is already under extreme pressure with the proposed McCarthy and Stone residential development, Copsewood with buildings in the garden, the Clairville with an application to demolish and redevelop and the problem redevelopment at Hughenden and Station Road.</p> <p>A frequent rationale for this type of development is that nowadays there is not the demand for large traditional houses set in large gardens. This has never been the case in this part of Yarm Road. However if the current pace of development is allowed to continue it eventually will become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The top line of professionals, managers and entrepreneurs who like traditional properties and have up until now been attracted to the area will now think twice. They wish to live adjacent to family houses where their children can have friends and not be dominated, surrounded, and often overlooked by flats, houses in multiple occupation, high density housing or institutional buildings. This could</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to debate specific applications in this document.</p> <p>The Council is aware that it is inevitable that affluent areas such as Eaglescliffe will be attractive to developers, and the large gardens that are by definition “brownfield” means that there is a large supply of easily-developed land. The Council is sympathetic to the feelings of local residents and will therefore strive to manage the inevitable change when dealing with planning applications in the most appropriate manner. Nevertheless, it is the role of the Planning system to support development, and only refuse planning permission where there is demonstrable harm. Through working together with developers, local people and other stakeholders, the Council seeks to ensure that areas do not stagnate, but also that any development is appropriate.</p> <p>The housing market is complex, and ultimately it is the individual who will choose which area to live in. The Government wishes to see dynamic mixed communities where there is a choice of housing, and the recent developments contribute to this. Change is inevitable as fashions come and go, and although this may not be to everybody’s agreement, the Council seeks to manage development in the most appropriate manner.</p>

have serious economic repercussions for Stockton. Eventually, unless the area, rather than individual buildings, is given a degree of protection it will go the same way as the north part of Yarm Road, which was once a desirable residential area.

This is why we cannot accept certain parts of the Policy regarding the extension of Conservation Areas. We have surveyed the whole of the Yarm Road area and have listed all the buildings: Victorian, Edwardian and thirties that we consider are worthy of individual protection. They amount to over 60. Sometimes they run together in large groups sometimes they do not. Some of them would no longer be desirable if a large development eg flats or nursing home were to be built up to their boundary fence. Your department recognised this problem when at my request, they agreed to change the wording of SPG4 to add “groups of buildings” in 4.3 in addition to “buildings”.

All your comments on the EWPCA Appraisal “Justification for CA status” and para2 in “Important Views and Townscapes” apply equally well to the west side of Yarm Road to South View and the boundary should be extended to this point. Any perceived difficulty in “policing it” should have no bearing whatsoever on the decision! A “no change” to the eastern boundary is also not acceptable. You are aware that when English Heritage reluctantly said they were unable to list Southlands, one of their comments was that they understood that The Avenue might be included in a Conservation Area. They have also stated that the River facing houses of Tees Bank Ave also deserve protection. As a minimum the boundary should be increased to include the south side of The Avenue, the east side of Tees Bank Avenue and the south side of Ashville Avenue. This would not involve “jumping Yarm Road to include a handful of houses in a piecemeal fashion”. All of the dwellings on the south side of The Avenue justify conservation as the smaller houses of the same period existed to support the large villas.

We are also extremely concerned with your comments in the paragraph above “justification for CA Status”. This Conservation Area has been in existence since 2002. The Council must have therefore been aware of any “unsympathetic alterations” that have taken place since. Why were they not opposed? I am encouraged by your proposal to “blanket apply Article 4 Directions to all land

The nominations for the Local List will be considered in due course, and the Council is grateful for the interest shown in the project.

All proposed development must be sympathetic to its surroundings, and the Council ensures that all planning applications are scrutinised to ensure that this is the case. This applies both to neighbouring buildings, and also to the wider street scene and groups of buildings. Where development proposals are found to be inappropriate, planning permission is refused.

The boundary review for Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area is explicit in its justification for maintaining the current boundary. The Council do not contend the point that there are some fine examples on the eastern side of Yarm Road, but as set out at length in the Conservation Area Appraisal, they do not share the character of Eaglescliffe With Preston Conservation Area. English Heritage state that there may be some justification for a new Conservation Area to be designated, but they also acknowledge that it would be difficult to define as there are too many unworthy buildings between and surrounding the best examples. Conservation Area status is not a tool for preventing development but to manage change. Therefore the Council wishes to pursue a Local List to give protection to the best examples without compromising the status associated with Conservation Areas elsewhere.

It is acknowledged that some recent developments have been carried out with the Council’s approval, however there are many more that do not require any form of planning consent and together they collectively harm the Conservation Area. The application of Article 4 Directions will go some way to improving the situation, and the management plan

within each CA boundary” but if lack of Article 4 directions was a factor, why was it not proposed to add them earlier? We are astonished that these “unsympathetic alterations” could “put the future of the Conservation Area in jeopardy”. It was and is the Council’s responsibility to protect it.

We are also encouraged by many of your comments in “Other non-designated historic areas” particularly your acknowledgement that redevelopment/demolition of large detached housing and/or the development of their gardens “can contribute to the loss of character in such areas” but would make the point that many of the statements oppose each other and can mean “all things to all men”. For example: “The Council is committed to maintaining the character of its older areas – but will not allow them to become pickled in time and stagnate”. Also, “housing intensification will only be suitable in certain areas where local character, the range of amenities and public transport can support greater density”. In some parts the amenities and the transport might be there but the local character could be lost. Is this a statement that all three have to be achieved before housing intensification is achieved?

I now refer to the “Conservation Areas document EN25 [chapter 6]. “The demolition of buildings and other structures which require consent for demolition within Conservation Areas will not be permitted unless “the structural condition renders it unsafe” and “The structure is beyond reasonable economic repair”. These two statements [Policy criteria] are a developer’s charter and I am sure you would agree the oldest trick in the book. A new statement EN25 [additional criterion in the Policy] should be added@ “If a building has been deliberately allowed to deteriorate or deliberately damaged by the owner/developer then permission to demolish will be withheld”

As regards the Local List I have attached our proposals for Eaglescliffe and Egglescliffe. I have also seen and endorse the Yarm list prepared by Yarm

is proposed so that over time any unsympathetic work can be removed and replaced. Text added: “*In order to pursue this aim, the Council will organise information events and invite residents and businesses in the Conservation Areas to attend to explain the process and procedures of Article 4 Directions. These meetings will be held with a view to having the Article 4 Directions in place (where they are supported by residents and businesses) by the end of 2007.*” It is a collective responsibility to maintain and improve the Conservation Area, and to that end the Council is eager to work with developers and local residents and business owners to achieve the best for the area.

Support welcome. Supplementary Planning Documents must be flexible, demonstrating the Council’s balanced approach by setting out how decisions will be made. SPD is intended to guide developers and therefore it must offer encouragement and controls to assist in managing development proposals. Some ambiguity is therefore inevitable, and sentences should not be read in isolation. Overall it is the thrust of the document to protect and enhance the Conservation Areas and other historic assets.

With regard to increasing densities and development of flats, the Council’s adopted SPG4 sets out the Council’s stance on this and it is not considered necessary to repeat that guidance here.

Policy EN25 is an Adopted Policy taken from the Adopted Local Plan 1997 and it is not possible to amend it through this process.

Nominations gratefully received.

<p>Residents Assoc. Time has meant that we do not have the detail on the individual buildings, however the photographs and I presume site visits, should tell the story. We have included some examples of traditional thirties suburban houses that nevertheless add to the character of the area. However I would emphasise that, as stated earlier, we see the extension of the Conservation Area boundaries as the most logical and sensible route. Those areas not within Conservation Area boundaries and where the number of buildings proposed represent a high proportion, should be given an area rather than individual listing.</p>	<p>The extension of the Conservation Areas have been discussed at length in the individual appraisals.</p>
---	--

ENGLISH HERITAGE

Alan Hunter

Regional Planner

Bessie Surtees House

Newcastle

<p>EH is delighted that Stockton Borough Council is taking on this significant body of work as a SPD at this stage of the LDF process.</p> <p>P5: EH has objected to the wording of RSS policy 34 where under (g), (h) and (j) local Authorities are only required to <i>consider</i> undertaking the tasks described</p> <p>P32: 4% of the region’s listed buildings matches closely the regional average per authority. In order to avoid any ambiguity I would point out that the 1948 Rule was not introduced in 1948.</p> <p>P33: Some possible alterations to listed buildings may not necessarily amount to development as such.</p> <p>P44: The application of a blanket Article 4 direction requires caution. Government Policy is to advise circumspection regarding the imposition of additional controls over property owners.</p>	<p>Support welcome.</p> <p>At the time of writing this was the most up to date wording of RSS. The most up-to-date wording will be used at the time of Adoption. Nevertheless, the Council is committed to following the advice of RSS whether it is a requirement of a suggestion.</p> <p>Additional information gratefully received. Agreed – the 1948 rule was not when legislation was introduced. Delete reference.</p> <p>Partially agree – although some works may not be “development” in the context of the principal Act, the emphasis is on ensuring Listed Buildings are cared for in the most appropriate manner, and the advice is to seek professional help from the Historic Buildings Officer who will advise on the work itself, as well as any necessary consents.</p> <p>Agreed – the management plan will be amended to reflect this. Instead of forcing Article4 Directions, the Plan will be to undertake further consultation with those directly affected in order to achieve consensus on the most appropriate way forward. This is a significant change to the</p>
--	---

<p>P48: there is a spelling mistake in the first caption</p> <p>P51: The caption is misleading, insofar as it infers that it is not only the colour which is original. However the door on the right appears not to be original. Not only are the tarmac sets poor, they are also unnecessary.</p> <p>P144: the juxtaposition of the two photographs could draw unfavourable suggestions that the public art on the right also constitutes street clutter.</p> <p>P212: Whilst I appreciate that the key message must be to properly maintain existing properties where they are possessed of some local value, care must also be taken to avoid condoning the use of, for example, inappropriate door and window detailing, even though such alterations are often reversible with the right sort of guidance and support.</p> <p>P214: better linkage between general encouragement and support for safeguarding local distinctiveness and good practice in terms of detailing would assist here.</p> <p>P216: The North of England Civic Trust could usefully be added to the list of contacts.</p>	<p>Management Plan, but is essential in order to ensure that additional controls are agreeable. Text added: <i>“In order to pursue this aim, the Council will organise information events and invite residents and businesses in the Conservation Areas to attend to explain the process and procedures of Article 4 Directions. These meetings will be held with a view to having the Article 4 Directions in place (where they are supported by residents and businesses) by the end of 2007.”</i></p> <p>Typographical error</p> <p>Agree – the caption requires amending. However, the text sets out the key features of doors in the Conservation Area. Text added <i>“Original colour, but the door on the right is modern and of the wrong design for this period.”</i></p> <p>Agree – caption changed.</p> <p>It is considered that the document makes it clear that traditional detailing is important, but also that inappropriate development is damaging – including well-intentioned but poor work. Throughout the document help and advice is offered by the Council.</p> <p>It is not clear where improvement is needed, as no suggestion is put forward. Therefore no change is made.</p> <p>Agreed – contact added.</p>
--	--

One North East
Regional Development Agency
Stella House
Goldcrest Way
Newburn Riverside
Newcastle
NE15 8NY
enquiries@onenortheast.co.uk
0191 229 6200

One North East welcomes and endorses your Council's intention to provide a SPD to include all the Council's Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans. The Agency has no specific comments to make regarding this draft SPD.

Support most welcome.

Other changes

The maps used in some of the Consultation drafts for the Conservation Areas were taken from the 1997 Local Plan. Some boundaries were amended in c2000 and therefore the maps are incorrect in a number of places where minor adjustments have been made. The maps used in the final draft show clearly the new boundaries, including any amendments made as a result of the consultation process. There is no need to re-consult on the new boundaries where they include additional buildings, as they were agreed in c2000 at the time of the review. The Council apologises for any confusion this may have caused.

The final draft of the Conservation and Historic Environment Folder shows the c2000 review boundaries, together with any amendments proposed in the 2006 consultation. Therefore these maps are to be considered the definitive boundaries.

The Conservation and Historic Environment Folder was initially intended to be a series of smaller documents split across the Borough. From the Consultation it is clear that a single Folder made up of individual chapters is easiest to navigate. This will allow people to select the chapter they are most interested in and avoid having to read numerous chapters of little relevance to them.

Change made to delete the references to numerous smaller folders.

Text added: “

Stockton Appraisal:

Brunswick Methodist Chapel

Text added: “~~and is currently being considered for inclusion~~ in 2006 was added to the English heritage”

Item also inserted into Listed Buildings chapter.

The Globe Theatre

Text added: “It is currently unused, however a feasibility study is under way to look at options for securing its future.”

West Row	Text added: <i>“Loss of various buildings have created gap[sites notably in the West Row area, thus creating opportunities for new development.”</i>
Castlegate Centre	Text added: <i>“(including a former brewery)”</i>
The yards	Text added: <i>“with an emphasis on creative uses”</i> Text added: <i>“Also, many small independent businesses are found here.”</i> Text added: <i>“with an emphasis on creative businesses. The rear of the High Street is unwelcoming.”</i>
Important views	Text added: <i>“Views into the Conservation Area are limited and the skyline is often dominated and ruined by the 1960’s Swallow Hotel. From some views the interesting roof of the new Baptist Tabernacle draws the eye. There is a distinct and unusual separation of the High Street and the River, with precious few views or vistas between them, and of these none are particularly interesting. Some of the best views of both are to be had form the roof top car park atop the Castlegate Centre.”</i>
Positive aspects	Text added: <i>“although much of the historic fabric above ground floor remains intact.”</i>
Signage.	Text Added: <i>“No examples of complete early shop fronts survive in place, however some were removed and re-erected in Preston Hall Museum in the period street.”</i>
Street furniture	Text added: <i>“The best examples are those found on the river front”</i>
Management plan	Text added: <i>“Investigate and pursue a Townscape Heritage Initiative funding bid.”</i>
History chapter	Insert text: <i>“but a restoration scheme completed in 2006 returned the park to its former glory. “</i> Text added: <i>“Following extensive public consultation, the Conservation</i>

Introduction chapter	<i>and Historic Environment Folder was amended in line with comments received, and then put back before Planning Committee on 15 November 2006, and Cabinet on 30 November 2006. The CaHEF was formally adopted for use on 17 January 2007 by Full Council.”</i>
Local List	Remove details of how to nominate a building – this will be undertaken every 2 years in its own special consultation, and therefore this information is no longer necessary in the SPD.
Conservation Areas	Text added: <i>“The defined boundaries of a Conservation Area should not be considered the absolute limit of the historic interest. Indeed, the setting of the Conservation Area can be just as important as the Conservation Area itself, as development adjacent a Conservation Area can have just as great an impact on the character. Although development outside the Conservation Area boundary is not subject to as many controls, the Council will fully consider any development for its effect on a Conservation Area, and determine a planning application accordingly.”</i>

Conservation and Historic Environment Folder Sustainability Appraisal Representations and Council responses.

English Nature Alex Staddon Conservation Officer English Nature Northumbria Team Alex.Staddon@English-Nature.Org.UK	
<p>This letter is provided as the formal response of English Nature to your request for advice or information under Directive 2001/42/EC (the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive) for this plan or programme.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that you have consulted “<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment and Biodiversity: Guidance for Practitioners</i>” (paragraph 1.4) in order to ensure the plan takes adequate account of biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna.</p> <p>This opinion is based on the information provided by you, and for the avoidance of doubt does not affect our obligation to advise on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan or programme which is the subject of this consultation, and which may despite SEA have adverse effects on the environment.</p>	<p>Support Welcome</p>
SUZIE SHAW Planning Liaison Officer Tel. 01904 822543 Email. suzie.shaw@environment-agency.gov.uk	
<p>Chapter 7: Identifying Sustainability Issues and Problems Flood Risk</p> <p>It is not clear what is meant by the following '.....it will continue to be important to balance negative and positive consequences'. This should be replaced with the following '.....it will continue to be important to ensure new development does not have a detrimental effect on flood risk'.</p> <p>The defences at Yarm are not 1:100 but 1:60. This should be amended.</p>	<p>Agreed – already noted in Appendix to SA</p> <p>This is not explicitly mentioned in either the SA or the report, but is</p>

Chapter 8

We note that the Sustainability Appraisal is based on the objectives and indicators set out in the Draft Scoping Report of higher level DPDs and the comments received in relation to this have been taken into consideration where appropriate. It would be helpful if amendments were documented so it is clear where changes have been made.

We also note that there have been amendments to the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives following our comments and we welcome the changes. We would, however, ask that SA Objective 14 is amended to include 'property' as well as people.

Appendix 2

There is no mention of the Groundwater Directive or of the Environment Agency's 'Tidal Tees Flood Risk Management Strategy which we mentioned as a relevant plan/programme in our previous response (DN/2005/006182-1/1). This should be included.

We would suggest that Draft PPS25: Development and Flood Risk should be included within the list of relevant plans and programmes.

=====

The Environment Agency note that our previous comments (ref:DN/2005/006182-2/1) have been accepted by the council with the exception of our request to amend the level of protection at Yarm defences from 1:100 to 1:60. We therefore request that this amendment is made.

The Agency has no further comments to make on the SPD.

included in the Scoping Report. Future reports will note this important information.

Changes have been documented in the appendix. It is considered that in the interests of readability that changes are not highlighted in the main report. This table of responses highlights the changes made.

Agreed – already noted in Appendix to SA. Previous response: “Agree”

Agreed – already noted in Appendix to SA. Previous response: “Agreed. This has been an oversight and they will be included. The consultation draft of the ‘Tidal Tees Management Strategy’ was published in March prior to the publication of the Scoping Report and will now be included.”

Agree – already actioned.

(repeat representation) This is not explicitly mentioned in either the SA or the report, but is included in the Scoping Report. Future reports will note this important information. (repeat representation)

English Nature
Jenny Loring, English Nature Northumbria Team
Designations, Development Planning and Data, Northumbria Team, Stocksfield Hall, Stocksfield, Northumberland, NE43 7TN
STD: 01661 845508
GTN: 6666 5508
Fax: 01661 845501
email: jenny.loring@english-nature.org.uk

Thank you for consulting English Nature on the above plan, with regard to the provision of data and the scoping report for the Historic Environment Folder.

This letter is provided as the formal response of English Nature to your request for advice or information under Directive 2001/42/EC (the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive) for this plan or programme.

English Nature consider LDFs in the context of PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation; thus we look to see appropriate consideration of designated sites, protected species, ancient woodland, habitats of principal importance and habitat networks, including cumulative effects. This should encompass protection of existing features, identify opportunities to maintain, create and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity resources and the encouragement of access to suitable sites and areas. PPS9 Policies 4-16 specifically address issues to be addressed in LDFs. The entire LDF process should be reviewed and the assessment carried out in the context of these National Planning Policies which set out a spectrum of issues to be addressed in spatial planning at the local level.

Comments noted. Actioned where appropriate.

PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation published by ODPM 16 August is available at http://www.odpm.gov.uk/embedded_object.asp?id=1143833 and the accompanying Government Circular: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system (ODPM 06/2005, Defra 01/2005) <http://www.planninghelp.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/51E3F3F7-6F17-4E26-A570-87908B964400/0/062005.pdf>

Scoping Report

The scoping report must recognise the issues of protected species in building particularly those where restoration, conversion, extension or demolition is proposed for any building, property or structure where protected species have their roosts, nests or other places of shelter. Government Circular ODPM 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system' sets out the statutory provisions with regard these issues. Bats are perhaps the most likely protected species likely to be affected, with summer maternity or winter hibernation roosts in, for example, residential properties, derelict structures, historic monuments, outbuildings, bridges etc. Other species including great crested newts, otters and water voles should be considered where open water or associated habitats might be affected.

I attach, for reference, our current guidance on protected species issues. We are expecting updated guidance to be available shortly.

We have considered the information provided by you at the scoping stage of the SEA assessment process in order to give particular attention to the likely effects of the plan or programme on biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna and to consider the likely effects on soil, water and landscape in so far as these are necessary to support biodiversity, flora and fauna.

In order to assess the plan in the context of Biodiversity, geodiversity and other nature conservation interests, we would look to see an evaluation of likely impacts (direct or indirect) on designated sites, protected species, wildlife corridors, habitat fragmentation and related drainage, including cumulative effects. This should encompass protection of existing features and identify opportunities to create and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity resources.

I attach Annex 1 which sets out generic information which English Nature expect to see included in the SEA process across North East, along with some specific to the plan area being assessed here.

To understand the general background to this advice, and in order that any later or alternative versions of the plan or programme take adequate account of biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna, we recommend that you consult “*Strategic Environmental Assessment and Biodiversity: Guidance for Practitioners*” which can be downloaded from our website at <http://www.english-nature.org.uk/pubs/publication/PDF/SEAbiodiversityGuide.pdf> and which is also available on CD-Rom by telephone or written request to this office.

This opinion is based on the information provided by you, and for the avoidance of doubt does not affect our obligation to advise on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan or programme which is the subject of this consultation, and which may despite SEA have adverse effects on the environment.

Countryside Agency
Rachel Oxley
North East Regional Office, Countryside Agency,
0191 2159502

Draft Scoping report SA and SEA for the Historic Environment
Thank you for consulting the Countryside Agency on the above scoping report please find some information attached which I hope you will find helpful.

The Countryside Agency Landscape, Access and Recreation Division (LAR) is responsible for advising government and taking action on issues relating to:

conserving and protecting our natural landscapes and all their characteristics
encouraging awareness of, access to and enjoyment of the countryside and green spaces
achieving the sustainable management and use of the countryside

In relation to the European Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), the Government has designated four Agencies – the Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency as ‘authorities with environmental responsibility’ which must be consulted during the SEA assessment process.

Comments noted. Actioned where appropriate.

Our SEA role embraces only those interests that we consider ‘environmental’ ie:

landscape character and quality
visual amenity and enjoyment of the countryside as a whole
recreational opportunities
enjoyment of access land or a public right of way

Due to limited staff resources we are not able to have detailed involvement in every SEA.

Although we rarely hold information that is not already in the public domain or in possession of local authorities we produce a wide range of literature which sets out our views and guidance on these aspects. They can therefore assist with consideration of issues and the establishment of baseline information against which to measure changes.

This information is detailed in our publications catalogue or available through our national or regional website (www.countryside.gov.uk). Lists of some relevant local and national publications and research are enclosed for information. In particular the following publications may be of particular interest in relation to your enquiry:

The state of the countryside, 2005. (This can be accessed through the national website: www.countryside.gov.uk).

The state of the countryside in the North East, 2004. (This can be accessed through our regional website: www.countryside.gov.uk/regions/northeast).

A copy of our revised planning policy statement Planning Principles for Landscape, Access and Recreation – moving on from ‘Planning tomorrow’s countryside’ is enclosed for your information. This provides advice to local planning authorities, to the Government, and to developers on how the planning system should operate and evolve to achieve out LAR objectives.

National Planning Position Statements and North East planning related briefing notes. These briefing notes are designed to offer North East planning officers an

informative view of various rural issues and to offer practical guidance whilst exploring topics in the context of sustainable development and the Agency's planning propositions contained in our planning policy publication 'Planning tomorrow's countryside'. A list of the briefing notes is enclosed and they can be accessed through our regional website.

LANDSCAPE

Our landscape interests include the effects of the plan or programme on the conservation of National Parks, AONBs or Heritage Coasts. They also cover our aspirations for future local landscape character, for which we will largely rely on the sources below :

Countryside Character Volume 1: North East. This contains details of the countryside character areas covered by your council, and sections on 'Shaping the Future' and can be obtained from Countryside Agency publications at the address on the enclosed national publications list.

Extensions to this approach through our Countryside Quality Counts work (www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk) and agri-environmental material;

Local landscape character assessments, where we agree with them;

Landscape policies in development plans, local development frameworks and other documents, where we agree with them;

Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland April 2002;

Countryside Character Network - (www.ccnetwork.org.uk);

National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and Heritage Coast Management Plans, where we agree with them.

ACCESS AND RECREATION

<p>Potential impacts on access land, public open land and rights of way should be fully considered.</p> <p>In terms of rights of way, particular attention should be paid to the Pennine Way National Trail, Cleveland Way National Trail and Hadrian’s Wall National Trail. The National Trails website (www.nationaltrails.gov.uk) provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer.</p> <p>The Countryside Agency has a statutory duty under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to prepare maps of all open countryside and registered common land in England which have new rights of access. Further information on this process and copies of maps can be found at www.openaccess.gov.uk</p> <p>For technical support and advice concerning Strategic Environmental Assessments we would suggest you obtain advice from the ODPM, the Local Government Association or Government Office for the North East.</p>	
<p>ENGLISH HERITAGE Alan Hunter Regional Planner Bessie Surtees House Newcastle</p>	
<p>Draft objectives: include Objective (d) of dealing with the Management Culture. This objective could usefully be explained to include the social and economic regeneration benefits of positively utilising the historic environment.</p> <p>P245: it is concluded that the production of the Folder would have no positive benefit on the SA Objective concerning the reduction of waste. However, in the context of housing market renewal I believe there could be significant benefits.</p> <p>P247: in general terms much more needs to be done to improve baseline indicators and targets in respect of the historic environment. I am more than happy to work with you to improve this aspect of the appraisal process.</p>	<p>It is considered unnecessary to do this as the SA is already lengthy and complex, and adding in more – albeit very useful – information would become unwieldy. No change.</p> <p>No details of the benefits are put forward, and therefore no change can be made. The Council is satisfied that there are no <i>direct</i> benefits of the CaHEF on the reduction of waste.</p> <p><i>Assistance in improving monitoring and baseline indicators is most welcome. The Management Plan is amended to reflect English Heritage’s offer of assistance in developing a more effective monitoring system for use in the Annual monitoring Report.</i></p>

OTHER CHANGES TO THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Changed para 1.1 to give a brief summary of the aims of the SPD.

Para 1.2 text added to inform how Sustainability Appraisals assess SPDs and DPDs.

Para 1.7 added to sum up the Sustainability Appraisal findings.

Changed para 3.1 to give a brief summary of the SPD. Remaining Paragraph numbers changed accordingly.

Inserted new chapter 4, mainly a shorter version of that found in the scoping report which details the links to other relevant plans and programmes, highlighting the SEA directive requirements and listing those plans or programmes relevant.

Inserted a new chapter 5, which gives a summary of the baseline condition and issues, again a shorter version of that found in the scoping report

Former chapter 4 now renumbered to chapter 6, paragraph numbers changed accordingly

Former chapter 5 is now chapter 7. Paragraph numbers changed accordingly

Text added to paragraph 7.5, concerning the iterative process of the Sustainability Appraisal and the future monitoring.

Former chapter 6 is now chapter 8. Paragraph numbers changed accordingly

Statement of Consultation

Under Section 17 (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council must prepare a consultation statement to accompany the draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder Supplementary Planning Document. It is also understood that the draft Supplementary Planning Document cannot be adopted until this is included and adopted within the Council's revised Local Development Scheme brought into effect April 2006.

The draft Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder Supplementary Planning Document was prepared in partnership with the Council's Development Plans Team, Development Control Team and the Historic Buildings Officer. English Heritage and Tees Archaeology were also involved in the preparation of the draft document prior to the formal consultation period.

In order to give maximum publicity, the Council followed the programme set out in Statement of Community Involvement for consulting on new documents. An advertisement was published in the Evening Gazette on 22 May 2006 explaining the document had been published for a six-consultation period ending 3 July 2006. The advertisement also gave an outline of the document, details of where copies of the document would be made available and contact details for further information.

Copies were made available free of charge in the Council's Planning Reception, Church Road, and the Council's eleven local libraries and the mobile library service. The document was also made available to download free of charge from the Council's website (www.stockton.gov.uk), together with a statement explaining the content of the document and the consultation procedure. Copies of the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder were also available to purchase for £10 or £5 for a paper copy or digital copy respectively.

Letters were sent to the Statutory bodies, Parish and Town Councils, and other interested parties whose contact details are held on the Council's database, informing them of the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder consultation, and some organisations received complimentary copies (English Heritage, Government Office etc). To further promote the consultation exercise, Officers attended various public and organisations' meetings, including the Area Partnership Boards.

To meet the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, the Council consulted the four key environmental bodies together with those organisations with a local sustainability interest (as set out in the SEA Regulations) on the scope and level of detail of the environmental information to be included in the Sustainability Appraisal report. A schedule of representations and council responses is included in Appendix 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal report.

The Consultation period expired on 3 July 2006, and the Council received a number of representations from interested parties to both the Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder itself and also to the Sustainability Appraisal. These responses were considered, and where necessary amendments were made to the CaHEF document. A schedule of these representations is included at the end of the adopted SPD, together with the Council's responses. These form part of the CaHEF and carry the same weight as the main document text.

The Conservation Areas and Historic Environment Folder SPD was put back before Planning Committee on 15 November 2006, and before Cabinet on 4 January 2007, and subject to their endorsement the document will be formally adopted by Full Council on 17 January 2007. If by 18 April (a statutory 6-week period from the date of Adoption) no legal challenge has been lodged against the SPD, then the SPD cannot be challenged.