

**Stockton-on-Tees**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

## APPENDIX D

CONSULTATION STATEMENT RELATING TO THE  
PREFERRED OPTIONS

CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
DOCUMENT  
PROPOSED SUBMISSION DRAFT

STOCKTON ON TEES LOCAL DEVELOPMENT  
FRAMEWORK

July 2008



---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

- 1.1 This statement outlines the consultation processes undertaken in the preparation of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) for publication.
- 1.2 This statement outlines the extent of the consultation carried out with stakeholders and the public, in addition to setting out the responses received through public consultation exercises.

### **Consultation related to Issues and Options for Stockton Borough**

- 1.3 The Core Strategy: Consultation Statement related to Issues and Options (September 2007) document provides information relating to consultation at this stage, and was published as part of a suite of documents at the Preferred Options stage. This provides details of local advertisements, consultees and meetings and a summary of comments received during this process. A copy of this document can be found on the Council's website at [www.stockton.gov.uk/corestrategy](http://www.stockton.gov.uk/corestrategy) or a copy obtained by contacting the Spatial Planning Team on 01642528557.

---

## 2.0 CONSULTATION RELATED TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS

---

### Development of the Preferred Options.

2.1 During the development of the Council's Preferred Options, a series of meetings were held, or attended, to inform the Core Strategy and identify more detailed issues for the Regeneration Development Plan Document.

2.2 Internal consultation took place with the following services:

- Regeneration (regular quarterly meetings);
- Building Schools for the future (monthly meetings?);
- Housing;
- Highways and Traffic Road Safety;
- Environmental Health;
- Parks and Countryside;
- Environmental Policy;
- Children, Education and Social Care;
- Business Development;
- Built and Natural Environment;
- Development Management; and
- Land and Property.

2.3 External meetings took place with:

- Health Improvement Partnership June 2007
- One Northeast July 2007

### Joint Meetings

2.4 During June and July 2007 officers from the Spatial Planning Section attended a number of Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) meetings and other group meetings with officers preparing the Sustainable Community Strategy. Details are set out in Appendix 1.

### Using other opportunities to raise awareness

2.5 In association with other services, the Spatial Planning section contributed towards the hire of a large mobile television screen which was displaying in Stockton Town Centre. This was present during core retail hours for 6 days between the 13<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> September 2007. This screen displayed an advert identifying issues relating to the Local Development Framework, and advertised the forthcoming consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.

2.6 When invited, other opportunities to raise the public profile of the Core Strategy were taken. These included attending:

- A "Tell us what you think event" for BME communities (September 2007)
- A special meeting of the Disability Action Group, similar to other "Tell us what you think" events (December 2007);
- A "Tell us what you think" event for the Faith Communities (May 2008).

## **Public Consultation – 28<sup>th</sup> September to 9<sup>th</sup> November 2007**

2.7 Following the publication of the document, the Council began a six-week public consultation by contacting people via post, publishing information in local newspapers and preparing a series of exhibitions.

### **Public Consultation**

2.8 In order to have further input into the preparation of the Core Strategy DPD, a wider consultation exercise was carried out. This included neighbouring local authorities, parish councils and neighbouring parish councils, key stakeholders and members of the public. A list of consultees is attached at Appendix 2.

2.9 In accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), the initial consultation exercise was advertised in the local press (see below). Letters were also sent out to those on the consultation database and members of Stockton Residents and Communities Groups Association. Members of the Residents' Panel were notified by e-mail, where possible. The feedback from the consultation is set out in Appendix 3.

### **Local Press**

2.10 The publication of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document and the related consultation were advertised in the public notices sections of the Evening Gazette and Herald and Post newspapers on the 28<sup>th</sup> September and 3<sup>rd</sup> October respectively. The on-going consultation was also highlighted in the autumn edition of Stockton News, free publication delivered to all properties within the Borough. Publicity was also given to a number of related exhibitions (see below) through press releases. Examples of articles published in local newspapers are displayed at Appendix 4

## **Public Exhibitions**

### **The Core Strategy and Regeneration DPD consultation launch**

2.11 For this event the Spatial Planning Section invited members of the public, residents groups, and stakeholders who had registered on the Council's LDF consultation database, to the, "Core Strategy and Regeneration DPD Consultation Launch". During this event there was a short presentation of the content and implications of the documents followed by an opportunity for attendees to view related exhibitions and discuss relevant issues with Council officers. A similar invitation was extended to Council officers aimed at raising corporate awareness of these documents within other Council departments (see Appendix 5).

### **Libraries and Supermarkets**

2.12 In order to further engage with members of the public, a number of staffed and un-staffed public exhibitions were organised. These commenced with an exhibition touring the Borough's libraries through mid to late October staying in each location for 2 days. Council officers staffed these exhibitions on one afternoon / early evening for each location. The table below shows the dates when the exhibitions were in each location.

Venue.	Exhibition dates.	Staffed Session
Billingham Branch Library	8th and 9th October.	9th October 2pm - 7pm.
Roseberry Library, Billingham	10th and 11th October.	10th October 2pm - 7pm.
Thornaby Branch Library.	12th and 13th October.	12th October 2pm - 7pm.
Thornaby Central Library.	15th and 16th October.	16th October 2pm - 7pm.
Ragworth Library	17th and 18th October.	18th October 2pm - 7pm.
Egglescliffe Library	19th and 20th October.	19th October 2pm - 7pm.
Yarm Library	22nd and 23rd October.	23rd October 2pm - 7pm.
Ingleby Barwick Library	24th and 25th October.	25th October 2pm - 7pm.
Norton Library	26th and 27th October.	26th October 2pm - 7pm.

2.13 Whilst the library exhibitions were useful in raising the awareness of the documents and gaining feedback from the public it was considered that the exhibitions also needed to be situated in locations which were highly visible to the community. It was decided that the exhibition should be displayed and staffed by Council officers in local supermarkets. The table below shows when and where these events took place.

2.14 In Stockton and Billingham, local facilities such as Stockton Town Hall and Billingham Forum, which also have a significant footfall, were also considered suitable locations to hold exhibitions. Exhibitions were also held in the communities of Port Clarence and Wynyard.

Venue.	Date
Tesco Extra, Durham Road.	Monday 29th October 2007. 2pm – 7pm.
Sainsburys, Bishopton Road.	Tuesday 30th October 2007. 2pm – 7pm.
Stockton Town Hall	Wednesday 31st October 2007. 2pm – 7pm.
Tesco, Ingleby Barwick.	Thursday 1st November 2007. 2pm – 7pm.
Wynyard.	Friday 2nd November 2007. 2pm – 7pm.
Billingham Forum.	Monday 5th November 2007. 2pm – 7pm.
Clarence Community Centre.	Tuesday 6th November 2007. 2pm – 7pm.

### Post Preferred Options Consultation

2.15 Following receipt of comments, to assist with the preparation of the submission draft Core Strategy and to inform the Infrastructure Strategy, meetings were held with key stakeholders:

- Disability Action Group, January 2008;
- Water and Sewerage Services, (Northumbrian Water Ltd.; Hartlepool Water, February 2008;
- Transport Infrastructure (Highways Authority), March 2008;
- Town Centre Managers, April 2008;
- Health Infrastructure Providers, Hartlepool pct; North Tees PCT), April 2008;
- Education and Extended Schools, Adult and Children's Strategy, April 2008;
- Infrastructure Workshop, April 2008; (associated with preparation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment), involving:
  - Highways Agency
  - Network Rail
  - Environment Agency
  - Northumbrian Water Ltd.)
- Police Authority, June 2008;
- Environment Agency, July 2008.

### **Consultation in relation to the Evidence Base**

2.16 To support the Core Strategy, the Council has been compiling an evidence base. This comprises a series of studies referred to in Table \*\* of the Core Strategy. Consultation has been an integral part in the preparation of some of these studies, as follows:

- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: this has been the subject of two public consultation exercises (early in 2008 at the beginning of the preparation process to comment on the proposed methodology and submit sites for consideration, and upon completion of the assessment of sites August 2008) and a developer workshop to gain insight into developer views on the suitability, availability and achievability of sites;
- Employment Land Review: the preparation of this review involved a business survey, a visioning workshop and stakeholder interviews; and
- Open Space. Recreation and Landscape Study: public input into this study has been encouraged, with the involvement of the general public as well as specific groups such as young people and those with a disability, to establish views on existing provision and find out what people would like to be provided in terms of quantity, quality, type and location of facilities.

## APPENDIX 1

### Local Strategic Partnership, Area Partnership Board and Themed Board meetings attended.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting</b>
5th July 2007	Stockton Renaissance
6th June 2007	Setting the Standard
6th June 2007	Health Improvement Partnership
11th June 2007	Central Area Partnership Board
11th June 2007	Older Persons Consultation Group
12th June 2007	Town Centre Business Forum & Chamber of Commerce
13th June 2007	Setting the Standard
20th June 2007	Childrens Trust Board
21st June 2007	Stockton Disability Advisory Group
26th June 2007	Eastern Area Partnership Board
27th June 2007	Policy Officers Group
27th June 2007	BME Network
2nd July 2007	Billingham Partnership Board
3rd July 2007	Safer Stockton Partnership
3rd July 2007	Youth Assembly
4th July 2007	Housing and Neighbourhood Partnership
11th July 2007	Economic Regeneration & Transport Partnership
16th July 2007	Cllr Briefing seminar
17th July 2007	Adult care Partnership
18th July 2007	Environment Partnership
19th July 2007	Community Cohesion Sub group
30th July 2007	Western Area Partnership Board



## APPENDIX 2

### List of Consultees

#### Local Parish Councils

Aislaby & Newsham Parish Meeting  
Ingleby Barwick Town Council  
Carlton Parish Council  
Long Newton Parish Council  
Castle Levington & Kirklevington Parish Council  
Maltby Parish Council  
Thornaby on Tees Town Council  
Preston on Tees Parish Council

Billingham Town Council  
Redmarshall Parish Council  
Egglescliffe Parish Council  
Stillington & Whitton Parish Council  
Elton Parish Council  
Wolviston Parish Council  
Grindon Parish Council  
Yarm Town Council  
Hilton Parish Council  
Redmarshall Parish Council

#### Neighbouring Parish Councils and Local Authorities

Bishopton Parish Council  
Middleton St George Parish Council  
Crathorne Parish Council  
Mordon Parish Meeting  
Darlington Borough Council  
Newby Parish Council  
Durham County Council  
North Yorkshire County Council  
East and West Newbiggin Parish Meeting  
Picton Parish Council  
Elwick Parish Council  
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council  
Girsby Parish Council  
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

Great Stainton Parish Meeting  
Rudby Parish Council  
Greatham Parish Council  
Sadberge Parish Council  
Hambleton District Council  
Seamer Parish Council  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Sedgefield Borough Council  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Sedgefield Parish Council  
High and Low Worsall Parish Council  
Stainton and Thornton Parish Council  
Middlesbrough Borough Council

#### Other Organisations

Age Concern - Teesside  
Appletons Chartered Surveyors  
Asda Stores Limited  
Avecia  
B. T. Group plc  
B.T.C.V.  
Baines Goldston  
Banks Developments  
Barclays Bank  
Barratt Homes  
Barton Willmore

Bellway Homes  
Blackett Hart and Pratt LLP  
Blue Sky Planning Ltd  
BOC Gases  
British Gas (Northern)  
British Geological Survey  
British Land  
British Telecom  
British Waterways  
British Wind Energy Association  
Bryant Homes/ Taylor Woodrow  
Building Design Consultant

CABE  
Castlegate Shopping Centre  
Caterpillar Stockton  
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology  
Charles Church  
Childrens Society  
Chris Thomas Ltd  
Church Commissioners  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Cleveland County Fire Brigade  
Commission for Racial Equality  
Conaco Phillips Petroleum Co. UK  
Ltd  
Corporate Real Estate  
Council for British Archaeology  
Country Land and Business  
Association (NE)  
CPRE  
Culture North East  
Cyclists Touring Club / Sustrans  
Dalton Warner Davis Chartered  
Surveyors  
David Kitchen Associates  
Davis Planning Partnership  
DEFRA  
Department for Education and  
Employment  
Department for Transport  
Development Planning Partnership  
Devplan UK  
Disability Rights Commission  
Disabled Persons Transport  
Advisory Commission  
DPDS Consulting Group  
Drivers Jonas Chartered Surveyors  
DTZ Debenham  
Dunlop Hayward Planning  
Durham Diocesan Secretary  
Eaglescliffe Preservation Action  
Group  
Eastern Area Partnership Board  
Egglescliffe Youth Group  
Emolior  
Endeavour Housing Association  
Endeavour Partnership  
Energy Management Section  
England and Lyle  
English Heritage  
English Partnerships  
Environment Agency

Erinaceous Planning  
Esh Developments  
Farming and Wildlife Group  
Firstplan  
Forest Enterprise  
Forestry Commission (County  
Durham)  
Forestry Commission (Morpeth)  
Friends of Tees Heritage Park  
Friends of the Earth  
Fusion on Line Ltd  
GAP Investment and Development  
Ltd  
George F White (Estate Agent)  
George Wimpy - Strategic Land  
GO Northern  
Government Office for the North  
East  
Groundwork Trust  
H J Banks & Co. Ltd.  
Habinteg Housing Association  
Halcrow Group Limited  
Hanover Housing Association  
Hartburn Residents Association  
Hartlepool Water  
Health and Safety Executive, North  
East Area  
Highways Agency  
Historic Towns Forum  
HM Prison Service Estates  
Hobson 7 Smith, Builders  
Home Builders Federation  
Home Housing Association  
Home Office  
Homes by Woodford  
Housing Corporation (Leeds)  
Housing Corporation (London)  
Ian Derby Partnership  
Industry Nature Conservation  
Association  
Jackson Plan  
Jayline Travel  
Jeffrey Tarren & Associates  
JG Eaglescliffe (Holdings) Ltd  
John Potts Limited  
Joint Public Transport Group  
Lambton Smith Hampton  
Lovell  
Lovell Johns  
Malamute MacKenzie

Matthew Trotter & Miller Architects  
McInerney  
Medical Property Fund  
Metropolis PD  
Miller Homes  
Ministry of Defence  
Mobile Operators Association C/o  
Mono Consultants Limited  
Montague Evans  
Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners  
National Farmers Union  
National Grid  
National Offender Management  
Service  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
Network Rail Property  
North British Housing  
North East Assembly  
North East Chamber of Commerce  
North East Civic Trust  
North Star Housing Group  
North Tees NHS Transitional Care  
Office  
North Tees NHS Trust  
North Tees Primary Care Trust  
Northern Consortium of Housing  
Northern Electric and Gas  
Northern Gas Networks  
Northumbrian Water Ltd.  
Npower Renewables  
One North East  
One North East (RTT)  
Peacock and Smith  
Persimmon Homes  
Persimmon Homes Teesside  
Peter Wigglesworth Planning Ltd  
Philips Petroleum  
Planning Prospects  
Planning Team, Dickinson Dees  
LLP  
Preston Farm Developments  
Primeland Consultants Limited  
Property Search Group  
Property Services Agency (Crown  
Property)  
Railtrack Plc  
Railway Housing Association  
Ramblers Association, Stockton  
Richard Burt Design

RPS Planning  
RSPB  
Sanderson Weatherall on behalf of  
Lidl UK  
SAVE  
Savills L&P Ltd  
School of Architecture, Planning &  
Landscape  
Scott Wilson  
Secondsite Property Holdings  
Signet Planning  
Society for the Promotion and  
Advancement of Romany Culture  
Society for the Protection of  
Ancient Buildings (SPAB)  
Solutions Northern  
Sport England  
St Mary's Parish Hall  
Stagecoach Transit  
Sted Construction Design  
Stewart Ross Association  
Stockton Business Forum  
Stockton Renaissance Secretariat  
Stockton Residents' Association  
Stockton Retail Park  
Stockton Riverside College  
Stockton Volunteering Support  
Project  
Stockton Western Area Partnership  
Board  
Tees and Hartlepool Port Authority  
Ltd.  
Tees Archaeology  
Tees Barrage  
Tees East and North Yorkshire  
Ambulance NHS Trust  
Tees Valley Biodiversity  
Tees Valley Housing Association  
Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit  
Tees Valley Living  
Tees Valley Partnership  
Tees Valley Regeneration  
Tees Valley Rural Community  
Council  
Tees Valley Wildlife Trust  
Teesport  
The Ancient Monuments Society  
The Billingham Partnership  
The Council for British Archaeology  
The Garden History Society

The Georgian Group  
The Gypsy Council UK Office  
The Tees Forest  
The Theatres Trust  
The Twentieth Century Society  
The Victorian Society  
The Woodland Trust  
Thornfield Properties plc  
Thorpe Thewles Residents  
Assocaition  
Transco  
Traveller Law Reform Coalition  
Tribal MJP  
Tristar Homes  
Turley Associates  
Turley Associates on behalf of  
Tees Valley Airport  
UK Association of Gypsy Women  
University of Durham

Viewpoint  
Ward Hadaway  
Wellington 2004 Estate Company  
Wellington Square  
Wimpey Homes  
Woodford Consulting Group (North)  
PLC  
Wright Construction (Durham) Ltd.  
Wynyard Estates  
Wynyard Park  
Yarm Chamber of Trade  
Yarm Civic Society  
Yarm Residents Group  
York Diocesan Society  
Yorkshire Forward  
YPAG  
Yuill Homes  
Zero Waste Ltd

### **Individuals**

30 individual local residents were also informed of the consultation by letter or email.

## Appendix 3 Consultee Responses to the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy

Core Strategy Reference	Comment Number	Comment Summary
	0	Regeneration DPD comment
	60	Comments will inform Regeneration DPD.
	79	Comments are in relation to Regeneration DPD
Objective	81	Option 1 of the 4 strategic objectives is the preferred option. It supports the majority of development being focused on the core urban area, with emphasis on the SMI, supported by the main town and district centres.
Objective	153	Encourage carbon neutrality outside of the "heart" - consider using the achievement of "carbon neutrality as a criteria to permit development outside of the core area which would otherwise help meet identified local needs and make existing communities more sustainable.
Objective	205	Note the Boroughs potential for energy through tidal and wind power is fully exploited within environmental limitations". Whilst we welcome the recognition of environmental limitations, as a spatial strategy the Core Strategy needs to direct commercial scale renewable energy development to sustainable locations where adverse effects on designated wildlife sites are minimised.  RSPB is supportive of the development of renewable energy provided it does not adversely affect designated sites of international conservation importance, nationally important bird assemblages or flight paths. Concerned that wind energy developments in the vicinity of the SPA have the potential to adversely affect the SPA. The key risks to the integrity of the SPA arising from inappropriately sited wind farms in this area are:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mortality of SPA species caused by collisions with turbine blades</li> <li>- Turbines causing disturbance or displacement of SPA species from feeding or roosting areas.</li> <li>- Turbines disturbance regularly used flightpaths e.g. between intertidal feeding areas and high tide roosts, or different parts of the SPA.</li> </ul> <p>Don't think the SPA area is suitable for wind energy development. This matter should be fully investigated in the AA of the Core Strategy. However because no particular Core Strategy policy deals with commercial scale renewable energy generation, this issue has been omitted from the Preferred Options. Note that the recommendation of the AA of the North east RSS is "The Tees Estuary should have been removed from Policy 42 of the RSS as being of least constrained for development. This is in line with DEFRA's policy of avoiding areas within concentrations of species of conservation importance and key migratory pathways". This recommendation has been supported by Natural England as a key amendment in order to demonstrate that the RSS will not have an adverse effect on the SPA. If this is accepted, identifying this area as suitable for wind energy development would therefore contradict both national and regional policy. The CS should contain a dedicated policy relating to renewable energy generation so that an appropriate spatial approach can be developed.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Objective 10	211	<p>Welcome the commitment to increasing the levels of renewable energy generated within the Borough, and the broad mix of sources proposed. However, we must point out that some of these sources have the potential for adverse environmental impacts, and therefore would benefit from the inclusion of a dedicated spatial policy within the Core Strategy to ensure that such impacts are avoided. Please read our comments on paragraph 3.5.</p> <p>Develop a dedicated policy relating to renewable energy generation. This should develop a sustainable and spatial strategy for wind energy development to guide developers away from sensitive areas and describe the constraints facing renewable energy developments on land in the vicinity of the SPA. This implications of this Policy needs assessed through the AA process.</p>
Objective 10	294	<p>The environment Agency think that this objective could be strengthened to include a statement supporting the clean up and remediation of previously contaminated sites, thereby addressing the industrial legacy of the Stockton area and contributing to a healthier and more sustainable way of life for people in the process.</p>
Objective 10	38	<p>The sentence relating to biofuel, solar, wind and tidal resources are common sources of energy production and needs to be conditioned 'within environmental limitations' as on page 12. See PPS9.</p>
Objective 10	413	<p>NWL would request that the Core Strategy reflect the fact that water is also a resource that should be conserved and used efficiently.</p>
Objective 11	286	<p>The Environment Agency agrees with the reference to flood risk and the need for sustainable drainage.</p>
Objective 12	154	<p>Planning system can only have a limited effect on the rate of housing. Its role should be to ensure that provision of a range of suitable sites with permissions which will ensure the right mix of size, tenure etc.</p> <p>The requirement for such house building to be focused on the Core Area could lead to interpretations which would prevent housing taking place in other areas where the delivery would contribute to overall sustainable development.</p> <p>There is a need for housing outside the core area (2006 study) This approach would prevent such need being met, in particular to meet the needs of the aging population. The needs of the elderly cover a wide spectrum and include the need for forms of supported accommodation which will allow them to reside within their local community. As crafted, Objective 12 and its approach could be used to only allow development within the Core Area.</p> <p>Consider adopting carbon neutrality as a required benchmark in such circumstances.</p>
Objective 12	16	<p>Agree with objective however the comments under Aspirations will not promote a continuance of the objective.</p> <p>The Aspiration should be: A steady rate of house building should be maintained focused on all parts of the Borough in order to ensure that homes will be available in a full range of sizes, types and tenures and to provide a balance and mix to meet the different requirements of the increasing population of the Borough.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Objective 12	237	New residential estates should have good pedestrian links with nearby facilities. Add wording to aspiration "New building will be designed around existing rights of way which will be used to give good pedestrian and cycle access to neighbouring countryside, communities and shops".
Objective 12	347	Support the need to provide homes for all needs.
Objective 12	372	For the reasons outlined in comments on chapter 3 - The Spatial Vision, we express concern about Objective 12 and the reference to the fact that development will be focussed on the Core Area. Whilst clearly the Core Area is an appropriate location, the area will not meet everyone's needs. The Vision and objectives are fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider objectives of the LDF.
Objective 12	385	Express concern about Strategic Objective 12 and it particular the reference to the fact that development will be focused on the Core Area. This area is not likely to meet the aspirations of future residents.  The Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives should be more widely defined to promote/deliver housing within or adjoining sustainable service village locations. The vision and objectives as currently expressed are fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider objectives on the LDF.
Objective 12	406	Express concern about Strategic Objective 12 and it particular the reference to the fact that development will be focused on the Core Area. This area is not likely to meet the aspirations of future residents.  The Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives should be more widely defined to promote/deliver housing within or adjoining sustainable service villages locations. The vision and objectives as currently expressed are fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider objectives on the LDF.
Objective 12	66	Document requires an additional objective:  13. "To promote accessibility by all modes to enhance connectivity to international markets."  Aspiration: "To facilitate the continued sustainable expansion of DTVA and associated employment development in line with national and regional policy airports and air transport". This should also make reference to the Airport Masterplan.
Objective 2	140	There is considerable scope within the Stockton Borough to develop new industry associated with the management of waste as evinced by the new Eco Park proposal. There are better jobs in this sector than in renewable energy.
Objective 2	207	Given the proximity of established core industries to the SPA, it is essential that the needs of the industry are not simply 'met': The principles of sustainable development should be paramount.  Propose that these needs are instead "met in a sustainable manner than ensures the protection of designated wildlife sites".



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Objective 3, 5	64	Objective 3: Should make reference to tackling employment discrimination and maximising the talents of older workers.  Objective 5: Make reference to extending working at home, greater use of flexible or staggered hours.
Objective 4	113	Also relevant for CS5 Section 1.  Support these Core Strategy Policies however suggest more detailed Town Center Policy sets out additional criteria offering a more flexible approach to changes of use in the Town Centre; for example , taking into account where a property has stood vacant for a period of time. Consider that active marketing of a property for a year should be viewed as an appropriate period of time.
Objective 4	390	A strong cultural sector is key to the development of a vibrant town centre and it is therefore vitally important to protect theatres for their contribution to the quality of cultural life and for their contribution to the character and function of Stockton.
Objective 5	152	The car will always be used as a means of transport in the Borough.  The development of an improved secondary road network is welcomed. However such a network needs to be more than just a North/South link and should improve connectivity East/West from Ingleby Barwick and the A174 to the A66. Effective demand management requires more than just alternatives to the A19 itself.
Objective 5	208	Note the reference to "new links across the Tees". Whilst it is difficult to determine the likely environmental impacts of such links in the absence of more details regarding their location and nature, we are concerned about the potential impacts on the SPA. We note that CS2 Transport does not refer to additional road crossings of the Tees. Any such crossings should be included in the Policy.
Objective 5	242	Rights of way network should be mentioned here.
Objective 5	252	Remove all reference to air travel from this document; indicate that public transport information must be available in clear, accurate and regularly-revised form on all bus stops and shelters. Remove all references to additional road-building and to more crossings of the Tees.
Objective 5	262	What is required is a new bridge or tunnel beside the Transporter Bridge linking Port Clarence and Middlesbrough and I hope with this and the opening of the Barrage bridge to through traffic is what is being preferred.
Objective 5	299	Supportive of the Objectives and in particular the first part of Objective 5, with regards to ensuring good access to jobs, facilities and services, but considers that, as stated during the consultation on the issues and options, that there needs to be a specific reference to sustainable travel and minimising the need to travel, particularly by private car, and promoting more sustainable modes of travel such as public transport, walking and cycling.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Objective 5	301	Objective 5 refers to improving links to other areas of the Tees Valley and beyond. This could be interpreted in different ways depending on the definition of links. If these were to be sustainable links, such as public transport enhancement/routes. However, if this was to be interpreted as improving links by constructing new roads, widening existing roads and generally increasing the capacity on the road network, this is obviously not a sustainable approach and therefore to provide some clarification, the Agency considers that the Objective should be amended so that it fully reflects the provisions of Policy CS2.
Objective 5	346	Support this objective
Objective 6	107	Sport England supports Objective 6, particular the aspiration to improve access to and opportunities to engage in sport, leisure and recreation.
Objective 6	169	Section places particular emphasis upon the River Tees and the "Heart". However the section seems to ignore the potential of other important areas such as Billingham Beck Valley which already supports a widely used Country Park and which is currently accessible only by car or those directly adjacent to the site.  Need to recognise the significant benefits which would arise from linking up a network of leisure and recreation sites with cycle ways and footpaths along the River Tees and its tributaries.  Recognise that improvements in facilities for formal sports would also assist in improving health and well being.  Recognise that opportunities for delivery of such facilities will arise outside of the Blue Green Heart as well as within in.
Objective 6	209	Watersports and recreation in inappropriate locations along the River Tees have the potential to cause displacement and disturbance of SPA species, both within the designated site and also when using other parts of the waterfront. Furthermore, there is the potential for recreational developments to affect the hydrology of the Rover Tees (waterfront development, watersports facilities/activities, berthing etc.) also threatening the SPA. A specific policy relating to watersports should be developed. This would allow the potential impacts of watersports on the SPA to be considered in the Core Strategy's AA, and robust policy safeguards development.
Objective 6	241	Mention should be made of the Teesdale Way.
Objective 6	244	An improvement in the general health of the community should be included in this objective.
Objective 6	259	Request the removal of the phrase "providing care closer to home". Such comments are too prescriptive and prejudice the Strategic Health authorities decisions.
Objective 6	35	Implementation of the Tees Forest proposals are missing from the aspiration.
Objective 6 + 7	258	No emphasis on quality of provision made. We recommend the inclusion of the phrase "quality of provision" when reference to health services is made throughout the strategy.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Objective 8	170	Support the overall vision . However the vision should be more ambitions and not just limited to the River Tees corridor and the Heart. Recognition should be given to the river valleys which can contribute to the overall objective of this section. The overall ambition should link up all of the green corridors by enhanced pedestrian and cycle access as well as enhance public accessibility within the river valleys. This may require public/private partnership and limited development of an appropriate types and scale. It is accepted that such development should not adversely affect the character of such areas or harm open space.
Objective 8	210	Welcome the inclusion of this Objective, the recognition of the SPA and Ramsar site's importance and the commitment to exploit conservation and enhancement opportunities.
Objective 8	240	Additional wording suggested for inclusion in objective 8, so that it is clear that green infrastructure will be accessible to all with dedicated sustainable footpaths, bridleways and cycle tracks shown on the Council's website.
Objective 8	263	Also relevant to Policy 4, page 37, 6.3. Support the River Tees Heritage Park. More consideration into the location of the new pedestrian bridge links need to me made.
Objective 8	6	Support objective. The correct title for the SPA/Ramsar Site is the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar.
Objective 9	15	Industrial heritage, particularly railway history should be recognised.
Objective 9	238	Within these historic areas, particular sensitivity should be exercised to maintain the character and appearance of the landscape. In particular, housing developments, high-rise flats etc will be strongly opposed.
Objective 9	238	Add wording to aspiration "The rights of way network, where many of the ways are of ancient origin and were used by our forbears for the their quotidian rounds, has been preserved and extended and continues to be used for the convenience and enjoyment of residents and others."
Objective Strategic Objectives	231	Whilst clearly the Core Area is an important location for some new housing development concentrating housing development in this location is only likely to meet the housing needs and aspirations of a small proportion of existing and future residents. The Spatial Vision and Spatial objectives should be more widely defined to promote/deliver housing within or adjacent sustainable service village locations on the edge of Stockton Town. The Vision and objectives as currently expressed are fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider objectives of the LDF.
Omission	71	Request a new policy which sets out the requirements for safeguarding consultation within the relevant zones. Zones should be shown on proposal maps or separate plan to be included in the documents.
Other	-	This comment put forward a property for future development. It will be dealt with under the Regeneration DPD.
Other	0	Document noted, no further comment
Other	10	I agree with the Preferred Options.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Other	104	It is Sport England's policy to challenge the soundness of relevant LDF documents where the LPA does not have an up to date playing pitch strategy and local needs assessment in place. I must advise that Sport England will object to the progression of the Core Strategy document until the evidence base for sport is complete.
Other	112	Would like to bring to attention the Royal Mail sites within stockton which are 90 High Street, Stockton and Order Wingate Way, Stockton.
Other	256	Object to the entire concept of sustainable development.
Other	482	Reference to Prisons. Should include a detailed policy of a criteria based policy to deal with a firm prison proposal should it arise during the plan period.
Other	483	Reference to prisons. The plan should recognise the economic benefits of prisons as per Circular 3/98. In addition a policy should be included to support the need for expansion where this can be justified.
Other	37	Reference should be made to biodiversity and geodiversity throughout the document
Other	65	There is a need to carry out a viewpoint survey to establish citizens views on SMI and consider modifying references to Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative depending on outcome of survey. Not many people know about this initiative.
Other	226	With reference to the Northern Area. Please see previous comments. Council should protect the SPA in the Northern Area. Should also strengthen the capacity of the SPA through planning policy and development control decisions in the northern area that facilitate complementary habitat restoration and creation in surrounding areas.
Other	343	Western area bullet 3 - please insert a separate bullet point which respects the history, character and nature of Eaglescliffe.
Other	166	The bullet point priorities ignore the importance of key infrastructure development required such as Park and Ride and secondary road networks. Consideration should be given to developing clusters of development around the proposed new transport links, including the station, the metro system and required Park and Ride interchanges.
Other	173	Reference to the Northern Area. Whilst improving the biodiversity of the Billingham Beck Valley is important, it is suggested that a higher priority should be accorded to remediation its contamination, creating public access to the area and linking the area up with other corridors to provide green lungs.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Other	227	<p>Diagram should outline the SPA in full and also the SSSI boundaries. This will allow consultees a more comprehensive understanding of the spatial constraints within the Borough and identify potential areas of conflict (e.g. the East Billingham Transport Corridor and the SP).</p> <p>The boundaries of the green wedges are mapped in detail (which we welcome) so this should also be possible for designated wildlife sites. We note that two sites are identified as the International Nature Reserve. This is confusing as the northernmost sites is the Teesmouth NNR and the one to the southwest will be the RSPBs Saltholme International Nature Reserve. This should be clarified. For the purpose of the Diagram, although we welcome the inclusion of these sites, the boundary of the SPA and SSI is perhaps more relevant than the location of these nature reserves.</p>
Other	379	<p>There is no clear explanation in the Core Strategy itself of what the Cross Boundary issues will entail. Issue 4 Development of Teesport is set out in Policy CS2, but is not stated as a cross boundary issue.</p> <p>Issue 5 Cross River Links is not referred to in the Core Strategy. There is a section on new river crossings in the Regeneration DPD but no mention is made of the river crossing from South Bank to Stockton on tees.</p> <p>Needs to set out more clearly the cross boundary issues which are illustrated on the Core Strategy Diagram.</p>
Other	25	<p>The boundaries of the housing subdivision areas appear to be exceptionally tight. Over the plan period this is not sustainable no matter what is felt to be the strategy to cram the population into the centre of the City region. Need to expand the limits of the housing subdivisions, particularly that of Stockton (area 2) to the west. This will make use of existing infrastructure and easily constructed new infrastructure on low quality land. Similarly expand the limit of area 4 to the south.</p>
Other	42	<p>Nature conservation designations are not clear.</p> <p>The Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area/Ramsar Site should be shown as a European designation.</p> <p>The Teesmouth National Nature Reserve could be shown as a national designation, along with the SSSIs</p>
Other	276	<p>Section 2 of the document relates the strategic context for the Core Strategy and includes descriptions of the sustainability appraisal and appropriate assessment which are both parts of the procedures that have to be followed in preparing the core strategy rather than a strategic context. I would recommend that these two topics are relocated into the introduction. In addition, Table 7 provides an excellent summary of the links between the CS and other strategies.</p>
Other	348	<p>Support Option 2 as a balanced approach with the provision that Norton is regarded as a separate area with its own allocation.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Other SC Diagram	116	Core Area boundaries need further refinement or explanation. There will be development sites which straddle the boundary between Core Area and housing subdivisions. In such cases there must be some flexibility in the policies.  There is confusion over the colours with the built up area looking like open countryside. The green wedge is shown as per the adopted Local Plan. However there has been a significant deletion from the green wedge at Bowesfield which needs to be reflected in the drawing.
Other	267	Note that you acknowledge that there is no requirement for any additional housing allocations whatsoever in Yarm and Eaglescliffe before 2011 and therefore very limited 130 in all between 2011 and 2024. Also, in this context we cannot accept the rounding down of the Total in Yarm and Eaglescliffe from 319 to 300. When 0, 50, 50 and 30 are the totals for the 4 periods, 19 (319 to 300) is far too large a figure to be rounded down. On the following page Ingelby Barwick is rounded up from 1409 to 1410 (not to the nearest 100 which would be 400).
Other	28	The Council should propose no further core area construction (housing) and should realign all of that construction to Stockton area 2.  Rural outside development limits should be adjusted from zero upwards by 3% or 4% as also should rural within development limits over the latter part of the plan period.
Other	292	The Flood Risk Assessment should be listed.
Other	193	There are no targets or indicators within the monitoring framework which relates to the historic environment. It is not clear how the council will measure the success or otherwise of the Core Strategy in meeting that part of the Vision concerning the historic environment or in meeting Strategic Objective 9 which is to protect and enhance the built environment and the areas archaeological, industrial and cultural heritage.
Other	282	Implementation Plan needs to be further developed and more detailed at the submission stage to be more effective. The implementation and monitoring plan should contain clear targets to measure whether the policies are being implemented successfully and should provide more detail on delivery, including timescale and infrastructure provision, in order to meet the test of soundness.
Other	60	Table 8. CS2 Transport - no targets/indicators provided for walking/cycling. CS3 Sustainable Living - no targets/indicators provided for biodiversity by design measures CS4 Economic Regeneration - no targets/indicators provided in relation to sustainable tourism schemes CS10 Environmental Protection - target 2 should read conditions on SSSIs against Natural England guidelines.

Core Strategy Reference	Comment Number	Comment Summary
Other	268	<p>The most important change to this document as well as the Regeneration DPD would be to change all reference to "Brownfield" or "previously developed land" will be changed to an accurate definition such as "underused or derelict land".</p> <p>In SC1 6.5, page 27 it states "Stockton Borough has an abundance of unused or under-utilised previously developed land....a legacy of industrial decline in the second half of the twentieth century...thus minimising the need to make further allocations of Greenfield land. Nearly 500 hectares of vacant land or derelict land and buildings where identified in the 2006 National Land Use Database Statistics". Reference is made in the Northern Area page iii, bullet point 3 "Remediation and rehabilitation of derelict and underused land". You will be aware that the legal definition includes all residential housing together with its curtilage i.e its gardens. That this is not semantics but absolutely critical, is shown in Core Strategy page 49 and 50, 6.59 and figs 5 and 6. "The Brownfield trajectory shows that, to meet the Councils target for development on previously developed land, additional allocations identified in the Regeneration DPD will need to be Brownfield". Developers will state when wishing to demolish and build higher density in established residential areas that they are carrying out government advice when in fact they are cherry picking as warned against 5.21 page 24 "it is likely to place further demands on areas which are already under pressure for development. Sites would be cherry picked for ease of development rather than more challenging sites. The housing strategy has to be seen "in the round" in that a key objective is to improve the housing stock in conjunction with restoring derelict and underused land - not demolishing valuable and desirable traditional housing that happens to sit on a reasonable size of plot.</p> <p>I would appreciate therefore your confirmation that all reference to Brownfield or previously developed land will be changed to an accurate definition such as underused or derelict land. Bear in mind that there are references in the Core Strategy to Stockton having surplus of Brownfield, previously developed land. Under the legal definition all Councils in England have a surplus of Brownfield land in that all houses in their town or county are Brownfield.</p>
Other	285	<p>We are sure you will appreciate that the disability Rights Commission DRC receives many such documents. Unfortunately we do not have the resources to respond to all these documents.</p>
Page	283	<p>Support Option 1 But concerned about the Rural Development outside limits figures of 4 and 8%. Once these limits are breached it opens up further encroachment as developers suggest sounding off the villages. In this areas we already have a small green wedge between Redmarshall and Carlton and any encroachment will be very detrimental to the villages.</p>
Page	24 - 25	<p>Urgent need to link the stations within the Borough by stopping services - make sure they are connected by a rail service.</p>
Page	414	<p>NWL have no particular comments on the options. However, they would support the reinforce the view recorded in the penultimate bullet point on page 25, i.e. that the cost of additional infrastructure becomes necessary as a result of development.</p>
Page	31 - 32	<p>Enhance levels and standards of passenger rail provision along the Durham coast line in particular, running through Stockton and avoiding Darlington and Middlesbrough alike, are guaranteed to ease traffic levels on many adjacent roads.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Page 33	61	Page 33, 54, 58 Support the Councils plans to maintain the villages and spaces.
Paragraph 1.11	344	Ignores the settlement of Norton an ancient settlement with its own district character. It has its own schools, medical services and retail centre as well as a historic core. It has 2 supermarkets within the town centre.
Paragraph 1.13	201	As the Core Strategy notes in Para 2.1, national guidance has put sustainability at the heart of the planning process, and one of the four aims for sustainable development is effective protection of the environment (also 2.1). With this in mind, we believe that securing and improving the conditions of the internationally and nationally important wildlife sites in the Borough is essential, particularly given the adverse conditions of the Teesmouth SPA and Ramsar site and its component SSSI's within Stockton.  The need to protect and restore biodiversity as part of the environment improvements should also be a key driver. Also believe that the enhancement of biodiversity in tandem with improvements to visitor infrastructure can also help deliver the regeneration of the area for example through the development of the RSPB Salthome nature reserve.
		Propose the following additional bullet points for paragraph 1.13:  -The internationally-important wildlife site of the Tees Estuary is subject to adverse ecological change and high pressure from development -The need to ensure that the Boroughs biodiversity is protected and enhanced to deliver an improved environment for wildlife as well as people. -The potential to use the internationally-important environment of the Tees Estuary to stimulate regeneration and improve the areas profile.
Paragraph 1.13	29	Very few environmental drivers for change have been identified.
Paragraph 1.14	176	Whilst the list of action points refers to improving the cultural offer of the area, this is an unduly narrow focus on tourism and leisure facilities is unhelpful. There is a need for a greater role for the historic environment in the future.
Paragraph 1.14	202	Unsure what capitalising would entail with respect to the Boroughs natural assets. Sustainable development requires that the environment is effectively protected from development. All developments should be located and designed in a way that fully respects the environmental features of the Borough.  Propose the wording: "optimising the value of the Borough's natural assets to regeneration whilst ensuring these assets are protected and enhanced at all times, by delivering sustainable developments that avoid sensitive locations and incorporate or create wildlife-rich areas".



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 1.14	30	<p>Very few environmental actions have been identified. This list could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tees Forest Plan</li> <li>- Protection and enhancement of biodiversity interests</li> </ul> <p>Actions could be expanded and correctly worded to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Capitalise on the Boroughs natural assets such as the River Tees and its valley, the Teesmouth National Nature Reserve, the RSPB Saltholme International Nature Reserve, and prospects for renewable energy generation".</li> <li>- "Improve the leisure, sport, recreation and cultural offer of the area through provision of open space, green infrastructure and improvements to the public right of way network".</li> </ul>
Paragraph 1.14	31	<p>The requirements of PPS9 paragraph 13 with respect to diversity and geodiversity needs to be taken into account when reference is made to re-use of previously developed land.</p>
Paragraph 2.6	203	<p>Welcome the decision to carry out an Appropriate Assessment (AA) at the early stage in the plan-making process and believe it has already strengthened the Core Strategy. We have appended some comments on the AA to our covering letter. We hope this will assist the Council during subsequent iterations of the Core Strategy AA and for AA's required for other LDDs in particular the Regeneration DPD. We would be please to discuss any issues regarding the AA of development plans in more detail. See RSPB comments. See RSPB comments for more detail.</p>
Paragraph 2.6	32	<p>Amend section to reflect the Conservation (Natural Habitats) (Amendment) Regulations 2007; Schedule 1 inserts new Part IVA to the 1994 Regulations 'Appropriate Assessment for Land Use Plans for England and Wales.'</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the local planning authority to ensure that the process is carried out in accordance with the Habitats Directive and the Amended Habitats Regulations. The document is subject to a HRA.</p>
Paragraph 3.3	330	<p>The vision is absolutely key. We suggest bullet point 3 is moved to bullet 1 since this is the essence of the long term vision.</p>
Paragraph 3.4	105	<p>Welcome the ambition within the Core Strategy that Stockton contains healthy communities, and that its people have access to the very best in sport, recreational and cultural facilities.</p>
Paragraph 3.4	178	<p>Welcome specific reference to the diversity, quality and character of the natural and built environment, and the need to protect, enhance and capitalise on the Boroughs unique assets. The Vision would be further enhanced, however, by specific reference to the historic environment.</p>
Paragraph 3.4	204	<p>Welcome the commitment to protect and enhance the diversity, quality and character of the natural environment. However, we believe the intention to capitalise on these assets introduces a potential tension with their protection and enhancement, and threatens the requirement to deliver sustainable development. "optimised" rather than "Capitalised on" would be more appropriate in the final sentence.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 3.4	331	Please replace "capitalised on" with "exploited".
Paragraph 3.5	106	There is very little detail about how Stocktons vision for sport and recreation facilities is to be achieved.
Paragraph 3.5	14	The pre 1947 position was a more user friendly and better forms of development than that which pertained since 1947. The balance between core and other areas should not be overwhelming and should be market led. It is inappropriate that such strong opinions should be expressed "clear conflict with a number of sustainability objectives". These paragraphs should be re-written in a more objective fashion.
		Hope that this is a hope for the future and by no means a representation of the present. The remainder of the core strategy will possibly undermine this vision.
		First sub paragraph under 3.5 should be changed to read "continuation of population growth, supported by a steady supply of quality housing in mix of sizes, types and tenures to meet all needs, pockets and aspirations throughout the Borough without seeking to limit choice of location particularly to areas of historic depravat
Paragraph 3.5	180	This paragraph advises that the Vision will be realised by continued recognition of the importance of the Boroughs built and natural heritage. Whilst recognition is important, commitment to action is equally so.
Paragraph 3.5	206	Welcome the commitment to the Borough's natural heritage and to increasing biodiversity through enhancement. This commitment should be strengthened to include designated wildlife sites.
		Propose the following wording: "Biodiversity has increased, through the protection and enhancement of green spaces, designated wildlife sites and the areas surrounding them.."
Paragraph 3.5	332	Final bullet point - please separate out the points about built and natural heritage since these are so important and deserve maximum coverage.
Paragraph 3.5	345	Support the paragraph which states "by a steady supply of good quality housing in a mix of sizes, types and tenures to meet all needs, pockets and aspirations."
Paragraph 3.5	63	Tees Valley Metro proposal is flawed and by only offering limited extra rolling stock on existing rail lines will not work. A true Metro system should be introduced.
		Remove the achievements of the Metro and add reference to better traffic control e.g. more part time lights on roundabouts.
		Take account of emerging fuel cell technology, which is greener than bio fuels.
Paragraph 3.5	65	Should read "Improve regional and sub-regional connectivity, through better rail services and the expansion of Durham Tees Valley Airport, resulting in over 3 million passengers using the airport in 2015".

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 4.3	181	Representations at the issues and options stage indicated that the objectives should include the preservation of the historical heritage of the area. Inclusion of such an objective would be welcomed. Would advise caution in the use of the work preservation. It was a rather negative connotation. Would wish the Council to promote the concept of constructive conservation as a means of embracing and utilising the historic environment to add value to the changes the Core Strategy seeks to bring about.
Paragraph 4.4	182	This paragraph identifies and expands upon the proposed objectives for the Core Strategy. English Heritage warmly welcomes Objective 9 and its stated aspirations.
Paragraph 5.11	19	Recent revisions in D.O.E flood risk assessment (1000 year flood risk requirements) and continuing effects of climate change throw severe doubt on the river corridor option for housing development. Need to revisit the flood risk assessment and costs of alleviation schemes.
Paragraph 5.11	287	The Environment Agency agrees with references to flood risk. Reference should be made to taking account of requirements of PPS25 - Development and Flood Risk, as well as the Councils own SFRA.
Paragraph 5.12	20	Recognise the requirement to decontaminate the areas concerned (historic industrial activity areas). Re-examine the sustainability appraisal matrix with a view to taking into account the problems of decontamination at all levels.
Paragraph 5.13	40	Make sure the findings of the SEA have been considered in the policies/text as appropriate with respect to ground, river and water quality, protecting local diversity, waste production and local air quality.
Paragraph 5.15	21	The requirement to create a City Region for the sake of it is not a satisfactory outcome for the citizens of the Borough. This is a political objective pursued by the politicians. Drop the idea of a City region to be created by means of confining new development and the population to the City core areas. Use spaces in a more imaginative way whilst leaving the population with its right to make its own choices as to desired locality to live.
Paragraph 5.17	171	The analysis is considered to be flawed and sweeping. Much of the Billingham Beck Valley downstream of the Country Park is contaminated and inaccessible to the public. Development of an appropriate type and scale could provide the necessary cross subsidisation of a reclamation project which would allow public access onto the land and a network of interconnected sites from Preston Park, along the Tees and up into the Billingham Beck Country Park.
Paragraph 5.17	288	There is reference made in the last sentence to Billingham Beck and Lustrum Beck (misspelt back in document) being affected. This could be further qualified by acknowledging that flood risk will still be an issue in these locations.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 5.18	158	Not all dispersed development is inherently unsustainable, particularly if it is focused around improved public transport nodes. Some developments such as Park and Ride Metro Interchanges could have a lower carbon footprint than so called sustainable Brownfield sites. This is recognised by the Government in its promotion of new eco towns.  Need to remain flexible in terms of accepting that there may be development proposals outside of the Core Area and on Greenfield sites which are either highly sustainable in themselves or would directly link with Core Sites through unlocking constraints such as highway capacity.
Paragraph 5.18	22	This Option presents the best choice for people of the Borough however there is still an overwhelming weight placed on development within the core areas. The development aspirations of the people in the rural fringes are ignored.  Sustainability needs to be balanced against the quality of life.  Billingham Beck and Lustrum Breck are areas subject to flooding and should not be considered for housing development.
Paragraph 5.20	289	There is reference made in the last sentence to Billingham Beck and Lustrum Beck (mis-spelt Back in document) being affected. This could be further qualified by acknowledging that flood risk will still be an issue in these locations.
Paragraph 5.21	23	The pre 1947 position was a more user friendly and better form of development than that which pertained since 1947. The balance between core and other areas should not be overwhelming and should be market led.  It is inappropriate that such strong opinions should be expressed "clear conflict with a number of sustainability objectives". These paragraphs should be re-written in a more objective fashion.
Paragraph 5.21	334	EPAG are opposed to this option.
Paragraph 5.5	17	Development should not be focused within the Core Area. The people within the Borough wish to live in the suburbs, not in waterfront developments. This area should be developed as a recreation area.  See people movements over the past 150 years where population wants to move away from areas such as the Core Area.  S - M Initiative will lead to the creation of two societies within the Borough.
Paragraph 5.6	157	Comment relates to para 5.6 to 5.13. The only disadvantage recorded relates to flood risk which is subsequently discussed. There is understanding to be significant problems with the capacity of the Core Area Highways Network. The Highways Agency have raised site specific concerns on a number of Core Area development sites and this is not recognised.
Paragraph 5.6	245	Focusing on the SMI could be construed as diluting the emphasis on Stockton Town Centre.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 5.6	246	Developing option 1 should not result in competing retail land uses being developed in the area between Stockton and Middlesbrough along the river Tees.
Paragraph 5.6	39	There is a need to ensure protection of the natural heritage value as well as the amenity value of the river corridor.
Paragraph 5.7	147	It is understood that the Council are considering only allowing development is sustainable villages. However 2 of the proposed distribution options seems to suggest that in the future, no development will be allowed but 8% of housing will occur outside the limits to development on permissions yet to be granted. There is no clear justification for this position. It is assumed that such a justification must exist as the Spatial Planning Team would be unlikely to make a fundamental mistake. Need to clarify the reason behind the proposition that development outside the limits to development will be allowed in the future.
Paragraph 5.7	18	Redundant following comment under 5.5 above.
		Consult on Option 3 Table 4 and reduce core area housing development and increase Stockton (outside core area) development, also increase rural development outside limits to a lesser extent.
Paragraph 5.8	333	Penultimate bullet. It is not clear what roles should be recognised.
Paragraph 6.1	213	Strongly support the Councils decision to reject Option 4 i.e. a market driven approach. This will make a strong contribution to sustainable development.
Paragraph 6.11	43	The first sentence should make reference to encouraging walking and cycling.
Paragraph 6.15	45	This makes no reference to any strategic priorities in relation to walking and cycling.
Paragraph 6.16	336	Final paragraph in sustainable living. Please clarify point on submitting a Sustainability Statement.
Paragraph 6.2	218	Support the Councils decision to put the burden on developers to prove compliance with Policy 3 and suggest that the Council criteria to assess any claims that meeting AC3's target would be unreasonable for a given development.
Paragraph 6.35	251	This paragraph is welcome but the Core Strategy should make it clear that the SMI will not be called upon to contribute to the retail hierarchy.
Paragraph 6.35	337	Still contend that Station Road Eaglescliffe is not a local or neighbourhood centre.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 6.38	189	It is important to recognise, that the value of heritage to the community is not simply to be found in such high status set pieces such as museums. Communities should be encouraged to acknowledge and understand that the historic environment is everywhere. With regards to the building schools for the future programme, where buildings are possessed of some historic merit, by virtue of listing or conservation status, every effort should be made to retain them in educational use and to adapt them. Where this is not possible, the council agrees a robust exit strategy which ensures the sympathetic conversion of the school buildings to other uses. Please find enclosed a copy of the English Heritage position statement on this issue.
Paragraph 6.4	184	Policy CS1 seems to spread regeneration projects and priorities out with the existing centres.
Paragraph 6.42	314	Also relevant to paras 6.43 to 6.66. Policy should be amended to widen the scope for the provision for high quality low density housing as an extension to existing village limits so as to enable development on the land south of Knowles Close, Kirklevington.
Paragraph 6.42	316	By all accounts, the Tees Valley economy is improving and seems likely to do so for some time to come on the strength of new technologies and employment sources locating here. At some time household growth is continuing. This will only become more of a feature as the population grows with increasing in migration. The cumulative effect of such drivers will be a need for more housing than is identified in each of the options put forward. The Borough is going to struggle to keep pace with the increasing demand for housing because so much new development is proposed in areas difficult to develop. In addition the context or setting of such sites will prejudice their appeal for households who have considerably higher aspirations for housing. This will restrict the phase of housing provision and will lead to pressures to release more readily developed sites in order to maintain the required continuous supply of land for housing.
		The pressures referred to above should be reflected in a broader view over the distribution of housing, the strategy being flexible enough to allow specific sites that qualify for the provision of high quality housing with incidental benefits of contributing to economic growth, the creation of public assets such as parks and accessible services open spaces or such other criteria as may be agreed. Land at Preston Farm would be suitable for such specific consideration.
Paragraph 6.42	319	Relevant to Para 6.42-6.66. The housing numbers relied upon depend on the Regional Spatial Strategy which has yet to be confirmed. Household growth and signs of an increasing amount of immigration into the Tees Valley may influence the eventual numbers to be accommodated. Creating an inflexible policy that does not recognise the possibility of growth beyond earlier estimates will depend upon economic growth.
Paragraph 6.43	26	There should be no further political interference in the planning process. There is a political desire to create a City Region at the expense of the desires of the population.  Also the plan should be treated as a flexible document throughout its forthcoming period taking into account changes in population, immigration and changes in guidance from Central Government on green belt development.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 6.48	128	<p>This paragraph stated "The importance of the SMI is acknowledged through the addition of the 20% flexibility allowance to deliver the housing element of this key regeneration initiative.</p> <p>This should be amended to refer to the North Shore, together with SMI. North Shore a significant scheme and is identified within the RSS as being of regional importance. We consider that such an amendment would make this paragraph sound given at present it does not represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, contrary to PPS12, Para. 24 vi.</p>
Paragraph 6.48	338	20% flexibility is too high, please reduce to 10-15%
Paragraph 6.5	156	<p>The majority of Brownfield land does not lie within the Core Area (ICI heartlands).</p> <p>It is not clear from the supporting text how redeveloping the core area supports the roles of Stockton, Billingham, Thornaby and Yarm.</p> <p>Greenfield development seems likely to create the conditions which will allow the Core Area potential to be realised. This would include park and ride facilities, metro interchanges and secondary road networks.</p>
Paragraph 6.50	339	Please define a modest scale. We believe this is too woolly an idea.
Paragraph 6.53	163	Concerned that deliverability will be a significant factor. Hope that the SHLAA process will be robust enough to ensure that sites are truly capable of development within the plan period without requiring investment in infrastructure which the site is incapable of delivering through the normal s106 process. Need to ensure key consultees such as Highways Agency have accepted the deliverability of sites before they are accepted as "committed" sites.
Paragraph 6.56	164	This position seems unduly restrictive and flies in the face of past experience. It is likely to perverse situations with otherwise sustainable proposals being refused permission. Need to recognise that unplanned proposals will come forward and provide criteria for their determination by reference to sustainable objectives.
Paragraph 6.6	248	The different roles of the SMI and Stockton town centre need to be recognised to assist with the regeneration of Stockton town centre.
Paragraph 6.65	340	The issue of flatted development needs to be reinforced in this document.
Paragraph 6.70	341	Environmental Protection Statement 1 - please define what the character of these villages means.
Paragraph 6.71	59	Also include the Teesmouth National Nature Reserve. The supporting text should make reference to the requirement to ensure that any protected species are taken into account, if impact cannot be avoided appropriate mitigation measures must be included in any proposal, taking into consideration the requirements of the Conservation Natural Habitats Regulations 2007 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Paragraph 6.74	291	Also relevant to Para 6.75. These paragraphs do not fully take into account the sequential test requirements of PPS25. This should be added in. Also, surface water issues and potential flooding may be a constraint in Flood Zone 1, contrary to what is stated in 6.75.
Paragraph 7.1	342	The annual monitoring report will be crucial. What is the governance structure for this and how will it be shared as per the SCI.
Policy 1	114	Pleased that the preferred option takes into account the likelihood that the remaining urban area outside the Core Areas will continue to provide housing because of the Brownfield land opportunities which will arise there. Support the continued reference to Bowesfield in terms of employment generation although we feel the term "industrial estate" does not adequately describe Bowesfield or Teesdale. This should be changed to Business Estate.
Policy 1	123	Fully support this policy which focuses the housing and employment development within the Core Area, including identification of North Shore as a key regeneration site. This policy accords with PPS3 and the emerging RSS. Importantly, Policy 7.1 of the emerging RSS requires priority to be given to the regeneration of the core regeneration areas of the SMI, with Policy 13 identifying North Shore as one of the 8 Brownfield mixed use developments.
Policy 1	133	Scale of the centre supporting Ingleby Barwick is inappropriate to meet the needs of the local residents. Expansion of the centre, including provision of services and facilities (which should include increased retail floorspace) would provide a centre for a more adequate size to support 20,000 + population.  Provision of services and facilities at the centre of Ingleby Barwick would help to support sustainability objectives, including minimising the need to travel and reducing car dependency as set out in SC2.
Policy 1	146	Clause 6 will raise difficulties of interpretation. What is a sustainable settlement or neighbourhood?  "Demonstrably necessary" implies that there exists some objective assessment tool. We are not aware of such a tool.  Viability and Viability seems to be borrowed from retail circles and also implies a certainty relating to assessment.  Sentence should be reworded:  1. Specific provision should be allowed for development which would give rise to a reduction in carbon consumption of a use or site. As drafted, the policy would prevent a new use coming forward which consumed less carbon than an existing use.  2. There is no specific discussion of what a zero policy would have for the overall health and well-being of village communities. The benefits of developing within the "heart" needs to be counter balanced with a transparent debate about the negative impacts of such a strategy in both the villages and outer areas of Stockton.



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	155	Reference to (4). The continued promotion of Durham Lane Industrial Estate seems somewhat strange in the context of the actual service of Article 14 directives by the Highways Agency. It is not understood how a promotional stance can be articulated without also clarifying the pre-requisites for such growth taking place. These should be clearly set out. Need to re-assess the conditions required for continued promotion of Durham Lane Industrial Estate and identify them in the supporting text. This will involve the remodelling of the Elton Interchange including a Park and Ride scheme.
Policy 1	159	Refers to para 6.8. This paragraph appears to be largely written in the future tense and it is more appropriate as a vision statement. It is not grounded in the reality of the present. It does not define or recognise the challenges to delivery of the strategy. Car use is most unlikely to reduce and needs to be planned for. Need to recognise the need to continue to plan for increased car usage whilst also seeking to provide for credible public transport alternatives.
Policy 1	183	Support this policy. Welcome the priority to be given to previously developed land but believe that this should be supplemented by reference to existing buildings and built fabric. Many historic buildings within the urban core are capable of repair, conversion and adaptation.  Concern that North Shore will draw focus from town centre. Projects will be required to support the Town Centre. The policy should also require the delivery of the North Shore Development to additionally support, and not detract from, the renaissance of the Town Centre. Proposals which do not should be resisted.
Policy 1	194	Welcome the fact that Thornaby is identified as an area where the remaining housing growth and development will be directed towards after the Core Area. This will help in the regeneration of Thornaby District Centre by increasing the size of the population that the centre will serve. Care will need to be undertaken to ensure such development, particularly housing is readily accessible to Thornaby District Centre, and otherwise any regeneration benefits may be eroded by leakage to other centres or out of the town centres.
Policy 1	214	Development in the Seal Sands area has significant implications for likely impacts of the Core Strategy on the SPA. We note from the Regeneration DPD issues and options consultation (Map 10) that a number of allocations in the Seal Sands area are located where developments would potentially cause adverse effects on the SPA. Given the strong legal protection provided by the Habitats regulations, it may not be possible for a number of these allocations to be brought forward.  Welcome the decision to include policy explicitly protecting the SPA within SC2, although the terminology used is more appropriate in SSSIs rather than Natural sites. There is a need to take a more rigorous approach than including policy stating that no adverse effect in SPA integrity will be allowed.  Propose the following wording: "In taking forward regeneration proposals along the river corridor and at Seal Sands, it will be necessary to ensure that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA and Ramsar site, either alone or in combination with other plans and programmes. Developments will be directed to sustainable locations where adverse effects on site integrity will be avoided."
		SC1 should clarify that any allocations within subsequent DPDs will be directed to locations where adverse impacts on the SPA will be avoided.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	232	<p>Object to CS1. The Spatial strategy in terms of housing land issues is fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider aspirations for the Borough detailed in the Spatial Vision and the Community Plan. The Core Area, as defined on the Core Strategy Diagram, comprises only a relatively small area of the Borough and lacks diversity in terms of its environment and therefore limits the type of housing market that any new development will serve. It is unrealistic therefore to expect this area to deliver the level, range and choice of house building that is anticipated in the Policy and as such the Policy fails Soundness Test 7.</p> <p>The Core Area, because of its high levels of accessibility/sustainability, is a much suitable location for employment and commercial uses and should be important to this type of development during the plan period.</p> <p>There is a need to balance the Core Area with development in other parts of the Borough, particularly the service villages.</p>
Policy 1	233	<p>Support the proposal to add a 20% flexibility element to the RSS requirements. It is clear from PPS3 and the RSS Proposed Changes that the RSS net housing requirement figures are not a ceiling and are only intended to be a guide.</p> <p>The flexibility element does not appear to take account of the fact that Tees Valley Living has recently submitted a bid for the Tees Valley to become a Growth Point. This could increase housing requirements further.</p> <p>Would object to the proposed distribution of remaining, non committed housing requirement as detailed in the policy. Maltby in particular could support more housing.</p> <p>The Core Strategy only allocates 14 dwellings in the Rural Area between now and 2024.. This fails to establish how this aim will be achieved in terms of allocating a deliverable amount of sites for future housing development in service villages. It would fail to reflect the necessity "to maintain and vitality and viability of sustainable settlements and neighbourhoods". This number should be increased to at least 50 dwellings in each of the three Plan periods to 2024.</p> <p>The site North of Maltby as identified in Map 24 Appendix 2 of the Regenerations DPD would represent the best location for a housing allocation to sustain the long term vitality and viability of Maltby.</p>
Policy 1	234	<p>CS1 fails to recognise the need to provide some modest development in rural areas, particularly rural service centres in order to maintain some degree of vitality and allow them to benefit in some growth.</p> <p>Criterion 6 is supported. This needs to be supported by alteration to development limits and positively planning for some growth with improvement to service infrastructure and village provisions.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	24	The boundaries of the housing subdivision areas appear to be exceptionally tight. Over the plan period this is not sustainable no matter what is felt to be the strategy to cram the population into the centre of the City region. Need to expand the limits of the housing subdivisions, particularly that of Stockton (area 2) to the west. This will make use of existing infrastructure and easily constructed new infrastructure on low quality land. Similarly expand the limit of area 4 to the south.
		Change the words "majority of housing development" to "some housing development".
		Change "ensuring that the remaining housing growth in development takes place in the remaining urban area etc" to "ensuring that most of the remaining housing growth and development takes place in the remaining urban areas etc".
		Change 6 to read as follows "Elsewhere, development within village limits will be small scale, low key growth demonstrably necessary to maintain the vitality and viability of sustainable settlements and neighbourhoods. Development outside village limits will be looked at on their particular merits and with a view to meeting the goals of sustainability and to help maintain the vitality and viability of the settlement concerned".
Policy 1	247	We question the appropriateness of combining the SMI with Stockton Town Centre into one area unless we can be assured that the Council is committed to facilitating the improvement of Stockton town centre and recognises the opportunities for regeneration around Wellington Square.
Policy 1	271	The Council is of the opinion that the document would benefit from providing more clarity regarding the role of Stockton in taking forward the development of the Tees Valley city Region. In this respect, it is considered that policy CS1 would benefit from providing more detail of the relationship between Stockton and Middlesbrough in creating a vibrant and successful heart to the city region.
Policy 1	301	The agency is supportive of locating development on previously developed land within existing centres, particularly where there is good access to a variety of sustainable modes of transport. However, as previously stated, any development that could have a detrimental impact upon the SRN would require further assessment in accordance with the provisions of Circular 02/2007. Further, the agency will be able to provide a more detailed assessment of individual potential development sites during its review of the Regeneration DPD.
Policy 1	315	Relevant to 6.1 to 6.10. The Spatial strategy should be widened to include reference to the acceptability of sites outside the core area, which offer the prospect of innovative high quality modern housing. Such sites could include for a modest amount of development in particular green wedges where housing development could be permitted, sufficient in size to fund complementary country park or parkland treatment to the balance of green wedge, this to be dedicated for public community use. Such an approach would open up public access to green wedges on the basis of limited development that would neither compromise the integrity of the green wedge nor its function in maintaining separation between settlements. Land at Preston Farm would present such an opportunity.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	317	By relying on Option 1, the strategy becomes to restrictive. Not permitting development within rural settlements even within current village envelopes precludes the contribution village sites can make to economic development by providing quality sites for bespoke housing. While a certain amount of such housing may be feasible within select parts of the urban areas, there will still be a demand for this type of housing in the rural areas and the planning process should acknowledge this fact by allowing for growth in and around the villages.
Policy 1	318	In terms of satisfying the need to deliver land available for housing and provide a five-year supply, the policy is unnecessarily restrictive. Because it depends on the redevelopment of existing sites, land within the Core Area and certain other Housing Sub-divisions is unlikely to come forward in the time suggested and there is a need to include additional sites which are at present outside the limit of the urban area to ensure continuity of supply.
Policy 1	320	Wynyard Estates considers that Wynyard should be treated in a similar way to that of Ingleby Barwick whereby the Council has recognised that there is a similar requirement to support the provision of services and facilities which contribute towards the sustainability and viability of the settlement. Provision should be made within the plan for provision of those missing facilities required to create a cohesive and sustainable community together with maximising the opportunity for additional housing.  The recognition at bullet 5 that a regionally significant employment cluster will be supported at Wynyard is welcomed and supported.  Drawing upon the comments of the preceding section, to ensure test vii, that the strategy is the most appropriate, there is a requirement for an additional bullet point stating:  "supporting the continued development of Wynyard to create a sustainable community with increased services and facilities."  This will ensure that housing and employment are provided in parallel, policy CS1 already acknowledging that a regionally significant employment cluster at Wynyard will be supported. This additional bullet will also ensure that the provision of services and facilities which will contribute towards the sustainability and vitality of Wynyard can be secured.
Policy 1	349	Support the emphasis on ensuring housing takes place in the urban area. But object that it ignores Norton once again I suggest that Norton is included as a district centre that needs supporting.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	358	<p>Proposals to include land outside the Core Area is welcomed however this should not solely for employment rather it should be a mixed-use and residential scheme. Point 1 of the CS1 does not allow the Council to achieve the governments key housing policy goal which is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live".</p> <p>Policy CS1 conflicts with PPS3 Planning for Housing policy objectives and needs to be rewritten. There is to much emphasis on the core area.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the distinct areas of Stockton outside the core areas which make up a different housing market in the areas where people wish to live i.e. growth areas such as Allen's west site in Eaglescliffe.</p>
Policy 1	360	<p>In agreement with Policy 1 however we request the following rewording of criteria 7:</p> <p>"Supporting the provision of services and facilities which contribute towards the sustainability and vitality of Ingleby Barwick including the completion of housing in villages 5 and 6 in accordance with the approved Masterplan (2002).</p>
Policy 1	373	<p>Object to CS1. They consider that the spatial strategy, in terms of housing land issues is fragile. The Core area comprises a small area of the Borough and lacks diversity in terms of its environment and therefore limits the type of housing market that any new development will serve. For this reason, the Policy fails Soundness Test 7.</p> <p>The Core Area, because of its high levels of accessibility/sustainability is a much more suitable location for employment and commercial uses and should be the focus for this type of development during the plan period.</p> <p>There is a need to balance development between the Core Area and other parts of Stockton Town. This approach should identify land in the Hartburn Grange Area, to the west of Stockton Town, as a strategic Greenfield option - as previously envisaged in the Tees Valley Structure Plan.</p>
Policy 1	381	<p>The contribution that settlements in the rural areas can make to sustainable development should also be recognised. Criterion 6. Of policy 1 recognises the need to maintain the vitality and viability of sustainable settlements. However, there are other settlements in the Borough whose sustainability would benefit greatly through a further appropriate level of development.</p> <p>A prime example is Wynyard Village which has not yet attained the population threshold necessary to attract and sustain the level of facilities and services required to provide fully for the villages residents and so reduce the need for them to access services out with the village. In order to reflect this we propose that the wording of criterion 6 be amended to read:</p> <p>6. "Elsewhere, development within the village limits will be small scale, low key growth demonstrably necessary to maintain or enhance the vitality and viability of sustainable settlements and neighbourhoods".</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	386	<p>Think that the spatial strategy is fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider aspirations for the Borough detailed in the Spatial Vision and Community Plan. The Core Area lacks diversity in terms of its environment and therefore limits the type of housing market that any new development will serve. Consider it unrealistic therefore to expect this area to deliver the level, range and choice of house building that is anticipated in the policy and as such the Policy fails Soundness Test 7.</p> <p>The Core Area, because of its high levels of accessibility, sustainability, is a much more suitable location for employment and commercial uses and should be the important to this type of development during the plan period.</p> <p>There is a need to balance development in the Core Area with other parts of the Borough, particularly service villages. This approach should include the identification of the site HA5 (Land at Durham Lane Road, Thorpe Thewles) as shown on Map 21 of the Regeneration Issues and Options DPD, as a sustainable service village allocation.</p>
Policy 1	387	<p>Section 1 - It is impractical to require all new housing to achieve Code 5 immediately. There is simply not the technology, expertise, products supply chain to deliver this. Aim should be Code 2.</p> <p>In accordance with the emerging guidance PPS22, achieving such targets should not impact negatively on the deliverability of sites. There would be little point in aiming to achieve very high efficiency etc if this results in too few houses being built to meet the targets set out elsewhere in the Preferred Options.</p> <p>Concerned that the Council are seeking to apply very high on-site renewable energy generation targets - significantly in excess of RSS. Such targets also appear to conflict/duplicate the Core for Sustainable Homes and the zero carbon target. Their inclusion is unnecessarily confusing and they should be deleted.</p> <p>Developers should not have to submit a Sustainability Statement and Waste Management Plan for small developments.</p>
Policy 1	397	<p>Support - especially projects that help to deliver the Stockton-Middlesbrough Initiative.</p>
Policy 1	407	<p>Think that the spatial strategy is fragile and unlikely to deliver the wider aspirations for the Borough detailed in the Spatial Vision and Community Plan. The Core Area lacks diversity in terms of its environment and therefore limits the type of housing market that any new development will serve. Consider it unrealistic therefore to expect this area to deliver the level, range and choice of house building that is anticipated in the policy and as such the Policy fails Soundness Test 7.</p> <p>The Core Area, because of its high levels of accessibility, sustainability, is a much more suitable location for employment and commercial uses and should be the important to this type of development during the plan period.</p> <p>There is a need to balance development in the Core Area with other parts of the Borough, particularly service villages. This approach should include the identification of the site HA16 on Map 22 of Regeneration DPD.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1	41	The HRA identified a range of potential impacts on the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA site and the policy/supporting text wording should reflect these issues and identify specific avoidance measures, which need to be implemented to ensure that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of a European Site. The text should read "in taking forward regeneration proposals along the river corridor and at Seal Sands, such development should be of an appropriate scale and nature to ensure there are no adverse effects on the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar Site".
Policy 1	456	This policy is supported, and deemed consistent with the regional planning policy objectives. The policy is largely based on option 1, which was supported by the NEA at the alternative option stage. The approach, which directs the majority of housing and employment development to the core areas is consistent with the locational strategy in the RSS proposed changes policies 5 and 7, which give priority to the regeneration of the Core Area. Supporting the development of North Shore regional mixed-use development site, and promoting employment provision in existing employment areas is supported. Support employment development at Billingham, Seal Sands and Wynyrd is consistent with RSS proposed changes policies 7 and 19. It should be noted that Haverton Hill is not specifically identified in the RSS. This site is therefore incorrectly described as a regionally significant employment cluster in bullet point 5.
Policy 1	457	Support for the housing market renewal areas of Mandale, Hardwick and Parkfield . It is consistent with RSS proposed changes policy 7, which directs strategies to support housing market renewal programmes in the Tees Valley city region.
Policy 1	458	Bullet point 2 describes the remainder of the housing growth and development being directed on the key diagram, the urban area is not specifically defined. In the interests of clarity, this should be defined on the key diagram. Urban areas should be defined as conurbations, main settlements, rural service centres and secondary settlements. The Tees Valley Conurbation is defined on the RSS proposed changes key diagrams. The smaller settlements defined on the key diagram are not reflected in the key diagram, and their status is unclear.
Policy 1	459	Whilst Policy CS1 places emphasis on the prioritising and use of previously developed land within the urban area, the NEA would support the inclusion of reference to the sequential approach to development.
Policy 1	62	Require regular bus services (every 10 minutes). Also need more bus shelters.
Policy 1	68	An appropriate reference should be made by adding DTVA to the list of locations for regionally significant clusters in SC1 or by addition of a separate reference after the current paragraph 5 of SC1.
Policy 1	72	Brownfield land should be used before greenfield land.
Policy 1	82	The agency endorses this policy which supports the Councils Preferred Option to support the regeneration of the urban core. The Agency also agrees with the area defined as the Core Area in the Core Strategy Diagram.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 1, 10	76	Preferred Option 1 would be the best option to protect rural fringes but also to develop urban areas.  It is possible to map and indicate the recognised wildlife corridors throughout the Borough. Consultation with local wildlife protection groups would be very informative of wildlife movements and protected species of plants and animals would be protected.
Policy 10	1	Include a statement that no further development should take place on land on North side of River Tees between Yarm and Eaglescliffe/Eaglescliffe and Aislaby Road.
Policy 10	102	Support the intentions of the Preferred Option to safeguard the Borough's environmental capital.
Policy 10	122	A review of the green wedge between Surtees Bridge to Yarm should take place. This would take into account the Bowesfield development opportunities which exist north of Bowesfield.
Policy 10	144	Protecting the character of all the villages without reference to any criteria, features or specific matters of interest is seen as an unnecessary statement, simply repeating guidance already enshrined in PPS1 "protect" can be construed as a negative criteria meaning "no change".
		Need to clarify that protect can also mean "enhance" through the promotion of appropriate forms and designs of development.
Policy 10	174	These sections are supported. However it would be more joined up as the council describe, if recognition was given to physically join up the riverside corridors rather than the present disjointed situation which the Billingham Beck Country Park and downstream valley is divorced from the the Tees Corridor.
Policy 10	177	This paragraph (referring to 3.3) sets out what the Vision for the Borough should contain. Again, notwithstanding the comments received at this issues and Options Stage , there is no overt reference here to heritage protection and celebration.
Policy 10	192	Concerned that it focuses exclusively on biodiversity, landscape, trees and other matters pertaining to the natural environment. There is no reference within this Policy to "heritage protection", nor is there elsewhere a corresponding Policy which deals specifically with safeguarding the historic environment.
Policy 10	2	Support for Policy



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 10	223	Strongly object to section 2 of this policy. "Balancing the development of heavy industrial base and economic diversification with the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity landscape". Falls well short of the protection provided to the SPA by Habitats Regulations. This policy should clarify the levels of protection that the CS will provide for internationally, nationally and locally designated wildlife sites, and clearly state how the Council will deal with proposals that have the potential to affect the SPA.
Policy 10	224	SC10 should state that the Council will not approve developments that would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Furthermore, CS10 should state how the Council will deal with developments that would affect SSSI's and also designated SPA, and established-criteria based policies by which developments that could affect locally-designated sites (e.g. SNCI) will be judged (as set out in paragraph 7 of PPS9 respectively).  Sections 4 and 5. Welcome SC10s commitment to protecting and enhancing biodiversity, and ensuring developments are directed to areas of the lowest flood risk. However, we draw para 5 (11) of PPS9 to the attention of the Council. We anticipate that the Core Strategy will identify areas for the restoration or creation of priority habitats, or signpost consultees to the relevant LDD that will identify such areas.  We note the Council welcome financial support for the development of the RSPB's Saitholme International Nature Reserve, and suggesting that this project is referred to in SC10 as an example of the Councils support for environmental enhancement.  Urge the Council to identify the Tees Estuary in the Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents as an area with high potential for the restoration and creation of priority habitats.  Add reference to the need to "protect and enhance the rights of way network, together with justification.  PPS12 paragraph 2.1 states that "The local development framework should contain within its documents, an integrated set of policies..." Some of the draft policies would benefit from further editing to remove elements which are repeating or covering elements in other policies in the core strategy. For example the final paragraphs of draft policies CS1 and CS2 both refer to matters which are covered in draft policy CS10. The specific reference to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coastal Special Protection Area/Ramsar site would be more appropriate in draft CS10.
Policy 10	290	Point 5 - p55. This needs to reflect the requirement of PPS25 that potential development sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3, depending on the development type, will need to be sequentially tested even before flood risk assessments are carried out.  From a Biodiversity perspective, we support CS10 as it provides for the protection and enhancement of wildlife corridors and the biodiversity resource.  Reflect the requirements of PPS25 that potential development sites in flood zone 2 and 3, depending on development type, will need to be sequentially tested even before flood risk assessments are carried out.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 10	295	It would be helpful if there was a paragraph addressing the requirements of land contamination issues as well as flood risk. It is stated something similar to Para 5 but mentioned the reuse of Brownfield sites. This would help recognise the long industrial legacy of the Borough and ties in with key regeneration areas/sites left vacant by manufacturing industries. The potential threats associated with land contamination could be properly managed in a systematic way thereby reducing risks to the Boroughs groundwater resources and surface waters.
		The EA suggests the wording "Where development is proposed on Brownfield land a preliminary risk assessment to establish the risks associated with previous contaminative uses is required".
Policy 10	312	No comment
Policy 10	353	Support general policy of protection of green wedges but when was the last time they were reviewed and as such they should be as a matter of urgency as they may affect the spatial location of development. Particularly in relation to the Billingham Beck Valley where the A19 is being re-aligned.
Policy 10	369	Support the Councils objectives of this policy.
Policy 10	403	Support policy
Policy 10	411	Would like to see paragraph 4 of CS10 amended to give strong protection to ancient woodland, ancient trees and other irreplaceable semi-natural habitats.
Policy 10	412	We would like to see paragraph 3 of Policy CS10 refer to the "Woodland Standard."
Policy 10	417	NWL would ask that the following is added to item 5:  "A FRA will also be required where the proposed development or change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding or where the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board and/or other bodies have indicated that there may be drainage problems".
Policy 10	479	Support the policy which seeks to protect the environmental assets in Stockton. RSS proposed changes policy 2 support this approach by directing local development frameworks to deliver environmental, social and economic objectives. This is also reflected in RSS proposed changes policy 5B. It is considered that bullet 1 in the policy should use the word "enhance" as well as "protect" in relation to the character of the villages.
Policy 10	480	Support the inclusion of reference to the strategic gaps, which is consistent with the objectives in RSS proposed changes policy 7. The sequential approach to flood risk based on a strategic flood risk assessment is supported and consistent with RSS proposed policy 37.
Policy 10	51	Also gateway to Teesmouth National Nature Reserve.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 10	52	This policy should also recognise the need to protect the natural heritage value and amenity value of river corridors, in line with the justification in paragraph 6.72. This should include the River Tees, Lustrum Beck, Billingham Beck and the River Leven.
Policy 10	53	Also recognise the need to protect green infrastructure in the Borough, recreational routes and the rights of way network and the countryside in its own right.
Policy 10	54	Point 2. Make reference to geodiversity
Policy 10	55	Point 4. PPS9 paragraph 9 sets out government policy for the establishment of criteria based policies and advises the regionally and locally important sites (County Wildlife Sites, Regionally Important Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves) should be distinguished from policies for nationally important sites (SSSIs and NNR).
Policy 10	56	Make reference to Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species in this policy, in line with PPS9 paragraph 11 and 16 and the policy should refer to the need to allow the natural environment to adapt to climate change.
Policy 10	57	4ii. Amended to read 'maintaining, enhancing and adding to biodiversity and geodiversity of sites of national, regional and local interest.
Policy 10	58	4iii. In addition this policy should seek to develop and maintain the integrity of networks on natural habitats (PPS9 paragraph 12); this goes beyond formal wildlife corridors.
Policy 10	74	Support policy, especially green wedges. Wildlife corridors should be maintained.
Policy 10	77	The character of the villages should be protected. Kirklevington is attractive because of the green spaces between the village and other areas. Strategic gap between village and Yarm must be maintained.  The balance between urban and rural areas should be maintained.  To optimise conditions for wildlife, corridors must be wide and long and linked together. The wildlife corridor that links the Leven with the Tees in Kirklevington and Castlelevington is noted on the Cleveland Structure Plan as needing improvement.
Policy 10	78	Agree with paragraph 1 and 3 which should include maintaining separation with strategic gaps.
Policy 11	103	Support the Preferred Option in respect of securing planning obligations for new development. Agree that all new developments should contribute towards meeting the costs to the community that arise from them. We agree that developer contributions need to be relevant to the size, type and scale of proposal and the differing circumstances of each new development.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 11	167	Policy does not accord with emerging thinking on the proposed "tariffs" recently suggested by government. Both the policy and supporting SPD need to be recast to recognise the need for new developments to make appropriate contributions towards the provision of strategic infrastructure, not just that directly related to the development. SPD needs revised to provide clear framework which advises developers of the likely scale of contributions required. Whilst the flexibility of negotiating contributions can be useful, it must ensure that at all times there is a level playing field for developers.
Policy 11	200	This policy seems to suggest that in the case of development that is not in sustainable locations, no obligations will be required?!
Policy 11	225	Broadly support the Councils Preferred Option to Planning Obligations. However it is worth clarifying that the nature and scale of the contribution made by a development should above all be related to the developments impacts, both in terms of damage/loss caused by its construction and also the additional infrastructure demands created by the development itself, including the need to provide additional infrastructure for housing developments.
Policy 11	313	Generally supportive of this policy and particularly welcome contributions towards infrastructure improvements. As previously stated, for contributions to any such improvement of the SRN the Agency would wish to be fully involved in agreeing the level/measure of contribution. However, notwithstanding this, the Agency considers that any physical changes to the network should be seen as a last resort and would firstly wish to see consideration given to measures to reduce the need to travel and measures that aim to maximise the level of sustainable access. See comments submitted for planning obligations SPD
Policy 11	370	Support the Councils objective of this policy; however PH object to some of the content of the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and have submitted individual representations dated 5 September 2007 with regard to this matter.
Policy 11	395	Cultural facilities have not been included within Planning Obligations SPD and there is no reference to these particular facilities in the CS for Planning obligations.
Policy 11	404	Support
Policy 11	418	NWL would request the inclusion of a specific reference to water and sewerage infrastructure in relation to improvements necessitated by future developments.
Policy 11	481	The inclusion of a policy on planning obligations is supported, and will assist in the delivery of a number of regional planning policy objectives, including the delivery of sustainable communities.
Policy 12	281	PPS12 paragraph 4.9. A full and comprehensive evidence base should also be provided with the submitted core strategy. Given that the options should also be informed by the evidence, the evidence base should be substantially completed at the preferred options stage.
Policy 2	11	Support the proposed Tees Valley Metro.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 2	111	Support the proposal of promoting the improvements to the road network in the vicinity of Stockton town center. Also support the Middlesbrough Stockton Initiative, it is essential for the economy that such infrastructure improvements continue.  The operational needs for Royal Mail and other key infrastructure services should be taken into consideration. Welcome initiatives encouraging sustainable transport and road safety schemes etc. however we would also like to ask that the Council consider how this will affect the accessibility of the Royal Mail depots within Stockton and accessibility of associated vehicles throughout the town center and beyond.
Policy 2	115	Support the thrust of the policy. Feel that there is a need to reconsider connecting the south Stockton link to the A1045 bypassing Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby, as well as the A66 and A19. This could be partially funded from development if the right schemes were considered which could contribute.  Make Specific mention to phase four of the South Stockton Link.
Policy 2	160	Reference to 4.6. There is no recognition of the need for Park and Ride within the policy even though the need for it is discussed elsewhere in the Plan.
Policy 2	185	Support this policy, particularly with regard to minimising the need to travel and reducing car dependency, and promoting the production of green travel plans for significant developments.
Policy 2	195	Support improved accessibility particularly in respect to minimising the need to travel by car if it involves improvements to footpaths and cycle routes, the focus must be on making local district centres more accessible to those within their catchment areas. This will encourage people to use facilities which are clearly the most sustainable solution and one which will aid the regeneration and enhancement of the existing centres.
Policy 2	215	Support the Councils measures to improve accessibility and widen transport choice through measures 1 to 4.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 2	216	<p>Concerned that the proposed East Billingham Transport Corridor (EBTC) in point 5 has the potential to cause adverse impacts on the SPA, through loss or damage to habitats used by SPA species, or by causing disturbance or displacement to SPA species during the construction phase or due to increased traffic.</p> <p>Concerned that the Improved Road Link on the diagram appears to run through the middle of the SPA. This is of considerable concern, and we strongly recommend that the location of the EBTC with respect to the SPA is clarified.</p> <p>The CS map should map out the full extent of the SPA, and indicate the location of the EBTC with more pre precision. Further versions of the AA will need to assess the likely impacts of the EBTC on the SPA in more detail, in order to assess the likely impacts of the EBTC on the SPA in more detail.</p> <p>Propose the following wording: "In Implementing transport proposals, it will be necessary to ensure that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA and Ramsar site, either alone or in combination with other plans and programmes. Proposals will be directed to sustainable locations where adverse effects on site integrity will be avoided".</p> <p>The Core Strategy's AA will need to provide clear evidence that the proposed EBTC can be delivered without an adverse effect on the SPA.</p>
Policy 2	239	<p>Omission: absence of a policy dealing with the protection and enhancement of the Borough's rights of way network. Policy wording suggested.</p>
Policy 2	254	<p>Redefine public transport to include rail travel  Add to rail infrastructure and electrify additional lines  Review impracticality of a Tees Metro  Create an interchange at Stockton station  East Billingham Transport Route not required</p>
Policy 2	261	<p>Also relevant to the Vision.  As regards transport, broadly support the objectives outlined. Have some concerns over "demand restraint" page 12 and page 31, 6. And 7. It is essential that if there is a stick and carrot approach then the improvements eg Tees Valley Metro should be up and running, before it would be acceptable even to consider implementing any form of road charging.</p> <p>As regards parking: when major new infrastructure developments such as proposed significant improvements to the Station and new interchange at Eaglescliffe are implemented, reserved parking for residents must be introduced. We raised the issue of the parking implications for the Station area resultant for the new Grand Central Service to London and the south in our representations at the time of the McCarthy and Stone Application. They were not taken on board at that stage.</p>
Policy 2	277	<p>As regards Aspiration 5 "new links across the Tees", page 15, the only new bridge is the princess of Wales Bridge.</p> <p>Section 3 of the policy should be clearer as to what essential infrastructure is involved and how it will be protected.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 2	302	Supportive of this policy and in particular welcomes the references to minimising the need to travel and reducing car dependency; providing an attractive choice of transport walking and cycling; ensuring significant developments are supported by travel plans; and protecting essential infrastructure that will facilitate sustainable freight movements by rail and water. Further, the Agency particularly welcomes reference to working in partnership with the Highways Agency to improve accessibility, develop a sustainable transport network and widen the choice of modes of travel.
Policy 2	303	The Agency considers Point 2 should also refer to the need for Transport Assessments to be undertaken for any significant development. This could be achieved through reference to current guidance - Guidance on Transport Assessments (GTA) and in relation to the assessment of traffic impacts on the SRN, in Circular 02/2007.
Policy 2	304	In relation to point 5, the Agency would wish to be fully involved in any such scheme which could have an impact on the SRN as a result of changing traffic patterns directly associated with such schemes. Should such schemes be being brought forward in order to facilitate development, the Agency would expect adequate assessment in line with the GTA and Circular 02/2007.
Policy 2	321	Support the Tees Valley Metro and the connection to Wynyard.
Policy 2	350	Support the sustainability principles contained in Paragraphs 1 and 2.
Policy 2	361	Generally support the Councils objectives of this policy however we seek further clarification of the outcomes of the Ingleby Barwick Traffic Study referenced in criteria 5.
Policy 2	398	Support - encourage public transport links, footpaths and cycle routes.
Policy 2	44	Last paragraph - the HRA identified a range of potential impacts on the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar Site and the policy/supporting text wording should reflect these issues and identify specific avoidance measures, which need to be implemented to ensure that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of a European Site.
		Text should read: In implementing transport proposals in the Borough there is a need to ensure there are no adverse effects on the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar Site.
Policy 2	69	CS2 Transport should include specific support for the growth of the DTVA in recognition of the contribution it has to regeneration of the Borough and improve accessibility across Tees Valley and beyond.
Policy 2	73	Public transport should become more accessible, affordable and efficient. Only by doing this would people use public transport.
Policy 2	83	The Agency endorses this policy which supports the Councils Preferred Option to improve accessibility and widen transport choice.
Policy 2	9	Support for fit for purpose transport infrastructure incorporating public transport, particularly rail.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	117	<p>Supports the push towards Renewable Energy in the UK but have concerns about draft policy CS3. These concerns relate to the realism and viability of the proposals. There seems to have been an attempt to word this policy so that Stockton goes further, sooner towards reaching sustainability targets. If adopted, we believe that the policy would dramatically reduce the opportunities for development in the Borough and affect the viability of allocated schemes.</p> <p>Part 2 of the policy goes beyond government targets. This policy require Code Level 5 while the Government aims to have homes reach a Core level 4. This would make homes within the Borough less attractive to potential buyers - cost more and less glazing.</p> <p>Part 3 goes way beyond existing policies for embedding renewable energy in developments. PSS Policy 39 requires 10% generation by Renewables. We believe this will be difficult to achieve in many cases. To impose 15% rising to 50% could make land in Stockton very impracticable for development. The sources of energy that could be imbedded in a scheme include biomass boiler, wind turbine, photovoltaic cells and solar panels. The CS does not provide guidance on which if any of these are encouraged within Stockton or ways in which the planning system would be adapted to facilitate improved environmental performance. None of the renewable energy technologies are truly embedded in a building. They are essentially bolted on. They may break or they may reduce in effectiveness over time. They may become outdated quickly and it may be impossible to integrate them into the local electricity network. The CS needs to address this issue in detail. It raises the question whether the core strategy should have policies in it which encourage stand alone renewable energy projects such as windfarms which would also contribute to the Boroughs strategy for carbon reductions.</p> <p>We propose that the policy is changed to reflect national Policy on Sustainable Homes and RSS Policy 39 in terms of renewable energy.</p>
Policy 3	124	<p>We consider that the draft Policy CS3 should be amended to reflect the above emerging RSS targets to ensure it is sound.</p>
Policy 3	142	<p>Policy is worded very loosely and will be open to interpretations "positive contribution" "protect and enhance" "important environmental assets" are all general statements of intent. First should be changed to protect or enhance.</p> <p>All this paragraph seeks to do is repeat objectives which are already rather more clearly articulated in PPS1. There is nothing specific to Stockton in this policy.</p> <p>Need to delete section 1 or make clear a statement about what is special about Stockton in these areas.</p>
Policy 3	143	<p>The requirement for a sustainability statement is not enshrined as a requirement in existing guidance to LPA's. It is debatable whether it should be made mandatory or advisory. Further clarification is needed on what exactly is envisaged in this requirement and at what thresholds should it apply.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the need for proper analysis of the carbon used in construction and the carbon used in the operation of a building. Favourable support should be indicated for a use in which the proposed carbon consumption is demonstrably less than the carbon consumption consumed in the existing use.</p>



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	161	With particular reference to (2). This section is broadly supported but should be made more precise and 'crisp'. Failure to do so will result in a differential approach to the topic and potentially an unfair playing field. Need to replace "work towards" and "aspiration" phrases with clear and unequivocal statements of requirement.
Policy 3	162	support the aspiration but the execution is flawed. The policy does not allow development to be designed which are intrinsically more efficient. Need to amend the policy to record carbon consumption of the completed development and base targets on such a base. Clarify the figures and % base referred to in the penultimate paragraph. Do they relate to whole life consumption, construction stages or operational consumption? Seek to use carbon consumption as a guide to energy efficiency rather than % of renewable energy both during construction and operation.
Policy 3	186	Welcome the protection of historic, archaeological and local character. Besides the prudent use of natural resources, development proposals can be resource and energy efficient by making prudent use of existing built fabric. This approach has been endorsed by the panel conducting the Examination in Public of the Regional Spatial Strategy, and the Secretary of State in her proposed recommendations is set to endorse it. This policy should be amended accordingly.
		Note the intention of the Council to require developers to submit Sustainability Statements in support of their applications however the Panel conducting the examination in Public of the regional Spatial Strategy came out against such statements, and it remains to be seen whether the Council would be able to press ahead with this.
Policy 3	196	This policy should refer to locating new development in appropriate and sustainable locations close to existing or proposed services and facilities which are readily accessible by non car modes of transport.  Reference should be made to the efficient use of water including the promotion of grey water technology. Water is an increasingly scarce resource and it also requires significant amounts of energy. This should be included in the Policy.
Policy 3	217	Support the measures proposed, which will make a strong contribution to sustainable development and ensure new developments incorporate biodiversity. However, we note that the headline figures proposed by the government in the climate change bill seek a reduction in CO2 emissions of 26-32% by 2020, whereas Stockton's target will be 22.5%. This should be revised.  SUDS can be designed to have higher value for wildlife, and we recommend that this course of action is strongly promoted through the Councils development control policies.
Policy 3	280	The secretary of State objects to draft Policy CS3 as it conflicts with Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks paragraph 2.8 which states that "There will normally be a number of development plan documents in the local development framework and conflict between policies should be avoided. The draft policy covers matters relating to facilities for reuse, sorting, recovery and recycling of waste which will be dealt with on a Tees Valley wide basis within the emerging Tees Valley Minerals and waste Core Strategy. It is important that the Stockton on Tees Core Strategy supports the Tees Valley wide document and adds local detail but there should be no conflict or repetition.
Policy 3	305	

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	322	Support the principles of sustainable living, the targets proposed for on site renewable energy generation are out with those contained within the emerging RSS or the Governments renewable energy strategy. This policy should be amended to ensure alignment with the higher tier RSS and national policy which states, at policy 40, that major developments should have embedded within them, a minimum of 10% energy supply from renewable sources. Whilst the text goes on to note that this target should be exceeded where appropriate it is not considered either practical or achievable to impose figures of 25% - 50% which would act as a disincentive to invest within Stockton if other locations are seeking lower contributions.
		The Code for sustainable homes Level 5 or 6 far exceeds the requirement contained within policy 39 of the emerging RSS whereby an Eco Homes 'very good' or 'excellent' rating should be achieved (Level 3).
		The following alteration is proposed:
		"2...new development should comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes and achieve Code Level 3 or above and meet the BREEAM rating of excellent.
		3. Developments incorporated on site renewable energy generation. The thresholds are as follows:
		Commercial development in excess of 1000 square metres of floor space and residential development in excess of 1000 square metres floor space and residential developments of more than 10 dwellings are expected to provide a minimum of 10% of their supply from renewable sources, but seek to achieve more where appropriate.
Policy 3	335	How will "positive contribution" be defined? Too subjective.
Policy 3	354	The HBF support the use of the Code for Sustainable Homes however believes the Council must keep the Core timetable. The HBF considers that the requirements for housing to met the timetable to be premature. The target should be to agree zero carbon standard by 2016.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	355	<p>Any requirement for renewable energy provision upon new development should be delivered through the higher stages of the Code of Sustainable Homes. As this provides a framework and timescale to which the industry is committed to delivering. The HBF considers that the application of locally based energy performance standards would be unhelpful in facilitating the broader delivery of higher energy performance and consumption standards from new housing. The industry believes that the best way to improve the energy efficiency of new housing stock and to promote renewable energy is through innovations in materials and technology development and the economies of scale available to house builders to incorporate the best of these new technologies in the construction process, not by setting arbitrary targets that are impossible to measure.</p> <p>We feel that the prescription of a minimum percentage for the incorporation of certain types of long term renewable energy is neither constructive nor beneficial in helping to tackle climate change.</p> <p>The generation of energy via micro-renewables will do little to help reduce carbon emissions. The reduction is best tackled through the design and construction of homes, improvements to the existing housing stock, changes in consumer preferences and individual behaviour and, at the macro-scale, through investment in cleaner power generation by central Government. A plethora of micro-renewables spread across the UK's 26 million existing homes, needing regular cleaning, routine servicing (by people in vans) and eventual replacement after a couple of decades, strikes us an inefficient use of resources.</p> <p>Solar collectors are the only near viable on site solution at the moment.</p>
Policy 3	356	<p>On the issue of SUDS these should be encouraged or sought where appropriate rather than be required in all circumstances as there remain unresolved difficulties in implementing them in certain circumstances.</p> <p>There are also outstanding problems and uncertainties regarding long term management which must be resolved before SUDS can reasonably be a pre-requisite for all development.</p>
Policy 3	362	<p>Object to the inclusion of criteria 2 in policy CS3 regarding energy efficiency as it is not in accordance with national guidance. PPS1 states that planning policies should not replicate, cut across, or detrimentally affect matters within the scope of other legislation. The building profession is addressing this through the Building regulations.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of paragraph 3 focusing on renewable energy, which is in accordance with RSS policy.</p>
Policy 3	374	<p>It is not necessary for the LDF to include a policy covering this issue. The requirement for all new housing to achieve Code 5 immediately is unrealistic. This should be changed to Code 2.</p> <p>Also consider that the requirement for 15% on-site renewable energy generation by 2011 rising to 50% by 2021, is lacking proper justification and probably not necessary. Does not take into account the possibility of off site renewable energy which is more sustainable/appropriate. It is also the case that if in the future new homes are in fact carbon neutral, the policy objectives would be met in a different way.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	391	Need to include the word 'cultural' in 4.iii of policy CS3 to read Major transport, leisure, tourist, cultural and community facilities. Theatre and performing arts facilities are required elements of a sustainable community, providing social, cultural, environmental and economic benefits. Theatres make a major contribution to the vitality of town centres and are significant elements of any town or city's cultural infrastructure.
Policy 3	410	<p>"Strongly welcome the Councils commitment in this policy"... to address the impacts of climate change by putting sustainability at the heart of the spatial planning process".</p> <p>The policy contains a number of commitments and targets for cutting CO2 emissions and for promotion of on site renewable energy generation for new development.</p> <p>Welcome Para 1 of this policy (hedges/trees etc).</p> <p>To improve the policy... wording should be more explicit the role which high quality open space and woodland can play in enabling adoption to climate change.</p> <p>It is important to promote landscape scale action to link, buffer and extend existing semi-natural habitats as a key strategy to enable wildlife to move and adapt to the impact of climate change.</p> <p>We note that the Council is involved with a partnership of 5 Tees Valley authorities to develop a strategic network of Green Infrastructure and that is precisely the type of landscape scale thinking which we would advocate.</p>
Policy 3	415	NWL would support this policy, particular item 7.
Policy 3	419	Recommend not using generic phrases which simply seek to encourage the use of energy efficiency, renewable energy and minimising waste and pollution.
Policy 3	421	Recommend the inclusion of an overarching climate change policy within the Core Strategy document, addressing the above issues, and the inclusion of discrete, proactive policies on energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable design and construction, within the Development Control DPD.
Policy 3	421	Recommend that policies designed to safeguard the character and setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and greenbelt, for example, have regard to the positive emissions and in mitigating against the environmentally damaging effects of climate change.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	422	<p>Strongly urge the Council to include a prescriptive micro-generation policy and reference to the positive contribution that such a policy can have on increasing overall level of energy efficiency while significantly reducing energy related carbon emissions within development.</p> <p>BWEA emphasises the contribution that small renewable systems can make....Council should implement a policy for the mandatory requirement for onsite renewables, as requested by Yvette Cooper, the Minister for Housing and Planning, on the 8th of June 2006. Such a policy would require onsite renewables to provide electricity for at least 10% of all new buildings needs including refurbishments, in addition to stringent energy efficiency/building performance requirements. The following wording is suggested:</p> <p>"All non-residential or mixed use developments (new build, conservation, or renovation) above a threshold of 1000m2 will be expected to provide at least 10% of their energy requirements from onsite renewable energy generation. All residential developments (new build, conservation, or renovation) of 10 or more units will be expected to provide at least 10% of their energy requirements from onsite renewable energy generation".</p>
Policy 3	423	<p>While building regulations will be strengthened, we recommend the inclusion of a discrete policy on sustainable design and construction methods, and the introduction of minimum efficiency standards for extensions ,change of use conversions and refurbishments.</p> <p>Recommend looking at the renewable Energy Tool Kit for planners, developers and consultants, developed by the London Energy Partnership for further guidance.</p>
Policy 3	424	<p>Recommend that the development plan provide a brief outline of the different renewable energy generation technologies, and equally encourage and promote all forms of renewable energy (solar, biomass, geothermal, hydro etc). The potential for an Energy Services Company and site-wide CHP should also be considered for inclusion.</p>
Policy 3	46	<p>In line with PPS9 this policy should maintain, enhance and deliver opportunities to build beneficial biodiversity and geological conservation features as part of good design.</p>
Policy 3	460	<p>The approach is in general conformity with regional planning policy. Minimising the need to travel and reducing car dependency through the location of development is consistent with RPG1 policy T1 and RSS proposed changes policies 2 and 5A. The provision of travel plans in association with all new development, and the development of a demand management strategy is consistent with RPG 1 Policy T11 and RSS proposed changes Policies 53 and 54.</p> <p>Ensuring that parking levels do not exceed the levels established in the supplementary planning document on parking provision is supported, providing that parking levels do not exceed the levels established in the supplementary planning document on parking provision is supported, provided that these standards are in accordance with the national maxima. The RSS seeks to reduce parking provision.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 3	461	Policy is supported and generally consistent with RPPG1 and policies 2 and 5B of the proposed changes. Reference to achieving BREEAM excellent rating and the code for sustainable homes is supported. However, the policy should also make reference to all new development meeting the Energy Efficiency Best Practise Standard in accordance with RSS proposed changes policy 39. In policy CS3, reference is made to the aspiration to achieve BREEAM rating by 2016. In accordance with the RSS proposed changes policy 39 all new development should achieve BREEAM rating Very Good or Excellent and conform to the code for sustainable homes. This should be reflected in the policy.
Policy 3	462	Recycling facilities are supported - consistent with waste hierarchy RSS proposed changes 46.
Policy 3	463	The use of secure by design principles is consistent RSS policy 24.
Policy 3	464	Reference to water recycling and the use of SUDS is supported, and consistent with RSS proposed changes policies 24 and 36.
Policy 3	84	Agency endorses this policy which supports the Councils Preferred Option to address the impacts of climate change by putting sustainability at the heart of the spatial planning process.
Policy 3	85	Agree that all new development should contribute towards renewable energy targets. Whether this is on site or off site should depend on the scale, nature and size of the development.
Policy 3	86	Support the use of renewable energy sources where applicable and this policy will support the Councils efforts to encourage the development of renewable energy sources.
Policy 3	87	Agency welcomes the policies reference to measures aimed at achieving Government targets on waste reduction.  In the context of this policy it may be useful to note the work of Renew Tees Valley which is supported by One NorthEast and provides a centre for renewable energy and waste management technologies leading to new economic activity. It is intended that this will come through inward investment, the creation of new businesses and helping existing local businesses to develop/diversify into new markets in renewable energy and recycling. This will ensure that across the Tees Valley we have an integrated approach to sustainable development and waste management.
Policy 4	118	In section 1 of this policy the sub-areas of the Borough are allocated a quantity of employment land. It is not clear from this which land is already allocated and which is new requirement. The distribution of employment land does not reflect the market demand for land in accessible attractive locations.  We are worried by the statement that "knowledge based employment uses" will be supported in the University Campus and at North Shore. By implication Stockton will not support knowledge based employment elsewhere. The knowledge economy is the future of Stockton. Limiting investment to two sites is not sufficient.  This policy may have to be reviewed when PPS4 is published which may require a more permissive approach to development.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 4	12	Support the allocation of 40 hectares of general employment land in Yarm/Eaglescliffe
Policy 4	125	Support draft policy SC4 which supports the development of knowledge-based employment uses associated with Durham Universities Queens Campus and expansion at North Shore. However, we consider that greater flexibility should be provided regarding the uses suggested at SC4 3(vii). This should be amended to state "Knowledge-based employment uses associated with Durham Universities Queens Campus and expansion at North Shore. Appropriate uses could include the development of a health centre care cluster, research and development and prestige offices".
Policy 4	131	<p>SC4 concentrates on the approach to the provision of employment land to contribute to economic regeneration. However the policy also seeks to support growth in tourism through various initiatives.</p> <p>Support Policy SC4 however if the policy is to include non B class employment generating uses, it is our opinion that it should reflect all uses which make a contribution to existing and future employment and economic regeneration. In this regard, we would highlight that retail facilities in the Borough and Teesside retail Park in particular are significant direct and indirect contributors to the economy.</p> <p>This policy should refer to the role played by all employment generating activities including retail, commercial, leisure etc.</p>
Policy 4	141	<p>The proposed strategy fails to recognise the potential of large areas of Brownfield employment land at Stockton/Billingham and it is not clear what differences is intended by the different wording in 4 and 5.</p> <p>Need to clarify what further development under use classes B1, B2 and B8 development is still to be welcomed and supported at Haverton Hill.</p>
Policy 4	187	Welcome Part 6 of the Policy which concerns growth in sustainable tourism however investment in the historic environment is capable of much more than improving the tourism and leisure offer. It is genuinely cross-cutting and can help to bring about economic regeneration across a broad range of business sectors. Some recognition of this within the policy would be welcomed.
Policy 4	197	Welcome the policies flexibility in relation to protecting existing sites. Employment sites inappropriately located or which are degraded may be better redeveloped either for more prestigious forms of employment or other higher value uses. In either case there would be likely benefits in terms of regeneration and the environment.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 4	219	<p>Note the preferred option for Seal Sands and North Tees Pools for chemical industries. As areas of Billingham area (as defined on the Core Strategy Diagram) are designated as SPA - and because several areas adjacent to the SPA are used by SPA species, particularly as a high tide roost but also as a feeding habitat - the RSPB is concerned that this strategy could adversely affect the integrity of the SPA.</p> <p>The extant Stockton Local Plan allocations immediately to the south of the main intertidal area at Seal Sands are known to have numbers of curlew, a species forming part of the SPA's internationally important waterfowl assemblage. Heavy industrial development at these locations would therefore lead to the loss of habitats. Also note that two sites adjacent to the Rover Tees to the east of Port Clarence lie directly behind part of the SPA known as the North Tees Mudflats, and therefore have potential to lead to the loss of SPA intertidal habitat through coastal squeeze.</p> <p>Due to the high potential for adverse effects on the SPA in the Billingham area, CS4 should include a similar policy safeguard. However, as stated above the Council needs to take a more thorough approach stating that no adverse effect on the PA integrity will be allowed. The CS's AA will need to provide clear evidence that the proposed allocations can be delivered without an adverse effect.</p>
Policy 4	220	<p>Our comments regarding section 1 of SC4 also apply to section 3. Again, the Council will need to demonstrate that its policies regarding waste management technology and energy generation at Billingham and Seal Sands can be realistically delivered without affecting the SPA. We note that such developments will have regard to the impacts on the environment and local communities. This in insufficient protection for the SPA and would contradict the Habitat Regulations. Section 3 reinforces our view that SC4 should contain an explicit commitment to ensuring that employment land allocations will not lead to adverse effects on the SPA.</p>
Policy 4	221	<p>With reference to section 4. Think that the Core Strategy should contain a specific spatial policy to renewable energy. As regards renewable energy manufacturing, our comments regarding sections 1 and 3 also apply to section 4.</p>
Policy 4	278	<p>It is unclear how the employment land figures in Table 5 relate to the figures given in the policy. Also the location descriptions should correspond with the employment provision descriptions within the spatial strategy as outlined in the draft policy SC1, where appropriate.</p>
Policy 4	306	<p>As previously stated, the Agency generally supports the principle of economic growth where it can be secured in a sustainable manner and considers that employment development should be located on previously developed land where it will not have a detrimental impact upon the SRN and where it can be accessed by a variety of sustainable modes of transport. With regards to the quantity of employment land proposed, the Agency will be able to provide a more detailed assessment of individual proposed sites during its review of the Regeneration DPD (should the required level of detail be available).</p>



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 4	323	<p>It is considered that policy CS4 should be amended to include reference to Wynyard which is identified in policy CS1 and policies 18 and 19 of the RSS.</p> <p>The following additional bullet is considered necessary:</p> <p>"Wynyard 70 hectares of prestige employment land".</p>
Policy 4	399	<p>Support especially to protect and enhance the role of the river Tees corridor as a key economic driver and water sports destination.</p>
Policy 4	465	<p>The inclusion of the restricted categories of employment land (i.e. airport related uses, chemicals and steel) within this table has the effect of reducing the clarity of the policy, and its relationship with policy 18 of the proposed changes to the RSS.</p> <p>Policy 18 makes provision for general employment land regional brownfield mixed use allocations and prestige employment sites, which totals 325 hectares. Airport, chemicals and steel are identified separately in Table 1 of the proposed changes to RSS, and an allocation of 445 hectares is provided in policy 23.</p> <p>This differentiation between the 325 hectares in the general, mixed use and prestige categories is useful and provides a clear distinction between these and the specialist uses. Whilst this is essentially a presentational matter the policy would benefit from greater clarity and differentiation between the allocation in policy 18 of the RSS and those in policy 23.</p>
		<p>In addition the airport category should be presented as separate from the principal allocations.</p>
Policy 4	466	<p>Should Wynyard be accepted, the NEA would encourage the inclusion of a higher allocation in the submission draft core strategy to account for this increase in the allocation at this prestige employment site (145 hectares for prestige employment sites and an increase in the total unrestricted employment land to 400 hectares.</p>
Policy 4	467	<p>It is currently unclear as to how the allocations of general employment land to the sub areas, as identified on the key diagram, are related to the allocation of 235 hectares in the proposed changes to RSS.</p> <p>This policy would benefit from a clearer breakdown of the RSS allocation as well as a breakdown of the supply of restricted employment land.</p>
Policy 4	468	<p>Reference should be made directly to Wynyard as a prestige employment site. The scale of employment growth anticipated at Wynyard will have transport implications that will need to be recognised as an issue, both in this policy and policy CS2.</p>
Policy 4	469	<p>RSS proposed changes policy 4 directs local authorities to plan for the managed release of employment land for the periods 2004-11; 2011-16 and 2016-21. The Core Strategy should therefore ensure that employment land supply is prioritised in order of its phased release.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 4	48	Make reference to regeneration in rural areas. Recognise the need for diversification of the rural economy and the delivery of new agri - environmental schemes (Environmental Stewardship) to secure widespread environmental benefits to including enhancement of biodiversity, landscape and cultural interests. This will require establishment of a range of skills and enterprises, which the LDF should encourage. This policy should also be linked to a policy which covers the re-use of rural buildings.
Policy 4	49	Point 5. Need to ensure protection of the natural heritage value as well as the amenity value of the river corridor.
Policy 4	50	Point 6. Policy should seek to improve access to the environment. Additional sites that should be included in the list: Teesmouth National Nature Reserve; the Tees Forest; Portrack Marsh Nature Reserve (Tees Valley Wildlife Trust).
Policy 4	70	Makes no reference to the 20ha of general employment land which draft RSS provides for at South Side at DTVA. See policy 18 of RSS. CS should include a similar reference.
Policy 4	88	Broadly endorse the Councils Preferred Option for the distribution and phasing of the Boroughs housing needs.
Policy 4	89	Welcome the protection afforded of existing employment sites by this policy.
Policy 4	90	Welcome the inclusion of the knowledge-based employment uses associated with Durham University's Queens Campus and North Shore since these sites actively encourage regeneration of Stockton Borough. North Shore is one of the eight Regional Brownfield Mixed Use Development Schemes identified within the draft submission Regional Spatial Strategy.
Policy 4	91	It is appropriate for this Core Strategy to include reference to the provision of skills training contribution where appropriate.
Policy 4	92	Inclusion within the CS of a requirement for developers to provide a skills training programme within appropriate development proposals will ensure that this important issue is addressed.
Policy 5	108	Sport England note the desire to extend the Splash facility but would only support such a proposal where need for additional facilities was shown to be necessary through a PPG 17 compliant Local Needs Analysis.
Policy 5	119	Support the thrust of the Policy. Pleased that it does not seek to limit office development to Town Centres which we feel would be a mistake.
		Would like to see consideration of Bowesfield for a local shopping centre. At present there are 260 residential units and a large number of people working in and around Bowesfield. It would make sense for there to be a small local retail provision within this area.
Policy 5	126	Support Draft Policy SC5 which focuses and promotes proposals for retailing as well as offices, leisure, culture, social and community facilities within the town centre.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 5	130	<p>Acknowledge that Core Strategies focus on Stockton's role as the main centre in the Borough for retail, culture, leisure and civic administrative activities.</p> <p>Welcome recognition of the role of Teesside retail Park in the retail hierarchy but consider that the more appropriate approach would be to acknowledge that additional retail development will be subject to PPS6 considerations. A criteria based policy reflecting PPS6 is therefore recommended against which any large scale non town centre retail proposals can be considered.</p> <p>If such proposals are shown to meet the criteria in this policy it would be preferable, from the point of view of sustainability, to first locate new development at existing out of centre retail locations before considering new free standing sites. This would improve opportunities for single trips to retail destinations and help reduce increases in the number of journeys.</p> <p>In our opinion, Portrack Lane is inferior to Teesside Park in Planning Terms as the retail provision on Portrack Lane is distributed over a wider area with little opportunity for linked trips. In comparison Teesside Park provides a concentration of retail warehousing and other facilities.</p> <p>The following modification to SC5 should be made:</p> <p>The main existing out of centre retail provision in Stockton is located at Teesside Retail Park and Portrack Lane. These locations form an established part of the overall network of retail provision in the Borough. The role played by Teesside Retail Park will continue to be recognised. Where the following criteria can be satisfactorily addressed, the Council will first wish to see identified needs met at Teesside Retail Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) there is a proven need for the proposed development, and</li> <li>(b) There are no available, suitable or viable sites or the proposed development in or on the edge of Stockton town centre or other defined centres, taking into account the types of goods sold and the role of the centres</li> <li>© the development would not result in an unacceptable loss to the vitality and viability of any nearby town centre, and</li> <li>(d) the development would not result in an unacceptable increase in congestion on the surrounding highway network, and</li> <li>(e) the development would be accessible by public transport from a wide area and would not significantly extend journey patterns.</li> </ul>
Policy 5	132	<p>The current retail hierarchy promoted through the Core Strategy Preferred Options is constraining retail development that is necessary to ensure vital and viable centres. Ingleby Barwick should be a district centre in order that it can adequately meet the needs of its large and expanding local population. There should also be an extension to the centre boundary as part of the re-designation.</p>
Policy 5	134	<p>Examining the Core Strategy Diagram, it is worthy of note that out of the 5 Housing Subdivision Areas marked, Ingleby Barwick is the only sub area without a district or town centre (as they appear in the current retail hierarchy). This balance must be re-dressed and Ingleby Barwick recognised more strongly in the retail hierarchy with designation as a district centre, as part of the wider rearrangement of the retail hierarchy.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 5	135	<p>Object to the proposed hierarchy in response so Objective 4 and proposed Draft Core Strategy Policy 5 (CS5).</p> <p>The importance of Billingham, Thornaby and Yarm is recognised in both Objective 4 and SC5 but they remain allocated as district centres, in line with the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan 2004.</p> <p>Thornaby, Billingham and Yarm should be reallocated in the hierarchy as town centres.</p> <p>The current version of the CS, incorporating the Secretary of States Proposed changes, highlights the importance of Stockton as an urban centre, but it does not go as far as directing the role of these centres further down the hierarchy. This provides an opportunity to prepare a SC that corrects the clear discrepancies in the current arrangement of the retail hierarchy.</p> <p>Despite being allocated as district centres, Thornaby, Billingham and Yarm are well known as 'town centres' and clearly perform town centre functions in PPS6 terms. The local centres, particularly Norton and Ingleby Barwick function over and above local centres in PPS6 terms and clearly perform district centre functions.</p>
Policy 5	136	<p>Re-designating the centres in the hierarchy will more accurately reflect the scale of the centres and will in no way undermine the regeneration of Thornaby and Billingham town centres.</p> <p>It is likely that it will support their growth and enhance their vitality and viability. Should the retail hierarchy be re-designated only development in-keeping with the scale of the individual centres will be permitted (in line with PPS6).</p>
Policy 5	137	<p>The Retail Study (2004) is currently being updated but only in relation to the quantitative capacity available in the Borough. In the absence of this study, and a lack of any likely recommendations on the retail hierarchy, a reasonable and sound judgement to maintain the current status quo of the hierarchy, in line with the Structure Plan cannot be made by the Council.</p>
Policy 5	138	<p>Current local centres should be considered for evaluation to district centres, particularly High Street, Norton and Myton way Ingleby Barwick. These changes are in line with PPS6.</p>
Policy 5	139	<p>Support the overall aim of Policy CS5. Support the aims to protect and enhance the retail character and function of Stockton Town Centre. Support the aim to improve the gateways, creating new development opportunities and promoting environmental improvements. Welcome the acknowledgement of the benefits that the new food store will bring to the town centre.</p> <p>Consider that it would be appropriate to highlight the need to enhance food store provision in the town centre within Policy SC5 itself: Local Development Frameworks requires, under Test of Soundness 4, that DPDs are consistent with, inter alia, national planning policy. In this context, Planning Policy Statement 6 requires local authorities to identify deficiencies in retail provision, assess the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development.</p> <p>The 2004 retail study, identifies a need to enhance the provision of large food stores within existing centres. The Core Strategy should recognise the potential of the Castlegate Centre to regenerate this part of the town centre.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 5	175	Concerns over the emerging Core Strategy consultation document, in relation to retailing and the available evidence base.
Policy 5	188	By respecting and building upon the historic character of the town centre, a retail offer can be provided which is not available elsewhere. Also support the reuse of upper floors and it is important to ensure that proposals at ground floor level do not remove the opportunity for independent access to the floors above.
Policy 5	198	Welcome the Councils commitment to focus and promote proposals for retailing and other appropriate town centre uses within the district centres of Billingham, Thornaby and Yarm. In respect to Thornaby particular mention is made in respect to its redevelopment and the need for any additional retail allocations up to 2011 because there is little need for additional floor space in the short term. The final wording of this policy should indicate the level of provision needed in the medium and long term.
		Housing provision is catered for until 2024 and Thornaby is planned to have a significant proportion of that growth. Such growth will likely generate extra retail demand and this needs to be accommodated. Expansions of the centres should be considered to enhance the sustainability of the centres.
		In respect to the NWL site, this is used as offices with associated parking etc. A use which is considered already to be an appropriate town/district centre use. Extending the boundary of the centre around the NWL site would seem appropriate and altering the above policy to allow this would ensure that the SC is flexible enough to accommodate the planned for growth and help to make the SC sound. The NWL site could also facilitate the provision of a link between Allensway and Trenchard Avenue which could be partly funded by the redevelopment of the site for higher value town centre uses. This would also provide a southern boundary of the site. The provision of such a link road has a number of benefits particular in improving access to the centre.
Policy 5	228	The Councils preferred option as set out within this policy is to focus and promote proposals for retailing as well as offices, commercial and leisure activities within Stockton Town Centre. This is supported however if the vision and aspirations of the Council are to be achieved in respect of economic and social growth, then the Core Strategy should be positively planning for not just accommodating these uses in the Town Centre but expanding the centre and seeing it grow to its full potential. This should mean amending this policy to allow for growth of the Town Centre. Suggesting that there should be no further retail allocations in advance of 2011 should be deleted given that any retail development can have wider economic benefits and support the wider aims and vision.
Policy 5	249	We support the Council's position given to Stockton town centre.
Policy 5	250	There should be no scope for further development at Teesside Park and Portrack Lane, as out-of-centre sites.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 5	272	The Council support the objectives of Draft Core Strategy Policy CS5, and its aim to focus and promote development in Stockton town centre. However, the Council consider that it would be appropriate to strengthen the policy stance for out of centre developments at Teesside Park and Portrack Lane. This should seek to ensure that no further developments take place in these out of centre locations, which are identified in the emerging retail work being undertaken already capture a significant share of retail trade in the sub region. Further retail growth in these locations could undermine the roles of Middlesbrough and Stockton town centres. In this context it is considered that it would be appropriate for the policy to make reference to the sequential approach for site selection and the need to protect the vitality and viability of centres within the retail hierarchy.
Policy 5	279	Object to draft Policy CS5 as it conflicts with Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres paragraph 2.16 which states that planning authorities should "identify the centres within their area where development will be focussed, as well as the need for any new centres of local importance, and develop strategies for developing and strengthening centres of local importance, and develop strategies for developing and strengthening centres within their area."
		The draft policy does identify the centres but only deals with the period up to 2011, the draft policy should cover the same period as indicated in the vision, i.e. 2021.
Policy 5	307	Generally support the Retail Strategy and welcome the priority afforded to town centres, which is in accordance with national planning guidance. The Agency considers that town centre are generally the most sustainable locations for development on the grounds of accessibility by a wide range of transport modes.
Policy 5	327	Support general improvements to the retail offer and shopping environment in Stockton, particularly in light of the significant level of growth prescribed under the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East. To this end, we support the Councils policies to enhance the centres.
Policy 5	328	Recognises that planned improvements to all three of these centres will protect and enhance the function of these stores, and believes that its Billingham store could play a pivotal role in the proposals at this centre. ASDA would also like the Council to ensure that any future retail growth of these areas would continue to protect the viability of these centres and Councils investment in their enhancement.
Policy 5	329	ASDA would urge the Council to adopt a policy which, while protecting the roles of existing centres, also allows for retail developments elsewhere where it can meet wider sustainability, economic and social objectives, including meeting local needs and promoting Stockton's competitiveness.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 5	357	<p>Preference would be for the inclusion of Option 2.</p> <p>The phasing suggested in Option 2 concentrates on future development in Yarm and Eaglescliffe on a meaningful scale 2011-2016. We support the thrust of this option particularly the priority given to Brownfield regeneration sites. However greater emphasis should be placed within phases 2004-2011 where sites are available, suitable and help to deliver wider policy objectives such as recycling rates and affordable housing. Advice contained within PPS3 and its current context identifies new house building as a national priority. RSS and PPS3 note that housing numbers within the RSS are not ceilings, they seek to increase affordability, improve design and environmental performance. One of the Strategic Housing Policy goals of PPS3 is to provide "decent homes for everyone, affordable, where people want to live". To focus new housing and development with the SMI and Core Area would undermine this strategic Housing Policy Goal.</p>
Policy 5	364	<p>Support the Councils objectives of this policy.</p>
Policy 5	392	<p>We are pleased to see that a Cultural Quarter will be developed and that the text includes promoting a balanced and socially inclusive cultural sector. Town centres are about more than just retailing...expression of their culture and identity. As well as shops they should provide a range of functions.</p>
Policy 5	400	<p>Support - especially 24 hour economy along River Tees, including Tees Barrage.</p>
Policy 5	425	<p>Support Policy CS5 on Town Centres. Support the strategy to focus proposals for retail and other town centre uses within Thornaby town centre as a designated district centre. Thornfield Properties have drawn up a retail-led redevelopment scheme for Thornaby town centre, which is urgently in need of a retail-led redevelopment scheme for Thornaby town centre.</p>
Policy 5	470	<p>The approach is consistent with RPG1 policies TC2 and TC3 which direct plans to establish a hierarchy of centres, and consider the scope for new or replacement district and local centres. The priority to concentrate town centre uses in Stockton primarily, and then in the district centres of Yarm, Billingham, and Thornaby is consistent with RPG 1 policy R1 and RSS proposed changes policy 25, which direct town centre uses to define urban centres, commensurate with their scale and function.</p> <p>Although not a requirement of regional planning policy, establishing the scale of development acceptable and anticipated in the centres listed in policy CS5 would more clearly define their role and ensure that any development is consistent with their scale and function. The restriction of development in out of centre locations is consistent with RPG1 policy RD3, which states that development plans should not make provision for new out of centre retail development of regional or sub-regional significance.</p> <p>The role Stockton plays in the region, as a commercial centre should be outlined in the supporting text to the policy.</p>
Policy 5	93	<p>Agency endorses this policy which supports the Councils Preferred Option to prioritise the town centres within the Borough and to focus and promote proposals for main services within those centres.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 5	94	The recent master planning exercise, which covers riverside/town centre area of Stockton has found that one of the biggest obstacles to regeneration of the town centre is the loss of retailers to out of town locations. Agency welcomes the restrictions imposed by this policy to resist out-of-town centre retail development.
Policy 6	109	Welcome the thrust of this policy, particularly the clarification on para 6.39 that sport and recreation facilities are an essential part of the range of facilities that make communities sustainable.  The word 'sport ' should be inserted in point 4 after the words open space.  Point 5 could be amended to read "Supplements the Building Schools for the Future programme to meet the Borough's need for facilities".  Draft Policy 11 Planning Obligations. Sport England support this policy.
Policy 6	172	The policy is too narrowly drafted in a geographic sense as it does not encourage the use of river corridors other than the Tees for leisure and recreational purposes. Increasing the coverage to include the Billingham Beck Valley would help assist with the remediation of contaminated land and would provide a link between two existing pieces of community infrastructure - the existing Country Park and the 8 Bridges cycle way.
Policy 6	222	Welcome the inclusion of open space as a community facility. However believe that high quality green space in an important and specific community facility that should be promoted within the Core Strategy.  Section 3 and 4 should specifically refer to the need to provide high quality green space within the Green Blue Heart and in open space/recreational facilities throughout the Borough.
Policy 6	308	Generally supportive of this policy, particularly with regard to ensuring that additional facilities are provided where they are accessible by means of transport other than the private car. The Agency also welcomes reference to encouraging multipurpose facilities in one accessible location, which can help to increase the service provision in a community reducing the need to travel.
Policy 6	324	It is noted that the strategy seeks to provide a range of community facilities at the heart of every community. The CS goes onto note that the community facilities can contribute to community cohesion and identity, and can also reduce the need to travel by providing easy access to multiple facilities. That is precisely that is being proposed at Wynyard.
Policy 6	365	Support this policy.



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 6	393	In Spite of the bullet points at 6.39 in the accompanying text we suggest that this description for community facilities should be simplified and recommend community facilities provide for health, welfare, social, educational, leisure and cultural needs of the community. This would include all the items mentioned but currently theatres and probably other facilities are omitted.
		This policy should also state that the loss of existing facility will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer needed, or it can be established that the services provided by the facility can served in an alternative location or manner that is equally accessible by the community.
Policy 6	394	The Strategy should provide sufficient protection to ensure continued theatre use within the area, particularly where theatres, or buildings for performance arts, may not be covered by listing or conservation areas or may be affected by new developments. (include performing arts facilities that stand alone, are part of other facilities, or are contained within educational or community buildings.
Policy 6	401	Support opportunities within the river corridor and Green Blue Heart to widen the Boroughs cultural, sport, recreation and leisure.
Policy 6	471	Support the policy. This is consistent with the objectives of RSS proposed changes policies 2 and 24, In order to better reflect RSS proposed changes 2 and 7, either this policy and or policy CS3 should make reference to supporting the establishment of a network of green infrastructure.
Policy 6	95	Support this policy which supports the Councils Preferred Option to ensure that additional facilities meet the needs of the Borough.
Policy 6	96	Welcome the reference in this policy to the Green Blue Heart which recognises the importance of the community benefits that this long term plan can provide.
Policy 7	120	Support the 20% flexibility over and above the RSS target.  Concerned that there may be over reliance on the Councils Strategic Land Availability Assessment which may not identify all the opportunities which will come forward over a period of time. The urban areas outside the Core Area will deliver substantial Brownfield windfall housing in the future. In accordance with PPS3 this unknown element should not be factored into the LDF supply calculations.
		Policy should not restrict windfall sites by including a statement that housing calculations will not be used as a reason for refusing applications on urban Brownfield windfall sites.
Policy 7	127	Support the Councils Preferred Option to support regeneration through the addition of a flexible element of 20% above the indicative RSS allocation.
Policy 7	148	The specific provision of 14 homes a year between 2011 and 2016 seems illogical and is not founded upon sound planning arguments which are articulated in the policy or supporting text. Requires a sustainable village appraisal.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 7	165	Flexibility does not allow for schemes to come forward within the Stockton area to meet changing housing need. Existing permissions are unlikely to address needs specifically identified in the 2006 (7) Housing needs Study and therefore the needs of specific groups, such as the elderly, will be compromised unless they move into the Core Area. This will lead to the break up of established community support networks which is considered undesirable. Stockton should be allocated a sensible proportion of the housing allocation to allow for sustainable forms of development to take place which meet local needs. It is suggested that an allocation of at least 100 homes a year should be provided.
Policy 7	199	Acknowledge the planned growth for Thornaby.
Policy 7	234	Allocating sites in and adjoining service villages would promote a greater range and choice of house types. The land to the north of Maltby would be able to accommodate a mix of higher value and affordable dwellings.
Policy 7	235	Support for the Council's approach to extend flexibility in the provision of housing by 20%.
Policy 7	266	Paragraph 6.50. Support the statement "Yarm does not have regeneration needs and the proposed allocation for the Yarm and Eaglescliffe sub-division is accordingly of a modest scale". Also encouraged by the western area introduction re Yarm.  However opportunities for further development here may be limited by environmental considerations, in terms of its historic fabric and constrained setting.
Policy 7	269	Page 19 2.15 of regeneration DPD indicates that there is no need to develop further housing in rural areas yet that Councils CS7 Housing and distribution and phasing table on page 45 of the Core Strategy document shows a figure of 14 in rural areas 2011-16 -proposed by the Council. Would like the rural development number to be reduced to 0 in all years including 2011-16. Also more emphasis should be placed on affordable housing to meet the needs of the disabled e.g. Bungalows.
Policy 7	27	There will be a political and social upheaval if the proposal for zero building within Stockton is maintained throughout the plan period as envisaged.  Would like the strategy to be re-thought with the majority of the core proposal removed from that area and applied to the area headed Stockton (housing area 2). Minor amendments required to rural area as well.
Policy 7	273	Draft Core Strategy Policy CS7 identifies the addition of a flexibility element of 20% above the indicative Regional Spatial Strategy (housing) allocation. It is considered that the policy would be more robust if the document provided some evidence as to how this figure has been reached. Furthermore, an explanation of how the additional housing element will be used would be appropriate. Stockton Council should demonstrate that the flexible element of 20% will support the delivery of regeneration activities, and will not be used to enable further Greenfield or other development in areas which could have a potentially adverse impact on housing market renewal and regeneration activities.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 7	274	It would be useful if the document included an assessment of how the Councils policies/proposals impact upon wider housing renewal activities, including those being conducted in Middlesbrough. Such an approach, sympathetic to wider HMR activities, will help support the policy objectives on the MBC core strategy in tackling HMR issues and wider regeneration activities.
Policy 7	325	It states that the Council is currently undertaking a Sustainability Study which will assess the housing needs of the villages and their ability to support additional development in a sustainable way. Pending the outcome of the study, the council may consider amending allocations to the rural sub-division within development limits. In relation to Wynyard it is considered that it has a hybrid role as not only a village but also as a major mixed use development with the potential to generate up to 15000 jobs. Housing and employment opportunities should be considered in parallel. We consider an alteration to policy CS7 is required to ensure that a sustainable spatial strategy at Wynyard, building on the success achieved to date can be secured.  There is potential for up to 300 additional dwellings at Wynyard. This is required to deliver a sustainable community and also ensures high quality housing to meet a demonstrable requirement is provided in close proximity to the sub regions only prestige employment site. This is considered necessary to ensure that the strategy is the most appropriate for Stockton on Tees.  Through phasing, we would anticipate development coming forward at a rate of 50 units per annum from 2011 and would suggest an additional row to be incorporated in policy SC7 as follows:  Wynyard: 2004-2011    11-16    16-21    21-24 0            50           50           0  Within the period 2004-2011 it is envisaged that development will comprise the continuation of the extant consents at Wynyard before the current masterplan is progressed. Accordingly, no allowance for additional units is proposed in the initial period.
Policy 7	351	Object to areas and the lack of allocation for Stockton.
Policy 7	352	Support flexibility of 20%
Policy 7	359	Balancing the RSS and the requirements of PPS3 in the provision of future housing is generally supported. As mentioned previously, Core Policy CS1 should be amended to reflect sufficient housing coming forward to take account of needs and demand and improve choice. 20% allowance for flexibility is welcomed.

Core Strategy Reference	Comment Number	Comment Summary
Policy 7	366	<p>Welcome the proposals to increase housing numbers within the Borough and is in general agreement with the Council that Option 1 would not provide an adequate framework to achieve this goal. We support the 20% flexibility. However the Council has got to be satisfied that in choosing Option 3 that this is the correct way to interpret the PPS3 20% i.e. should/can Core Strategy Allocation numbers include 20% flexibility or is this to be treated as an allowable extra cover for DC purposes? Permission Homes seeks clarification on this matter.</p> <p>With regards to Ingleby Barwick, we accept the future development should not exceed figures anticipated within the approved masterplan (2002) which is reflected within the statistical analysis work for the policy; however, we propose that the Core Strategy document should make specific reference to this matter.</p> <p>PH acknowledge and welcomes the need for continued regeneration of the Borough but note caution on the over-reliance of regeneration sites. Past successful housing provision within the region has been achieved through a balanced proportion of sites coming forward, providing range and choice, and it is essential that this continues to be the case, and maintained throughout the plan period.</p> <p>PM highlights that large drops in annual requirements over the plan period are based on performance at the time. As it is a requirement to continually monitor the progress of housing provision through Annual Monitoring reports, we request that the Core Strategy should show more flexibility in the numerical phasing of distribution as logically the three periods will roll into one another.</p>

Core Strategy Reference	Comment Number	Comment Summary																																													
Policy 7	375	<p>Support 20% flexibility. This flexibility element does not take account of the fact that Tees Valley Living has recently submitted a bid for the Tees Valley to become a growth point. This could increase it further.</p> <p>Object to the proposed distribution of the remaining. Non housing requirement as detailed in the policy. They consider that the over concentration of development in the Core Area and the complete absence of any additional development in the rest of the Stockton Area to be unsustainable and un-sound. A more appropriate distribution should be as outlined below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>04-11</th> <th>11-16</th> <th>16-21</th> <th>21-24</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Core Area</td> <td>305</td> <td>590</td> <td>1110</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Billingham</td> <td>190</td> <td>250</td> <td>150</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stockton</td> <td>0</td> <td>300</td> <td>500</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thornaby</td> <td>100</td> <td>250</td> <td>150</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yarm/Eaglescliffe</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ingleby Barwick</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural Area</td> <td>64</td> <td>50</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>660</td> <td>1440</td> <td>1940</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The justification for the figure in Table 1 is that, in terms of the future terms of future housing land supply post 2016, the Core Strategy is unrealistic and unsustainably dependant upon the Core Area as the main source of sites for new housing development - 64% 2016-2021 and 84% 2021-2024. This approach is not robust. There is a need to ensure to a broader range of new housing throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The best way to address this issue is to identify an additional strategic growth option in the Borough, as previously proposed in the Tees Valley Structure Plan. The land at Hartburn Grange on the western edge of Stockton town (site Ha13 would be the best site.</p>		04-11	11-16	16-21	21-24	Core Area	305	590	1110		Billingham	190	250	150		Stockton	0	300	500		Thornaby	100	250	150		Yarm/Eaglescliffe	0	0	0		Ingleby Barwick	0	0	0		Rural Area	64	50	30		TOTAL	660	1440	1940	
	04-11	11-16	16-21	21-24																																											
Core Area	305	590	1110																																												
Billingham	190	250	150																																												
Stockton	0	300	500																																												
Thornaby	100	250	150																																												
Yarm/Eaglescliffe	0	0	0																																												
Ingleby Barwick	0	0	0																																												
Rural Area	64	50	30																																												
TOTAL	660	1440	1940																																												
Policy 7	378	<p>Object to the preferred option of housing distribution and phasing.</p> <p>The flexibility approach of 20% could affect the ability of Redcar and Cleveland Council to achieve its own housing requirement figure, as agreed by the Tees Valley authorities.</p> <p>There is no strategic planning justification at this time for adding a further 20% onto the figures, notwithstanding that some uplift of the housing requirement may be required if the Tees valleys bid (growth point) is successful.</p> <p>The table in Option 3 should be amended as set out in the Tees Valley joint response dated August 2007 by the JSU to the North East Regional Spatial Strategy. These figures were agreed by all the Tees valley Local Planning Authorities.</p>																																													
Policy 7	382	<p>There is no recognition made that other sites will come forward during the life of the LDF that whilst not allocated, will be acceptable in planning terms, in all other respects. In accordance with the approach taken by other local authorities, it would be more appropriate to include a separate policy addressing this issue.</p>																																													

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 7	388	<p>Support the 20% flexibility element of the RSS requirements. It is clear from PPS3 that the figures are not a ceiling and are only intended to be a guide on housing numbers.</p> <p>If the growth point bid is successful, housing figures should be increased.</p> <p>Object to the proposed distribution of the remaining, non committed housing requirements as detailed in the policy. It considers that the over concentration of development in the Core Area and amount of additional development proposed in the rest of the Stockton area to be unsustainable and unsound. For the reasons outlined in relation to representations on the Vision and Spatial Strategy they would prefer a more equitable distribution of housing which supports the long term sustainability of the Borough Service villages, particularly Thorpe Thewles.</p> <p>The number of dwellings should be increased to at least 50 in each of three plan periods to 2024 from the present 14. This will help support the rural villages.</p>
Policy 7	402	Support policy 7.
Policy 7	408	<p>Support the 20% flexibility element of the RSS requirements. It is clear from PPS3 that the figures are not a ceiling and are only intended to be a guide on housing numbers.</p> <p>If the growth point bid is successful, housing figures should be increased.</p> <p>Object to the proposed distribution of the remaining, non committed housing requirements as detailed in the policy. It considers that the over concentration of development in the Core Area and amount of additional development proposed in the rest of the Stockton area to be unsustainable and unsound. For the reasons outlined in relation to representations on the Vision and Spatial Strategy they would prefer a more equitable distribution of housing which supports the long term sustainability of the Borough Service villages, particularly Longnewton.</p> <p>“Acknowledge aim number 5 on page 26 which states: “Elsewhere, development within limits will be small scale, low key growth demonstrably necessary to maintain the vitality and viability of sustainable settlements and neighbourhoods”.</p> <p>The number of dwellings should be increased to at least 50 in each of three plan periods to 2024 from the present 14. This will help support the rural villages.</p> <p>The site North of White House Farm and at Mount Pleasant would represent the best location for a housing allocation to sustain the long term vitality and viability of Longnewton.</p>
Policy 7	416	Request close liaison with the Council and potential development partners at the earliest stage to identify the precise details of future development, such as specific use and scale and density of development, so that they can carry out a more detailed assessment on capacity issues relating to individual sites and therefore the implications for strategic water and sewer investment in the Borough over the Plan period.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 7	472	RSS proposed changes policies 5 and 7 direct the majority of new development to the conurbations and place particular emphasis on the regeneration of the core urban areas. Policy 30 should be seen as a ceiling where the objectives of the strategy are being fulfilled. Concentrating more housing provision in part of the conurbation represents an over provision that would not be to the detriment of delivering the strategy.
Policy 7	473	Housing should be a mix of dwellings.
Policy 7	474	Need to consider how this would impact on the wider housing market area.
Policy 7	475	Need to say more about housing market restructuring and how this will occur - how it will contribute alongside the net dwelling provision, to a better housing stock and wider planning objectives. Some indication of anticipated gross build would therefore be valuable because it would give recognition to both facets of house building that are likely to occur over the plan period.
Policy 7	476	RSS proposed changes policy 30 includes sub-regional previously developed land targets, which for the Tees Valley is 70%. The NEA would support reference to this target in the policy.
Policy 7	97	Broadly endorse the Councils Preferred Option for the distribution and phasing of the Boroughs housing needs.
Policy 7	98	Previously the Agency, welcomed the sequential approach to site selection. This approach will enable the Council to prioritise areas for development and ensure that services and community facilities can be planned and delivered where required rather than a piecemeal approach to development. There is no mention of the sequential approach within Policy 7.
Policy 7	99	Welcome the 20% flexibility allowance of this policy in the context of the delivery of the housing element of the SMI, although we acknowledge that 20% will need to be justified by the Council within the Boroughs overall housing allocation.
Policy 8	100	Welcome the inclusion of this policy which refers to the provision of a mix and balance of good quality housing of all types and tenure.  It is important to support the Tees Valley Living Project to restructure the housing stock. An important consideration in new build will be not only the number of units but also the type of new build and how this relates to the existing stock in the Borough.  Work on the regional housing aspirations by the Agency demonstrates the importance of providing a different range of housing types in the future in order to achieve sustainable communities and support the regional economy.
Policy 8	101	It is considered that cross boundary issues relating to housing provision and employment will be addressed only by continued interaction between the appropriate local authorities, regional and other partnerships. This should be acknowledged within this policy.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 8	121	Support the proposal to provide 15% affordable housing.
Policy 8	129	Support the Preferred Option to create sustainable residential communities by providing mix and balance of good quality housing however do not consider that there is a sound evidence base to justify a requirement for a minimum of 15% affordable housing provision on sites over 15 dwellings in urban areas, especially given there is currently a supply of 9 years within the Stockton urban area. The Local Housing Needs Assessment requires the provision of 40 affordable units per annum, with 20.6 of these to be provided within the Stockton urban area. There are currently 184 affordable new units coming on stream within the Stockton area providing a 9 year supply. See the covering letter for more detail.  CS8 should be amended to state the following:  "Housing proposals of 15 units or over will be required to provide an appropriate mix of housing on the site, including affordable housing where necessary. The final mix will be negotiated with the developer based on local housing needs and aspirations identified in the up-to-date housing market assessment".
Policy 8	145	The reference in Section 7iii suggests a special emphasis is to be given to the use of Council sites to deliver affordable housing. However it is concluded that this should only be considered in locations which are otherwise suitable for housing in accordance with remaining core policies. Depot sites in industrial areas should not be used to deliver affordable housing.  Need to clarify the wording of the policy to make it clear that such sites must otherwise be suitable for housing.
Policy 8	149	Clarify that development in sustainable villages need not be required to be affordable, other than in the context of clause (5) unless the site is proposed as an exceptions site and is outside defined limits to development. The policy might be interpreted to suggest that only exceptions housing of which 100% will be affordable, will be permitted within the villages.
Policy 8	190	Support the Council's intention to renovate and improve the Borough's existing housing stock where sustainable and viable to do so. In light of the approach to the prudent use of existing buildings, the implementation of the policy requires a form of adoption of existing buildings to help meet current housing demands and only when it is uneconomical or socially unacceptable to do so should demolition and redevelopment be contemplated.  Support the wording of the part of the second consideration which concerns itself with demolition and redevelopment.  Welcome the policy which seeks to achieve a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare.
Policy 8	284	Rural exception sites should not be detrimental to the green wedges between villages. Also affordable housing should not overcome the need for sustainable developments.
Policy 8	310	The Agency has no particular comment but considers that the provision of a mix of housing types, sizes and tenures, can help to reduce the need to travel by giving everyone the opportunity to live in their desired location where they can access employment opportunities via sustainable transport modes.



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 8	326	<p>The Council are seeking to create sustainable communities by providing a mix and balance of good quality housing of all types and tenures. The draft policy recognises that in locations such as parts of Yarm and Eaglescliffe, which are characterised by mature dwellings and large gardens, a density of lower than 30 dwellings per hectare may be appropriate.</p> <p>This is considered equally applicable to Wynyard which is also an existing community within Stockton and has the continued potential to provide larger dwellings within large gardens to meet the defined need for executive and prestige housing.</p> <p>Finally whilst we note that the requirement for a minimum of 15% affordable housing in sites over 15 dwellings in applicable within the urban areas, if this policy expands to cover sites out with the urban areas Wynyard Estates have concerns over the robustness of the evidence base. Given the shortfall is understood to be in the region of 40 units per annum, against the emerging requirements, this does not represent 15% of the planned output but nearer 6% against the proposed changes to RSS.</p> <p>Cognisant of the analysis contained in the aforementioned section bullet 3 of policy 8 should be amended to state:</p> <p>"Housing proposals of 15 units or more will be required to provide an appropriate mix of housing on the site, including affordable housing where necessary. The final mix will be negotiated with the developer based on local housing needs and aspirations identified in an up-to-date housing market assessment".</p> <p>This will ensure the policy is robust (tees viii) yet can be applied on a flexible basis (test ix), site by site and area by area rather than a blanket policy.</p>
Policy 8	367	<p>Support the need for a policy on affordable housing provision within the Borough. However an accurate requirement for the region can only be published once the SHLAA is complete.</p>
Policy 8	376	<p>Consider the requirement to meet a minimum housing density of 30 dwellings/ha on all new sites, except in parts of Yarm and Eaglescliffe which are characterised by mature dwellings in large gardens, is no longer appropriate or supported by PPS3 or RSS.</p> <p>Policy should include an acknowledgement that lower density development may also be appropriate in other locations in the Borough as part of proposals to meet the need for high value low density development and improve the range of mix of properties. Amend policy to reflect paragraphs 46-47 concerning the need to define local density standards. It is no longer appropriate to rely on a blanket density of 30dph.</p> <p>In terms of affordable housing it is noted that the Council is seeking 15% of all homes on sites &gt;15 units to be affordable. This does not reflect the requirement in the Housing Assessment 2006 which states that only 40 affordable dwellings per year is required until 2012.</p>

Core Strategy Reference	Comment Number	Comment Summary
Policy 8	383	<p>The Regional Economic Strategy/Housing Strategy/Draft RSS and Regional Housing Aspirations Study all recognise that the current housing stock in the north east is acting as a barrier to economic growth and in migration and that the identification of a shortage of mid-market and executive housing reinforces this. A specific reference should be made within Policy 8 to the need to provide housing at the top end of the marked in addition to addressing the shortage of affordable housing in the Borough.</p>
Policy 8	389	<p>Object to the reference in Point 3 of CS8 that housing development should achieve a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare across the Borough except in certain specified locations (Yarm and Eaglescliffe). This approach no longer complies with guidance in PPS3 (Para 45/47) which promotes a more flexible approach to housing densities, especially where this would help re-balance the housing stock and correct an over-reliance of terraces and semi detached properties at medium densities. The 30dph figures is a national figure to be used until local density policies are in place.</p> <p>Allocating sites in the adjoining service villages would promote a greater range and choice of house types and densities. The Core Strategy needs to consider and specify what would be appropriate in individual circumstances. The HA5 site in Thorpe Thewles would, for example be suitable for a mix of property types and densities including lower density development.</p> <p>Object to the requirement in Section 4 of Draft Policy CS8 that there be a minimum of 15% affordable housing on sites over 15 dwellings in the urban area. Content with providing an element of affordable housing but this must be based on robust evidence.</p> <p>The 2006 Housing Assessment found that there was a requirement for only 40 affordable dwellings a year until 2012.</p> <p>Object strongly to Section 7 of Draft Policy CS8 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reference to 2 and 3 bed semi detached properties in criterion 1 is too specific as this could change over time. It is not acceptable to just state that this will be addressed through an SPD. Policy CS8 needs to be reworded to allow for flexibility in housing needs in the future and should refer to the affordable housing mix being based on the HMA, which itself should be annually updated.</li> <li>-The emphasis given to social rented accommodation in criterion 2 is too vague. Need to seek to quantify the proportions of affordable housing to be provided through social rented, shared equity etc, as required by PPS3 (Para29) once it has the evidence base to do this and in consultation with house builders.</li> <li>-The suggestion in criterion 3 that the council will give priority to land in its ownership to meet housing needs is wholly inappropriate in a planning document and must be deleted.</li> </ul> <p>PPS3 (Para22) states that LDDs should set out the proportion of households requiring affordable housing. This relates to the number of units on a site not the gross developable area. Draft Policy CS8 should be reworded accordingly.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Policy 8	409	Allocating sites for housing development in or adjacent to service villages such as Long Newton would promote a greater mix of housing in the Borough. Development on the sites North of White House Farm and at Mount Pleasant, lower density housing, as well as significant element of rural affordable housing in accordance with PPS7.
Policy 8	477	The policy proposes to provide a mix of housing types and tenures in accordance with the findings of the strategic housing market assessment. This includes the provision of 15 percent affordable housing on all sites over 15 dwellings. This approach is consistent with RPG policy H7 and RSS proposed changes policy 32.
Policy 9	191	In respect to provision for gypsies and travellers, believe it also to be important for it to be sensitive to the setting of important heritage assets - those where the possible harm to cultural assets could adversely impact upon social regeneration and tourism.
Policy 9	257	Remove reference to sites being located within development limits and on traditional stopping points for gypsies and travellers. Remove reference to excluding proposed sites from the green wedge. There is no basis for this restriction - see Circ 1/2006.
Policy 9	3	Support for safe guarding existing Gypsy and Traveller Site.
Policy 9	311	generally supportive of this policy, particularly with regards to locating gypsy and traveller sites where they are accessible to services, facilities and public transport, provided that such a site does not have any detrimental impact upon the SRN.
Policy 9	368	Support the Councils objectives of this policy.
Policy 9	4	Policy 9 should be amended to reflect need to meet unexpected demand.
Policy 9	478	CS9 is consistent with the RSS proposed changes policy 32.
Policy 9	5	Criteria should be amended to reflect fully circular 1/2006
Policy 9	6	Local Landscape and Nature Conservation designations should not be used in themselves to refuse planning permission.
Policy 9	7	Borough should bring forward a DPD to allocate sites for Gypsies and Travellers.
Policy 9	8	Policy should take into account the identification of separate sites for residential and business use if mixed sites are not practical.
Vision	110	Support the general aims and objectives of the document.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	150	The major public transport scheme referred to in the section is associated with a range of specific improvements. However Park and Ride is not mentioned, even though it is a fundamental requirement of improved accessibility to public transport.
Vision	168	Does not mention leisure and recreation activities and there is no indication that they will be the subject of separate documents within the D.P Folder. Such activities are a vital component of the health and well being agenda. Furthermore, many Brownfield and contaminated sites can often only be remediated with a leisure/recreational end use and they can therefore be a useful tool for site remediation.
Vision	230	There needs to be a wider range and choice of potential housing sites throughout the Borough, and not just promote sites in the Core Area.
Vision	260	Find the document to be constructive and positive. Approve and support the proposals to create a Green Blue Heart.
Vision	264	3.4. The diversity, quality and character of the natural and built environment, together with the Boroughs unique historic assets, are valued, protected, enhanced and capitalised on for the benefits of everyone". Also, Housing Mix page 51, 3 Density.
Vision	265	Strongly support the acknowledgement that in other locations such as parts of Yarm and Eaglescliffe which are characterised by mature dwellings and large gardens, a density lower than 30 dwellings per hectare may be appropriate.
Vision	270	Support the strategy, in particular its emphasis on the regeneration of the urban core. Middlesbrough Council welcome the documents recognition of the Stockton-Middlesbrough Initiative as being of key significance to the future success in the Tees Valley city region. Similarly, the council is pleased to note Stockton Borough Councils acknowledgement of the importance of maintaining and developing links with Middlesbrough, and the potential benefits of working in partnership.
Vision	296	Welcome the increasing emphasis on the Tees areas backbone with the Green Blue Heart at its centre - also the manner in which the aims are seen as an integral part of the Tees Valley ambitions. We were also delighted to see a number of references to the Tees Heritage Park in the strategy. However I was personally disappointed with the Vision statement, which said all the right things without a clear message.
Vision	297	The LDF is a great opportunity to re-brand the town in the Tees Valley context and there should be a strong theme which runs through everything.
Vision	298	The Agency has no particular comment regarding the vision, but generally welcomes the reference to providing world class integrated transport systems.
Vision	33	Should make reference to the need to encourage walking and cycling.
Vision	34	Sustainable Development - this should also embrace climate change issues.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	377	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council generally supports the preferred options for the Core Strategy.
Vision	380	Residents of Thorpe Thewles have made it clear via 144 responses to the document that they would strongly resist development on the sites HA4 and HA5. The parish Council supports them in this.  Grindon Parish Council wishes to place on record that it would object to development on the site MU1 in Wynyard.  Support residents of the ward in any attempt to extend the planning envelopes of both Thorpe Thewles and Wynyard.  Wish to draw attention to the fact that on pg. 54 there is no mention amongst the villages of Wynyard. This should be rectified.
Vision	384	Support the Vision for Stockton however express concern that it may be difficult to deliver this Vision if the LDF does not provide opportunity for existing and future residents to meet their housing aspiration within the Borough.  Support the regeneration of the urban core but consider there is a need to allocate and deliver a wider range and choice of housing. Including sites in serviced villages.
Vision	388	Support bullet point to "improve the leisure, sport, recreation and culture offer of the area" as a cultural activity brings economic benefits by providing employment and generating the visitor economy.
Vision	389	Cultural facilities should be seen as an essential prerequisite for a healthy population, rather than an additional component of life.
Vision	396	British Waterways support the spatial vision incorporating Option 1.
Vision	405	Support the Vision for Stockton however express concern that it may be difficult to deliver this Vision if LDF does not provide opportunity for existing and future residents to meet their housing aspiration within the Borough.  Support the regeneration of the urban core and consider there is a need to allocate and deliver a wider range and choice of housing. Including sites in serviced villages.
Vision	426	There should be no housing in this area but the area should be developed into an accessible nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the Tees corridor rather than continues built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	427	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.  There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the Tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	428	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	429	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	430	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	431	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	432	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	433	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	434	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	435	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	436	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	437	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.
Vision	438	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees. The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.
Vision	439	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees. The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.
Vision	440	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees. The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.
Vision	441	2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart. There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees. The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	442	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	443	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	444	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	445	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	446	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>



<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	447	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	448	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	449	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	450	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	451	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision	452	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	453	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a green wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	454	<p>2.5 Reference to the Green Blue Heart.</p> <p>There should be no housing in this area. Should be a nature reserve. This would protect a Green Wedge between Stockton and Middlesbrough. This would provide a contrast in the tees corridor. Rather than a continuous built up corridor from Bowesfield to the mouth of the Tees.</p> <p>The area should be made more accessible to the public. No housing or industrial development in this area.</p>
Vision	455	<p>Overall Vision and objectives are supported and deemed to be consistent with the RSS proposed changes objectives for the North East renaissance, in policy 1.</p> <p>Para 3.5 is somewhat confusing. It is understood that this is establishing what the vision will achieve by 2021, on a number of different issues. However the present tense is used in some cases, which suggests that these objectives have already been achieved. For example there are no longer areas of low demand housing in the Borough. This is a matter of clarity rather than general conformity with RSS.</p>
Vision	67	<p>Reflect the Regional Spatial Strategy theme " to encourage the development of the airport related uses to enable Durham Tees Valley Airports potential as an economic driver to be realised. Include this within the Preferred Options.</p>
Vision	80	<p>Welcome the Councils Preferred Vision and the strategic objectives identified to achieve the Vision.</p>
Vision	13	<p>Limits of development are too tightly around the west Stockton area (housing sub division 2). Should be expanded westwards along the north edge of the A66 by 1000m. Up to the southern edge of the A177.</p>
Vision	3.5	<p>Reference is made to the creation of a culture quarter within the town centre. Introducing the concept at this stage is helpful, but little in the way of clarification is to be found later in the document.</p>

<b>Core Strategy Reference</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
Vision Chapter 3	371	Support the Vision for Stockton as outlined in the report. They would however express concern that it may be difficult to deliver this Vision if the LDF does not provide opportunity for existing and future residents to meet their housing aspirations within the Borough.
		In this respect whilst they would support the regeneration of the Urban core they consider there is a need as part of the LDF to allocate and deliver a wider range and choice of potential housing sites, not just in the core area.
Vision Page 12	243	Include reference to "an enhanced and user friendly public rights of way network".
Vision Spatial Vision	229	Support the Vision for Stockton however concerned that it may be difficult to deliver the Vision if the LDF does not provide adequate opportunity for existing and future residents to meet their housing aspirations within the Borough.
Vision Transport	151	The future vision of transport identifies a number of key improvements. However the success of these proposed improvements, from a development perspective would be that our transport system is capable of supporting our development ambitions without threat of embargo or constraint. Need to have a specific outcome for transport improvements (excepting normal s106 site specific contributions).

# Planning the Borough's future - *tell us what you think*

At the end of September, a six-week consultation period will begin on two planning documents – the 'Preferred Options for the Core Strategy Development Plan Document' and 'Issues and Options for the Regeneration Development Plan Document.'

This is your opportunity to let the Council know what you think of proposals.

The Core Strategy Development Plan Document will set the broad framework for development in the Borough up to 2021.

The Regeneration Development Plan Document will deal with site allocations for housing, employment and other land uses.


The documents will be available on the Council's website, [www.stockton.gov.uk](http://www.stockton.gov.uk) where you click on 'Your Council', followed by Plans

and Strategies then to Spatial Planning.

Paper copies will be available for viewing at Planning Services in Gloucester House, and at Municipal Buildings, both on Church Road, Stockton, and at local libraries.

If you would like copies of the Documents, or further information, please contact a member of the Spatial Planning Section on (01642) 528557.

**50** Stockton News | Autumn 2007



Stockton-on-Tees  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Spatial Planning invite you to the  
**Consultation Launch**  
of the  
**Core Strategy and  
Regeneration  
Development Plan  
Documents**

Friday 5 October at 2.00pm  
Stockton Central Library Lecture Theatre

The Local Development Framework is a collection of documents that sets out the Council's policies for meeting the community's economic, environmental and social needs for the future, where this affects the development and use of land.

The Core Strategy and Regeneration DPDs will be key planning policy documents. There will be a short presentation and an exhibition to view. The Spatial Planning Team will be on hand to answer your questions.

Please email [isabel.nicholls@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:isabel.nicholls@stockton.gov.uk) or call 01642 528557 to let us know you'll be attending.

## STATUTORY NOTICES

### STOCKTON-ON-TEES BOROUGH COUNCIL

#### **NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF THE CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PREFERRED OPTIONS AND THE REGENERATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS, TOGETHER WITH ACCOMPANYING SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORTS AND THE APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT OF THE CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PREFERRED OPTIONS.**

#### **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

#### **PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004**

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council has prepared its Core Strategy Development Plan Document Preferred Options and its Regeneration Development Plan Document Issues and Options. In addition to these documents a full Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared to accompany the Core Strategy and a scoping report for the Regeneration Development Plan Document. An Appropriate Assessment of the Core Strategy has also been prepared.

#### **CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT.**

The Core Strategy sets out the vision and objectives that will underpin the Council's development plan documents, and proposes a spatial strategy for meeting known and anticipated development requirements to 2021, including the number of dwellings required. It includes a limited range of strategic policies to guide the preparation of more detailed policies in subsequent plans. The second stage in the preparation process is to seek views on the Council's preferred options for meeting the Borough's needs.

#### **REGENERATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT.**

The Regeneration Development Plan Document will set out site specific allocations and policies for a variety of uses, including housing, employment, and mixed use proposals to promote regeneration within the Borough. As a first step in this process, views are being sought on a range of issues and options that will help inform the content of the Regeneration Development Plan Document.

The Council has approved both documents for public consultation purposes. Copies of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document Preferred Options and the Regeneration Development Plan Document Issues and Options and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment Reports are available for public inspection free of charge at:

- Planning Department, Gloucester House, Church Road, Stockton (between the hours of 08:30 and 17:00 Monday to Wednesday inclusive, 08:30 and 19:00 Thursday and 08:30 and 16:30 Friday)
- Billingham Branch Library, Bedale Avenue, Billingham
- Eaglescliffe Library, Butterfield Drive, Eaglescliffe
- Fairfield Library, Fairfield Road, Stockton
- Ingleby Barwick Library, Community Campus, Blair Avenue, Ingleby Barwick
- Norton Branch Library, High Street, Norton
- Ragworth Neighbourhood Centre, St Johns Way
- Roseberry Library, The Causeway, Billingham
- Roseworth Branch Library, Redhill Road, Roseworth
- Thornaby Branch Library, Westbury Street, Thornaby
- Thornaby Central Library, Thornaby Pavillion, Thornaby
- Stockton Central Library, Church Road, Stockton, and
- Yarm Library, High Street, Yarm (during normal opening hours).

Consultation commences on Friday 28 September 2007. Comments in respect of these documents must be received by the Council before 4:30pm on Friday 9 November 2007 and should be sent:

- Using the on-line comments forms provided on the Council's website [www.stockton.gov.uk/spatialplanning](http://www.stockton.gov.uk/spatialplanning)
- In writing to the Spatial Planning Manager, Spatial Planning Section, Gloucester House, Church Road, Stockton, TS18 1TW;
- By e-mail to:
  - o [jane.elliott@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:jane.elliott@stockton.gov.uk) for the Core Strategy document.
  - o [matthew.clifford@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.clifford@stockton.gov.uk) for the Regeneration document.

Comments should specify the specific document and matters to which they relate. Any representations submitted to the Council may be accompanied by a request to be notified of the adoption of the documents.

Further information and copies of the documentation are available from the Council's website [www.stockton.gov.uk/spatialplanning](http://www.stockton.gov.uk/spatialplanning). Alternatively, copies can be obtained from the Planning Department during the hours specified above, or by telephoning (01642) 526557.

# It's your Borough Have your say!

## Development Plan Exhibition Coming to your library soon

The Council is consulting on:  
Core Strategy Development Plan Document,  
Preferred Options; and  
Regeneration Development Plan Document, Issues  
and Options

**Help plan the Borough's future up to 2021.**

Library	Exhibition dates	Manned session
Billingham (Bedale Ave)	Monday 8 October	Tuesday 9 <sup>th</sup>
	Tuesday 9 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Billingham (Roseberry)	Wednesday 10 October	Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup>
	Thursday 11 October	2:00 – 7:00pm
Thornaby (Westbury St.)	Friday 12 October	Friday 12 <sup>th</sup>
	Saturday 13 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Thornaby (Central)	Monday 15 October	Tuesday 16 <sup>th</sup>
	Tuesday 16 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Ragworth	Wednesday 17 October	Thursday 18 <sup>th</sup>
	Thursday 18 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Egglescliffe	Friday 19 October	Friday 19 <sup>th</sup>
	Saturday 20 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Yarm	Monday 22 October	Tuesday 23
	Tuesday 23 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Ingleby Barwick	Wednesday 24 October	Thursday 25 <sup>th</sup>
	Thursday 25 October	2:00 – 7:00 pm
Norton	Friday 26 October	Friday 26 <sup>th</sup>
	Saturday 27 October	2:00 – 6:00 pm
Stockton Town Hall	Wednesday 31 October	9:00 am until 5:00 pm.

# A vision of the future

STOCKTON Council is looking ahead to the future of the borough and is urging residents to go along to a series of exhibitions, which will set out the objectives and planned vision for the borough up to 2021.

The council is keen for anyone and everyone with an interest in the future of the borough to show their interest and comment on the preferred options chosen by the council, following consultation which took place last year.

The exhibitions aim to show how the council is planning a better quality of life for everyone now, and for the generations of the future.

There will also be the opportunity to see how the vision for the future will take into consideration nature conservation.

## Have your say on the borough

The exhibitions will be held in the following libraries:

Billingham, Roseberry, Thursday, October 11;

Thornaby, Westbury Street, Friday and Saturday, October 12 and 13;

Thornaby, Central, Monday and Tuesday, October 15 and 16;

Ragworth, Wednesday and Thursday, October 17 and 18; Egglecliffe, Friday and Saturday, October 19 and 20;

Yarm, Monday and Tuesday, October 22 and 23;

Ingleby Barwick, Wednesday and Thursday, October 24 and 25;

Norton, Friday and Saturday, October 26 and 27.

The exhibition will also be in Stockton Town Hall on Wednesday, October 31, from 9am to 5pm.

■ For more information call 01642 528557 or visit [www.stockton.gov.uk/spatialplanning](http://www.stockton.gov.uk/spatialplanning) or email [spatialplans@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:spatialplans@stockton.gov.uk)

## Planning consultation complete

Last year, Stockton Council asked for your views on two new planning documents.

The first will set the broad strategy for the Borough's growth and development over the next 10 – 15 years. The other will allocate sites for development to support the framework for regeneration.

With consultation now over, the Council would like to thank those who responded for their comments.

We received more than 100 responses to our Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. We're now considering these and deciding how to amend the plan before submitting it to the Secretary of State for examination in early summer. Residents will have a further chance to comment at this time.

There were more than 300 responses to the Regeneration Issues and Options Report. Some commented on issues in the report and others proposed sites for development.

The Council will consider all of these to ensure any sites allocated in the plan contribute towards sustainable communities and support the regeneration of the main urban areas.

Once the Council has selected its preferred sites, another consultation will allow views and comments to be made.

To find out more about the development plan, call the Spatial Planning Team on (01642) 528557 or email [spatialplans@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:spatialplans@stockton.gov.uk).

Another consultation exercise is planned for February/March 2008, relating to Preferred Options for Minerals and Waste Development Plans, and interested residents may wish to put a reminder in their diaries.

The date for the consultation has not yet been set, but to find out the date please ring the Spatial Planning Team on (01642) 528557 in mid-February.

## Appendix 5 –Consultation Launch of the Core Strategy and Regeneration DPDs.





