

**Stockton-on-Tees Core Strategy Local Development Framework
Addendum 1
Significant Proposed Changes**

Change Number	Page Number	Other Identification	Text Changes
37	23	Policy CS2, Clause 6	and consideration of 'Park and Ride' initiatives where appropriate
55	28	Policy CS4, Clause 5 a, b and c	a. North Tees Pools up to 100 ha. b. Seal Sands up to 175 ha. c. Billingham Chemical Complex up to 65 ha.
56	29	Policy CS4, Clause 6	riverside-based site. <u>No port or river based development will be permitted on, or on land immediately adjacent to, the North Tees Mudflat component of the Tees and Hartlepool Foreshore and Wetlands SSSI.</u>
64	30	Paragraph 9.7	Teesport. <u>Proposals requiring a riverside location, in addition to developments within the Seal Sands and North Tees Pools areas, have the potential to significantly affect the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar site, and the provisions of Policy 10 will need to be taken into account. To inform site allocations in the Seal Sands, North Tees Pools and River Tees Corridor areas in the Regeneration Development Plan Document, the Council has agreed to undertake a study in partnership with Natural England and the RSPB, to assess the potential for development in those areas to adversely affect the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar site. The study will involve a detailed assessment of the usage of these and adjacent areas by SPA and Ramsar site bird species. This will be used to develop a strategic framework for development in these areas by identifying where land can be allocated for development without adverse impact on the SPA/Ramsar site, whilst taking an integrated approach to habitat creation to ensure sufficient mitigation can be delivered. Further studies will investigate the precise extent of site allocations in these areas.</u>
66	32	Policy CS5 Clause 1	No further allocations for retail development will be made in the Borough <u>will be made other than in or on the edge of Stockton Town Centre.</u>
66A	32	Policy CS5 Clause 2	Stockton will continue in its role as the Borough's main shopping centre. Up to 2011, the need for additional capacity can be <u>mostly</u> met through committed developments and the occupation and reoccupation of vacant floorspace. Beyond 2011 there may be a requirement to bring forward new retail development within the town centre <u>in the first instance</u>
69	33	Policy CS5 Clause 6	6. The existing roles played by Teesside Park as an out-of-town locations, and Portrack Lane as an out of centre site, are recognised. Whilst no additional retail or leisure development <u>proposals</u> will be permitted encouraged in these locations <u>or any other out of centre locations, any proposals which</u>

			emerge will be dealt with as under 7 below.
70	33	Policy CS5 Clause 7 <i>New clause added</i>	<u>7. Should any planning application proposals for main town centre uses in edge or out-of-centre locations emerge, such proposals will be determined in accordance with prevailing national policy on town centre uses as set out in PPS4 or any successor to PPS4.</u>
70A	33	Paragraph 10.2	To achieve this, no further expansion of the out of centre retail and leisure developments at Teesside Park and Portrack Lane will be permitted <u>unless it is in accordance with prevailing national policy on town centre uses.</u>
91	43	Policy CS8 Clause 5	Affordable housing provision within a range of 15-20% depending on the needs of specific areas, whether a site is brownfield or greenfield, within a target range of 15-20% will be required on sites schemes of 150 dwellings or more and on development sites of 0.5 hectares or more. <u>Affordable housing provision at a rate Figures lower than the standard requirement target for a specific area will only be acceptable where robust justification is provided. This must demonstrate that provision at the standard requirement target would make a site the development economically unviable.</u>
92	43	Policy CS8 Clause 7	will be negotiable on a site by site basis but the starting point for the negotiations will be 20%
93	43	Policy CS8 Clause 7	high priority accorded to <u>the delivery of two and three bedroom houses and bungalows. Affordable housing provision with a tenure mix different from the standard target will only be acceptable where robust justification is provided. This must demonstrate either that provision at the standard target would make the development economically unviable or that the resultant tenure mix would be detrimental to the achievement of sustainable, mixed communities.</u> i) the delivery of two and three bedroom semi-detached affordable houses; ii) the delivery of two and three bedroom bungalows.
102	45	Paragraph 12.31	is that 15-20% is achievable <u>during positive market conditions</u>
103	45	Paragraph 12.31	on brownfield sites and that this is inclusive of sites with significant development costs such as remediation. A range of 15-20% has, therefore, been set with a general distinction drawn between brownfield and greenfield sites on the basis that development costs associated with greenfield sites are generally lower. An affordable housing target range of 15-20% has therefore been set. The Council is mindful that market conditions have fluctuated since the benchmark of late 2007 for the policy. The policy will therefore be applied with a flexibility that is sensitive to the market conditions prevailing at the time the planning application is submitted.
105	45	Paragraph 12.33	15-20% range target
106	45	Paragraph 12.34	15-20% range target
107	46	Paragraph 12.36	accord with the minimum provision of standard affordable housing <u>target or with the tenure mix for affordable housing recommended for that specific area</u> will
108	46	Paragraph 12.36	assessed- <u>to determine whether it meets the test of robust justification. The Council will produce</u>

163	46	Paragraph 12.36 New Paragraph added after	<p><u>guidance explicitly setting out what is meant by 'robust justification' as part of a forthcoming DPD.</u></p> <p><i>In proposed changes the Council intended to add a new paragraph after 12.36. This was advertised as a proposed change.</i></p> <p><u>Financial appraisals will generally focus on abnormal site specific costs and/or the impact of economic circumstances on a proposed scheme at the time of submitting the planning application. Where an appraisal is accepted as robust evidence based wholly or partly on economic circumstances, the owner of the site will be expected to enter into a Section 106 Agreement. This will require the regular submission to the Council of financial appraisal reports updating the information contained in the original financial appraisal. If the updated reports show that the viability of a scheme has improved to the point of facilitating greater provision then the developer will be obliged to either provide on site affordable homes up to the level which is viable (subject to not exceeding the 15-20% range of the policy) or an equivalent financial contribution. This will apply whether the original financial appraisal showed that provision is only viable at a rate less than the standard requirement or if it showed that no provision at all is viable.</u></p> <p><i>After discussions at the hearing on 25th September 2009 the paragraph was removed.</i></p> <p>Financial appraisals will generally focus on abnormal site specific costs and/or the impact of economic circumstances on a proposed scheme at the time of submitting the planning application. Where an appraisal is accepted as robust evidence based wholly or partly on economic circumstances, the owner of the site will be expected to enter into a Section 106 Agreement. This will require the regular submission to the Council of financial appraisal reports updating the information contained in the original financial appraisal. If the updated reports show that the viability of a scheme has improved to the point of facilitating greater provision then the developer will be obliged to either provide on site affordable homes up to the level which is viable (subject to not exceeding the 15-20% range of the policy) or an equivalent financial contribution. This will apply whether the original financial appraisal showed that provision is only viable at a rate less than the standard requirement or if it showed that no provision at all is viable.</p>
-----	----	---	--