

Appendix C
Schedule of Comments and Council Response Tables

SPD1: Housing		
Person/Organisation	Comment	Council Response
Matt Verlander/Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	No comments	Noted.
Cllr Louise Baldock/Stockton on Tees Borough Council	Section 13 (accessible and adaptable homes) should be strengthened. These figures are a minimum and a sentence which says that the Council 'encourage you to come forward with percentages higher' than these % for accessible and adaptable homes 'would be particularly welcome'.	The percentages for accessible and adaptable home are set by Local Plan policy H4. However, developers can be encouraged to provide for a higher proportion. A sentence will be added setting out that the percentages are not a maximum and developers can provide more.
Carla Wright/Natural England	No comments	Noted
Emma Sharpe/Historic England	No comments	Noted
Richard Holland/Persimmon	Sets out that Policy H4 of the Local Plan requires 8% of all new dwellings to meet M4(3), and that this has been taken forward in the SPD, and requests caution and flexibility in the rigid application of this policy. The concerns are raised, as at Local Plan Examination, around site and plan wide viability. A flexible approach or consideration of this policy is required to avoid a disproportionate impact on viability. Suggests an addition to paragraph 13.13 which reads: "Through consultation with the Local Authority it may be possible for applicants to agree a proportionate increase in provision for M4(2) provision in lieu of provision of M4(3), such instances will be treated on a case by case basis."	The approach of the SPD reflects point 9 b. of policy H4. Point 9 also sets out those instances where considerations might indicate a deviation from the Standards, and that includes site viability. There is no justification to include the suggested sentence. No proposed change.
Caitlin Newby/Environment Agency	No Comments	Noted
Paul Mackings/Cameron Hall	Objection raised to the revised off-site affordable housing calculations in Section 8. Argues that the level of financial contribution should be calculated to reflect the difference between the RSL purchase price and the	The approach in the SPD reflects adopted Policy H4.6, which states that where off-site affordable housing or a commuted sum is considered acceptable, the amount will be equivalent in value to that which would have been

	<p>open market value/recent sale price of housing in the locality that the affordable housing is to be provided. Questions whether the identified market home (for value) are on site or where the homes are to be provided. Supports the current SPD calculation, the use of average house price and see no reason for change. The change will make housing development sites less deliverable and potentially unviable.</p>	<p>viable if the provision was made on-site and calculated with regard to Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 8 and any successor.</p> <p>Viability matters are fully informed by formal assessment and subsequent negotiations are carried out on a case by case basis. For clarity amend paragraph 8.1 to state that the value of market homes is equivalent to that of homes on the development site.</p>
Chris Ratcliff/Sembcorp	<p>Paragraph 5.2 allows for departures from the Local Plan and in paragraph 5.10 that viability will be considered, an allowance for the cost of supporting infrastructure and/particularly the cost for remediation of brownfield sites (other than demolition costs) is hidden. This approach is undermined by reference to exceptional circumstances and it is not mentioned in the calculation of a Commuted Sum. Greater sympathy or emphasis is appropriate, for example to have a conversation with a developer where there is a complicated or expensive remediation. Sembcorp supports the need for an objectively justified deviation from policy.</p>	<p>Appendix B4 sets out the matters that a Viability Assessment is expected to address but is not intended to be exhaustive. Where supporting infrastructure or remediation has an impact on viability and deliverability, the Council expects that element to form part of assessment and discussions. No proposed change.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 10.5 onwards; questions whether the statement concerning the local lettings policy and certain of the direction to Registered Providers or agreed Alternative Provider in paragraphs 10.3 and 10.4 is applicable to the SPD. Questions whether this should be a matter for the developer. Preference expressed would be for the developer's obligation to cease at the timely delivery up of affordable housing to the RP in the agreed ratios and for the right tenures.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the Council considers that this information is of use to those with an interest in affordable homes. Preference for cessation of developer's obligation is noted. No proposed change.</p>
Tetlow King Planning/Rentplus UK Ltd	<p>Promotes the Rentplus route to affordable home ownership through affordable rented housing. States that the reference to 'intermediate' tenures should be deleted (in paragraphs 7.15-7.18) and reference made only to the four tenures in the framework's definition of affordable housing – which is set out in Figure 2 of the SPD.</p>	<p>The definition of affordable homes within the Glossary to the SPD reflects the four definitions in the Framework. The Council has defined Intermediate Tenure as homes for sale and rent provided above social rent, and that these can be shared equity [shared ownership and equity loans, other low-cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing. Furthermore, the definition goes on to say that the intermediate tenures</p>

		MUST fit within the definition of affordable housing. No proposed change.
	Paragraph 7.15 identifies a 70:30 split between affordable rented and 'intermediate' tenures and goes on to say that the starting point will be to secure 30% shared ownership. This should be expanded to include other affordable home ownership [products], in accordance with the framework.	The intent of paragraph 7.15 onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would meet and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. No proposed change.
	Paragraph 7.17 states that the Council is not intending to meet the 10% provision of affordable home ownership but are asked to consider the role of affordable rent to but in helping to achieve this percentage provision of affordable home ownership options in Stockton.	The intent of paragraph 7.15 onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would meet and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. No proposed change.
Chris Smith/Lichfields on behalf of Story Homes	Paragraph 7.8. Agrees with the Council's support and encouragement attainment of the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), but comments that Local Plan Policy H4 does not impose a requirement to do so, and NDSS's should not be mandatory. Also notes that NDSS can impact on the viability of a scheme and impact upon the Council's wider S106 requirements.	Paragraph 7.8 does not require NDSS but supports and encourages attainment of those standards. Comments regarding viability are noted. No proposed change.
	Paragraphs 7.15 – 7.18 – The Affordable Housing Tenure preferences refer to the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment and it is considered that this evidence is now out of date, and no justification to go against a clear direction from the NPPF which seeks to deliver homes for affordable ownership. There is no justification to dismiss the provision of Discounted Market Sale Homes (DMSH). Whilst the SPD seeks to stipulate conditions upon when the provision of DMSH would be acceptable, the requirement for 'robust evidence' is heavy handed, and this would normally be included in an Affordable Housing Statement.	The intent of paragraph 7.15 onwards is not preclude entirely other products. Any alternatives to the Council's preferences however should be justified in evidence of how that product would address and be secured to meet a local affordable housing need. There is no requirement for 'robust evidence' in this instance, but robust procedures to ensure that the homes are available to those in need. The advice in paragraph 7.18 reflects the Council's view that the housing market has not changed sufficiently to dismiss the findings of the SHMA. Paragraph Appendix B1 Housing Statement (rather than the Affordable Housing Statement) requires information regarding house tenures and types and how this reflects local needs and demands. No proposed change.
	Revise paragraphs 7.18-7.19 to place less emphasis on the SHMA and resisting affordable homeownership products. They should support the delivery of affordable	Paragraphs 7.18 and 7.19 around housing mix and tenure refers to evidence in the SHMA, but paragraph 7.21 goes on to say that an applicant can provide other evidentiary

	homeownership and suggest that it should encourage discussions on the proposed housing mix based on the evidence available in an up to date SHMA, and sufficiently flexible to adapt to future updates of the evidence base.	documents and surveys to support products. It is considered that there is enough flex to allow for consideration and provision of alternatives. No proposed change.
	Paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 Housing Mix and Tenure should not be derived from the SHMA because it is out of date. Suggest a more flexible approach, and it would be more appropriate to review this section of the SPD to ensure that any referenced figures/mix is indicative and to encourage discussions on the proposed housing mix based upon evidence in an up to date SHMA.	The guidance given in paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 reflects the approach in the Local Plan around housing mix and tenure and refers not only to the SHMA, but to the fact that ‘there may be other acceptable sources of evidence’. Although the Council’s preferred mix is given in Table 2, paragraph 7.20 states that this is a starting point for negotiation and consideration of planning applications. Paragraph 7.21 suggests that other evidentiary documents can be submitted in support of planning applications. It considered that the approach in those paragraphs allows for further information to be submitted including where an applicant is of the view that the SHMA is ‘out of date’. No proposed change.
	Paragraphs 7.29 – 7.34 Off Site Affordable Housing appear to go beyond the requirements as set out in the Local Plan and it should be revised for consistency.	Agree and revise bullet points in Paragraph 7.30 to reflect point 5 of Policy H4.
	Paragraph 11.4 Viability Assessments should be revised to refer to the Council’s preference for key information to be agreed with the applicant, and that this be made publicly available. Also encourage applicants to work with the Council to produce versions of the documents that will be published online. Suggests the production of a standard key facts form which can be used to summarise key information from the viability assessment. This form could be made publicly available.	The basis of the approach is paragraph 11.4 is to agree those matters that can be released to the public and those which are commercially sensitive. Agree that a less prescriptive approach would be appropriate. Amend paragraph 11.4 to require agreement (with the Council) of sensitive information and for applicants to supply, for publication a redacted version of viability evidence.
	Paragraph 13.6 – 13.11 Accessible and Adaptable Homes: Compliance with M4(1) is a standard part of Building Regulations and inclusion in this section is not required.	Comment is noted but disagree and the reference to M4(1) is retained for completeness. No proposed change.
Oliver Lloyd/Gladman	Gladman reminds that SPDs are not an opportunity to set policy. It is to provide guidance on existing planning policy.	Noted. The SPD has not been drafted with the intention of setting new policy.

	Paragraphs 5.11 and 7.3 Affordable Housing Statements state that AHS should be submitted and approved by the Council before the development commences. Gladman considers that this requirement is not efficient and imposes time constraints on the development process.	Noted and Paragraph 5.11 leads on this matter. Agree that there may be instances where this is not possible, and this should be reflected in the paragraph. Amend relevant sentence to allow flexibility in this regard.
	It is inappropriate for Registered Providers to be provided alongside other Planning Obligations at the masterplan stage as suggested at Paragraph 5.12 Strategic and Large Major scale development	Agree and amend sentence in paragraph 5.12 to refer to supplying the details of Registered Providers where appropriate and available.
	Paragraph 7.3 states that an AHS requires details that are not required at outline application stage and is not appropriate.	Paragraph 7.3 and Appendix B2 sets out that an AHS should be based on the approach and information requirements set out in the SPD and the Appendix, as appropriate. This gives flexibility around the detail required for determination based on the type of application. For clarity, insert sentence in Paragraph 7.3 to allow for flexibility in the range and type of information to be submitted in each instance.
	Paragraph 7.6 sets out that development uses good quality materials in their design. There is insufficient detail as to how this can be measured and applied for decision makers to apply this transparently and consistently.	Amend paragraph 7.6 to add to the first sentence that making use of good quality materials will help in this regard.'
	Paragraphs 7.9 and 7.10 include the definition of all new homes to include the C3 element of sheltered homes and extra care facilities and as such consider that this already serves a purpose of addressing a shortfall in supply. It is not appropriate for these schemes to deliver on site affordable housing, instead these should be off-site.	Other evidence around viability indicates that an affordable homes contribution from this type of development in sheltered and extra-care accommodation is not recommended. Delete second part of paragraph 7.10 which states' including sheltered and extra care housing for older people.'
	Paragraph 7.20 Housing Mix and Type - Setting the presumption in favour of 2-3 bedroom homes is not appropriate and contradicts national policy in respect of sustainable development, to meet development needs, reduces the flexibility of the Local Plan to adapt to rapid change, and undermines the positive approach of SD1 to take a positive approach that reflects the presumptions in favour of market conditions and drivers.	The guidance given in paragraphs 7.19 – 7.22 reflects the approach in the Local Plan around housing mix and tenure and refers not only to the SHMA, but to the fact that 'there may be other acceptable sources of evidence'. Although the Council's preferred mix is given in Table 2, paragraph 7.20 states that this is a starting point for negotiation and consideration of planning applications. Paragraph 7.21 suggests that other evidentiary documents can be

	Suggests that the SHMA (2016) is now out of date, and the market will continue to change over the lifetime of the plan.	submitted in support of planning applications. It considered that the approach in those paragraphs allows for further information to be submitted including where an applicant is of the view that the SHMA is 'out of date'. No proposed change.
	Paragraph 7.27 and 7.28 Land Transfer and Delivery Triggers questions how a larger site with phases how the triggers can be applied – can the triggers be applied to each phase?	Agree. Amend the final sentence in paragraph 7.28 to include reference to phasing as another circumstance or influence which lead to a variation in triggers.
	Paragraph 7.36 Land Transfer and Site Services - the requirement to transfer no more than 25% of market homes be completed prior to transfer part of the site to a Provider. It is asserted that this is too restrictive and offers no flexibility in the deliverability of a site and is inappropriate to secure transfer of land for affordable housing.	Agree and give further flexibility by amending paragraph 7.36 to allow flexibility by discussion and agreement of triggers, where required.
	Paragraph 11.3 requires that a Viability Assessment be submitted at the time of the application, however there may be instances where one is required at a later stage. Request flexibility to allow for these instances.	Agree and amend paragraph 11.3 to provide flexibility to allow viability evidence to be submitted at later stages of the planning application determination process.'
	Paragraph 11.4 sets out that the Council will refuse to consider a Viability Assessment is an applicant does not provide good reason as to why it should remain confidential. Queries the legal basis is for this approach.	Agree that a less prescriptive approach would be better suited, it would introduce flexibility whilst providing for the submission of the requisite viability information. Amend paragraph 11.3 to allow for discussion and agreement around commercially sensitive information and for the applicant to submit a redacted version of viability evidence. Delete the final sentence which states that 'The Council may refuse to consider a Viability Assessment if an applicant insists upon its remaining confidential without good reason.'
	Application of the Optional Standards – Queries what framework is there for decision makers to follow.	For clarity addition of word 'all' to first sentence of paragraph 13.5 so this requirement applies to all new homes. Redraft section to include make clear expectations and flexibilities in respect of engagement and information, including reference to Appendix B1 Housing Statement.

Nik Milnes/Community Homes Tees Valley	Paragraph 15.17 considers the support for Community Led Housing within Self-Build and Custom Build Housing to be positive. Suggests that Community Led Housing (CLH) be considered independently as an approach and a choice to delivering affordable housing. Also, that CLH could be the subject of a separate SPD, and within the SPD and can set out clearly what is required of CLH projects in order to increase the chances of obtaining planning permission.	The Council supports CLH and can assist groups in their submissions for those homes. However, it is not a matter that the Council considers requires specialist tailored guidance in this SPD or as a separate matter. No proposed change.
--	--	--

SPD2: Householder Extensions and Alterations		
Person/Organisation	Comment	Council Response
Matt Verlander/Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	No comments	Noted
Carole Whitehead/Egglescliffe and Eaglescliffe Parish Council	Section 2: Design Principles -The photographs in this section seem to be superfluous to requirements and potentially misleading as no captions are provided to make it clear whether they are good or bad examples or why.	The photographs are contextual and are intended to illustrate general good principles.
Carla Wright/Natural England	No comments	Noted
Emma Sharpe/Historic England	No comments	Noted
Caitlin Newby/Environment Agency	<p>The SPD sets out the General Design Principles expected of householder proposals. We consider this should more closely relate to policy SD5 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan (2019) as the overarching document. Policy SD5 seeks to meet the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.</p> <p>We consider the approach taken in this document to encourage applicants to explore constraints is positive. However, it would be beneficial if this document encouraged applicants to determine the flood risk of their site and if any part of their curtilage lies in Flood Zones 2 or 3.</p>	A sentence will be added to the introduction section to ensure that all constraints, including flood risk, are checked by the homeowner.

	<p>We direct Local Planning Authorities to apply our Flood Risk Standing Advice in respect to minor development as we would not normally comment on these types of proposals. You can read the flood risk standing advice here: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice#standing-advice-for-vulnerable-developments</p> <p>Where the proposal is for a vulnerable development, which for householder extensions is likely to be the case, the planning application should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Surface Water Management• Access and Evacuation• Floor Levels	
Chris Ratliff/Sembcorp Energy UK	No comments	Noted