



Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan

Publicity Period: Monday, 20 February 2017 to Monday, 17 April (8 weeks)

Regulation 16 Representations

Ref:	Respondent:	Organisation: (if applicable)	Comments:	Wish to be informed of decision under Regulation 19:
HRNP1	K R Brown	F. Brown & Son	<p>I would like to make comment on the final draft of the Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The farm buildings at North Hart Farm have been wrongly marked in blue as community buildings. These are on privately owned property, are privately owned and in constant farm use and always have been.</p> <p>Therefore, I must ask that they be removed from the Draft Plan asap. I enclose a copy of the building's plan at North Hart Farm with the buildings in question shaded in red.</p>	Not stated

HRNP2	Louise Tait, Senior Planning Advisor	Environment Agency	<p><b>Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2030 Publication Draft</b></p> <p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the above consultation.</p> <p>In general, we consider that our previous comments detailed in our response to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan in July 2015 have been addressed.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>We previously recommended that the Water Framework Directive (WFD) should be referenced within the Neighbourhood Plan. This does not appear to have been taken forward in the Publication version of the plan. The Northumbria River Basin Management Plan (2016) has not been listed in Appendix 2 (List of Evidence Base Documents). However, we welcome the inclusion of the following sentence within Policy NE1 – Natural Environment (criterion 3), which supports the objectives of the WFD.</p> <p>“Any development should not result in, or contribute to, a deterioration in the ecological quality of the Greatham Beck waterbody.”</p> <p>We consider that the issue of flooding from all sources does need greater consideration within the plan. There is potential to address this issue, as discussed below, within Policy GEN2-Design Principles.</p> <p><b>Policy GEN2-Design Principles</b></p> <p>We wish to re-iterate our previous comments on this policy. In</p>	Not stated
-------	---	-----------------------	--	------------

			<p>particular, the recommendation that consideration should be given to all sources of flooding, including fluvial.</p> <p>We acknowledge that fluvial flooding has been referenced within Policy GEN2 (criterion 9). However, it has not been referenced correctly as this criterion addresses the management of surface water. We, therefore, recommend that the word 'including' is replaced with the word 'into' so that criterion 9 reads:</p> <p>“how the design uses sustainable surface water management solutions in new developments to reduce all water disposal in public sewers and manage the release of surface water <i>into</i> fluvial water.”</p> <p>We also advise that further consideration is given within the policy to ensuring that new developments seek to manage, and if possible, reduce flood risk from all flood sources. This would include surface water, groundwater, and fluvial and tidal flood water.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.11 states that the Hartlepool Surface Water Management Plan and the Environment Agency provide further advice on managing surface water in the area. We advise that you omit reference to the Environment Agency in this paragraph as Hartlepool Borough Council are Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and are now the responsible body for advising on surface water matters within their area.</p> <p><b>Policy H5-Housing Development on the Edge of Hartlepool</b>  We support criterion 10 of Policy H5, which recommends that development avoid areas at risk of flooding and incorporate sustainable drainage measures to manage rain water run-off from</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the development.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this letter.</p>	
HRNP3	Ellen Bekker, Northumbria Area Team	Natural England	<p><b>Planning consultation:</b> Publication of the Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan <b>Location:</b> Hartlepool</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 20 February 2017 which was received by Natural England on the same date.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan (HRNP)</b> We note that there is no reference in the HRNP to Green Infrastructure (GI). We advise that the HRNP links to Hartlepool's Green Infrastructure Strategy. For instance, it appears that the wildlife corridors shown in Appendix 9 are similar to the Tees Valley GI network as visualised in the GI strategy. GI has a multi-functional purpose, performing a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement. Natural England encourages the incorporation of GI into development. GI can therefore be linked to other policies, such as on green space/open space, ecological networks, flood risk, climate change adaptation and footpaths/cycle ways.</p>	Not stated

			<p>The proposals map does not show protected sites on international and national importance (SPA, Ramsar site and SSSIs), even though it is stated in policy NE1 these are included on the map. We advise including these sites on the proposals map. In addition, the key for Green Gaps does not seem to correspond with what is shown on the map.</p> <p><b>HRA screening</b> Where a neighbourhood plan could potentially affect a European protected site, it will be necessary to screen the plan in relation to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010), as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations'). One of the basic conditions that will be tested at Examination is whether the making of the plan is compatible with European obligations and this includes requirements relating to the Habitats Directive, which is transposed into the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p><b>In accordance with Schedule 2 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, a neighbourhood plan cannot be made if the likelihood of significant effects on any European Site, either alone (or in combination with other plans and projects) cannot be ruled out.</b> Therefore, measures may need to be incorporated into the neighbourhood plan to ensure that any likely significant effects are avoided in order to secure compliance with the Regulations. A screening exercise should be undertaken if there is any doubt about the possible effects of the plan on European protected sites. This will be particularly important if a neighbourhood plan is to progress <b>before</b> a local plan has been adopted and/or the neighbourhood plan proposes development which has not been assessed and/or included in the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the local plan.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>Policy H1</i>  Natural England notes that the HRNP proposes 170 dwellings, including 87 dwellings without planning permission as of yet. It appears that some of the proposed sites could be within 6km from Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar site, which means that a development of 10 or more houses may have likely significant effects (LSEs) on the SPA as a result of an increase in recreational disturbance (please see Magic for the location of this buffer/Impact Zone Risk).</p> <p>It is uncertain from the HRNP and HRA which sites are also allocated within the Hartlepool Publication Local Plan. If they are allocated in the Local Plan and if the Local Plan is likely to be adopted after the Neighbourhood Plan, it might not be appropriate to defer the assessment of these allocations to the Local Plan and its HRA, unless an interim strategy is developed. This ensures that any development coming forward before the Local Plan's mitigation strategy is completed, is sufficiently mitigated. If the sites are not allocated in the Local Plan, a mitigation strategy for the NRNP may be required, depending on if any effects on European sites are identified.</p> <p><i>Policies EC3, T2 and T3</i>  Policies EC3, T2 and T3 (all related to the development of leisure facilities, park and ride and footpaths) are identified as having potential effects as a result of recreational disturbance. Due to the proximity to the SPA, there might also be effects on functionally-linked land, which is land located outside the SPA, but still considered to be critical to or necessary for the ecological or behavioural functioning in a relevant season of a qualifying feature</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>for which that site has been designated. In a previous response from Natural England (dated 22 June 2015; our ref 154081 &amp; 155785) we raised this issue, highlighting that the evidence used was out of date.</p> <p>Policy EC3 mentions mitigation measures for local habitats, but it is unclear whether this would include European sites. This policy could be amended to include habitats of national and international importance also.</p> <p>Section 5.28 also mentions no adverse effects on site integrity. At this stage of the HRA (screening) it is only necessary to assess likely significant effects. If these are identified, the HRA progresses to the appropriate assessment, during which adverse effects might be identified.</p> <p><i>Mitigation</i></p> <p>There is no specific mitigation proposed in the HRA. The provision of leisure facilities at Greatham may be a potential, future mitigation measure for all policies with an effect, but only for recreational disturbance on that part of the protected site. In addition, as the details of this facility are unknown, it is uncertain if this mitigation would be sufficient to prevent likely significant effects. In addition, there may be an increase in recreation as a result of these facilities, which would need to be considered as well. Likewise, policy EC1 is not a suitable mitigation measure, as there are no further details available.</p> <p>There is mention of potential mitigation through open space and footpaths in section 5.30; however, these are only an appropriate mitigation measure under specific circumstances. As there is no</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>further detail of the open space and footpaths, it cannot be considered a suitable mitigation measure.</p> <p><i>In-combination assessment</i>  The HRA assesses in-combination effects with the Hartlepool Local Plan, which has already concluded LSEs for recreational disturbance on Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and therefore does not need to be included into the in-combination assessment (unless the Local Plan HRA identifies residual effects). The HRA of the HRNP would need an in-combination assessment if no LSEs alone are concluded (or residual effects) and in that case, there is only a need to include relevant plans and projects with no LSEs or with residual effects. This may include relevant leisure or housing developments in the area.</p> <p><i>Other advice</i>  In section 5.1, the abbreviation SPA is said to stand for 'Special Protected Area' instead of 'Special Protection Area', which is the correct term.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i>  In conclusion, the HRA currently does not contain sufficient information to rule out likely significant effects.</p> <p>The NP can defer the assessment of LSEs of policies and allocations that are also contained within the Local Plan, but if the NP is likely to be adopted before the Local Plan, an interim strategy may be necessary.</p> <p>In some cases, it may be appropriate to defer the assessment of LSEs to the project level if the Neighbourhood Plan cannot</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>reasonably assess the effects on a European site in a meaningful way. In the case of policies EC3, T2 and T3, there may not be enough detail available to reasonably assess effects as a result of recreational disturbance. In the case of policy H1 with its housing allocations, as the location of development is known and an estimation is made of numbers of dwellings, the HRA might be able to reasonably predict the effects on European sites. Therefore, it could be appropriate to amend the HRA screening to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential effects on European sites;</li> <li>- Mitigation measures proposed, of which we would need certainty that they are effective and achievable. Neighbourhood Plan policies will need to link to any mitigation measures included in the HRA;</li> <li>- If no LSEs alone are concluded, an in-combination assessment will need to be carried out (please see above).</li> </ul> <p>Natural England advises that the HRA is amended to reflect our comments and we welcome being consulted on any amendments.</p> <p><b>SEA Screening</b></p> <p>If the HRA screening is amended and no LSEs are concluded, then Natural England concurs with the assessment's conclusion that no SEA is required. However, we recommend that the assessment is updated to reflect the most recent Local Plan SA (December 2016) that was completed for the publication stage (and not the preferred options as stated in section 4.8). This ensures the SEA screening is up to date.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter <u>only</u> please contact Ellen Bekker on 0208 225 7091 or <a href="mailto:ellen.bekker@naturalengland.org.uk">ellen.bekker@naturalengland.org.uk</a> .	
HRNP4	Diane Cragg, Town Planner EM & LNE	Network Rail	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to make further comments on the Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The railway line through the rural plan area is part of the Durham Coast Line which links Newcastle with Middlesborough via Sunderland and Hartlepool. The line sees generally an hourly service run by Northern trains; Grand Central trains run a service to London from Sunderland which also calls at Hartlepool.</p> <p>Network Rail's comments on the previous iteration of the document forwarded to Mr Walker are attached for information. We previously commented on policies T2 and EC3 raising concerns about the potential for increased use of Greatham Level crossing as a result of proposed allocations and the need to set out a business case for the re-opening of the Greatham (and Hart) station. In terms of EC3 we suggested an alternative scenario to the development of the site which would allow for the elimination of the level crossing for vehicle use (at the very least). Our suggestion was to promote the use of an alternative route to the factory site via Thorn Tree Lane and bridge and the construction of a new lane to the site. We also indicated that Network Rail cannot support any car parking on the Former RHM side of the level crossing as this would import further risk at the crossing. For T2 we confirmed that Network Rail is not funded for the reopening of stations, and that financing of stations would depend on a number of factors, not least of which is a business case to support the re-introduction of the station including, crucially, the buy-in of the incumbent Train Operating Company.</p>	Yes

			<p>We indicated that new stations are generally financed on the back of significant residential or commercial development, neither of which is proposed in the plan so that in the absence of a robust business case it is unlikely that the stations could be reopened in the plan period.</p> <p>Network Rail are disappointed that our concerns have not been reflected in the amended version of the document. We are particularly concerned that the proposals in the plan will if implemented lead to a significant increase in the use of Greatham level crossing.</p> <p>Greatham level crossing is a private manned barrier crossing located on a section of railway line with a 70 mph speed limit. The number of users that currently need to cross the line are limited to those accessing the Environment Agency nature reserve and the farm and HGV operation at Marsh House.</p> <p>The Office of Rail and Road (ORR)'s policy on levels crossings says that it is neither effective nor efficient for only railway companies to manage railway safety at level crossings. Decisions about level crossings should involve rail companies, traffic authorities and other relevant organisations such as planning authorities as early on as possible. In accordance with this policy Network Rail would like to work with those developing the Neighbourhood Plan to secure level crossing closures or improvements as part of new development proposals.</p> <p>The plan proposes, through policy EC3, to allocate the former RHM site for community and leisure uses and for the provision of a park and ride facility connected to the reopening of Greatham Station.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The policy supports development conditional upon traffic generation being restricted to the level seen by the previous land use. The policy says that the reason for seeking traffic restrictions is to lessen traffic levels through the village. Network Rail's previous concerns about the use of the level crossing as the main access to the allocation are not addressed in the policy. Network Rail are concerned that the allocation will increase pedestrian, cycle and vehicular movements across the level crossing to the detriment of the safety of highway (vehicle and pedestrian) and railway users. As our previous comments indicated we consider that there is potential for alternative access to the site via Thorn Tree Lane. Without alternative access arrangements Network Rail object to the allocation in policy EC3.</p> <p>For clarification Network Rail consider the previous RHM use has been abandoned because the existing buildings have been removed and planning permission would be needed to reinstate any use of the site. The basis for assessing increased traffic usage should therefore be the existing traffic levels, not those before RHM ceased to operate.</p> <p>Policy EC3, T2 and PO1 (PO1 addresses the need for planning obligations) should recognise the limitations of developing a site accessed solely via the level crossing and should acknowledge that funding for railway infrastructure and/or level crossing improvements will be necessary if development is to be supported beyond the level crossing. As previously stated a business case to support the reopening of stations would also be an essential part of the consideration of re-opening of former stations. More specifically for each policy:</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Policy T2 should acknowledge in the text the need to set out a business case for the re-opening of Greatham and Hart Stations and the policy should specifically mention the need for a car park at Greatham to be located on the village side of the level crossing. Land on the village side of the crossing could be shown as safeguarded land as part of the proposals map. (The provision of such car parking will need to be acknowledged as acceptable within the strategic gap).</p> <p>Policy EC3 should acknowledge the restriction placed on development which is accessed via the level crossing and aspire to provide alternative/improved access arrangements including the consideration of an alternative access via the bridge on Thorne Tree Lane.</p> <p>Policy PO1 should acknowledge that railway infrastructure will need to be funded through planning obligations related to the proposed allocations in the rural plan if the aspirations of the plan are to be achieved.</p> <p>We would ask that based on the above the allocation of the RHM site be reconsidered. Our concerns amount to an objection to the plan. We consider that without amendment the scheme fails to meet the basic conditions for a neighbourhood plan as set out in paragraph 8 (2) schedule 4 b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as the impact of the allocation will be detrimental to the operation of the railway. Therefore the proposed allocation of the RHM site fails to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>In accordance with regulation 19 Network Rail would like to be</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			informed about the decision on the plan.	
HRNP5	Mr S Rushworth		<p>I am writing in support of the proposed Hartlepool Rural Plan. In particular I fully support the policies on housing development as laid out GEN1, H1, H3 &amp; H4. I note that the intent is to protect the “Green Gaps” wherever possible and that should any development be permitted outside of the village envelope then it should be restricted in size to 10 dwellings or less. I also note that for Dalton Piercy infill development only is proposed and that no sites outside of the village envelope have deemed suitable for development. I fully support the policies for economic development laid out in EC1 &amp; EC2. I also support the policies as laid out in T1 to divert any traffic from the minor roads connecting the villages and improvements to the A689/A179 as part of any substantial housing scheme.</p> <p>Under Regulation 19, I would like to be informed of the Council’s decision.</p>	Yes
HRNP6	Richard Cowen	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Durham	<p>I refer to the consultation into this proposed Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of CPRE Durham.</p> <p>In the main, we have no comment to make to the proposals in this document which clearly is intended to apply the wishes of the local community. As stated on your council’s website, “Neighbourhood Plans, introduced under the Localism Act 2011, are intended to give local people greater ownership of plans and policies that affect their local area, and to provide communities with the opportunity to develop a community led framework for guiding the future development, regeneration and conservation of an area.”</p>	Not stated

			<p>That said, we had anticipated that Neighbourhood Plans would address local issues, placing where appropriate a local gloss on the Council's own Development Plan. We are a little surprised that some of the proposals in this Neighbourhood Plan appear to be more of a strategic nature, especially when the Local Plan is also currently being developed. While we do not necessarily oppose the proposals and understand there may be specific reasons why they have been included in this document rather than elsewhere, we do question whether this is the appropriate forum for the following proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy H5, relating to new development on the edge of Hartlepool (which we understand to mean major housing to the west of the "urban fence"). While we acknowledge that local people may wish to be involved in the design of such development, the principle regarding the actual development is contained in the Hartlepool Final Draft of the Local Plan which has not yet been tested at an Examination in Public or adopted.</li> <li>2) Policy EC4, relating to Service Stations and travel related development. Surely this is a strategic rather than a neighbourhood issue. Why is this not addressed in the Local Plan proposals where it appears more appropriate?</li> <li>3) Policy T1, relating to highway improvements particularly to the strategic highway network. While this may well be desirable and the issue is addressed in the Local Infrastructure Plan published in November 2016, the sort of improvements proposed here to major highways do not appear appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan. We note</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Policy INF2 in the proposed Local Plan but question if the proposals here do conform to this particular proposed policy.</p> <p>4) Policy T3, relating to public and permissive rights of way. While we fully support the principles outlined here in relation to proposed cycleways and bridleways which we agree are Neighbourhood Plan issues, we consider issues such as bridges over the A19 and A689 (as mentioned in point 1 of this policy) are more strategic issues. We note again references to such proposals in the Infrastructure Plan and wonder why these policies are not included in the proposed Local Plan. All there is in that document is a reference in the text at paragraph 10.38.</p> <p>A similar consideration could also apply to point 2 relating to a traffic light controlled crossing at Newton Bewley on the A689 which as far as we can see is not mentioned in the proposed Local Plan.</p> <p>5) Policy NE2, relating to renewable energy. We acknowledge that provisions for domestic and other small projects are appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan. We are concerned however about the references to High Volts and Red Gap wind farms and directing any future commercial developments to those locations. While this is little more than a note, it is contained in the Policy itself. Provision has been made in the proposed Hartlepool Plan for extending the wind farm at High Volts and CPRE Durham has made representations about this.</p> <p>The possibility of extending this to Red Gap is a new</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>proposal in the Neighbourhood Plan that appears to be strategic in nature and not mentioned in the proposed Hartlepool Plan. We represent that similar considerations to the ones we have made to the Hartlepool Plan in respect of High Volts also apply in relation to Red Gap.</p> <p>We object to the inclusion of references to these sites in the Neighbourhood Plan. (A copy of our representations regarding the High Volts proposals is attached for information together with a copy of our representations to Section 8 Infrastructure at the Issues and Options stage).</p> <p>There are other issues which may be more of a strategic nature such as references to reopening stations with park and ride facilities and a solar farm at the RHM site which may be more appropriate for the Local Plan. In addition, we note some paragraphs such as 8.84 (referring to proposed improvements at the A19/179 junction to be completed by 2015 which have not taken place) and 8.120 where it refers to 5 turbines in County Durham/Thorpe Bulmer. This Durham part of this application (which I presume is the Sheraton site) has been refused permission.</p> <p>We stress that, save where otherwise stated, we do not object to the proposed policies but are concerned that they do not appear appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan. However, we had understood that the more strategic elements of the Neighbourhood Plan were in fact intended as pointers or "place-holders" for inclusion in the proposed Hartlepool Local Plan which is currently being considered as mentioned above. We are also aware that such a Local Plan will in fact supersede these strategic elements of the Neighbourhood Plan when adopted, with a more up-to-date</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>evidence base.</p> <p>At the present time, the proposed Local Plan does not address these issues save as mentioned above but, if that is the ultimate intention, then their inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan might, exceptionally, be permitted.</p>	
HRNP7	Mark Harrison, Principal Manager	The Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for the notification of the 20 February 2017 consulting The Coal Authority on the above NDP.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined deep coalfield. However the Neighbourhood Plan area does not contain any surface coal resources or recorded risks from past coal mining activity. Therefore The Coal Authority has <b>no specific comments</b> to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.</p> <p>The Coal Authority wishes the Neighbourhood Plan team every</p>	No

			success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
HRNP8	Richard Irving, Director	ID Planning	<p><b>HARTLEPOOL RURAL PLAN – PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEBRUARY 2017 – REPRESENTATIONS WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO POLICY EC3 AND THE FORMER RHM SITE, GREATHAM</b></p> <p>I am writing in connection to the aforementioned consultation. I have examined the Publication Draft Rural Plan including the Basic Conditions Statement and on behalf of our client, Darnham Ltd, I hereby submit representations specifically in relation to policy EC3 regarding land known as the ‘former RHM site’. The current wording of policy EC3 promotes community and leisure uses. However, such uses are not deliverable or viable and that there is a need to allow a viable commercial development to be brought forward on this privately owned site as an enabling development to some of the desired community and leisure facilities.</p> <p>The site is a redundant industrial site located either side of Marsh House Lane 370m to the south of Greatham to the immediate south of the railway line and a group of four existing residential properties. The site measures approximately 12 hectares and previously contained a mix of industrial buildings up to two-storeys in height but has now been cleared and is therefore a previously developed brownfield site.</p> <p>It is noted that within the Rural Plan the former RHM site is promoted as having the potential to deliver a community and leisure use such as a park and ride facility associated with the re-opening of Greatham train station, a visitor centre and a solar energy installation. The draft policy also states any development should</p>	Not stated

			<p>enhance the landscape and should not increase traffic movements through the village.</p> <p>Whereas the provision of community and leisure facilities and a park and ride facility are clear aspirations for the site and is supported to a degree, this is only appropriate, and could only be delivered, in conjunction with new housing being provided on the site therefore it is proposed that policy EC3 (and other relevant policies of the publication draft) should be amended to promote the RHM site for housing in addition to those other uses already highlighted.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed residential development on the Marsh House Lane site would represent sustainable development and there would be no adverse impacts that would justify refusal of the principle of housing development for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>The site is a brownfield site (adopted Local Plan policy Hsg5 seeks 75% housing to be delivered on brownfield land) located just 370m from Greatham and is immediately adjacent to existing housing. Greatham contains a variety of local services and amenities including a primary school, post office, general store, pubs and has a good bus service providing links to Middlesbrough, Billingham, Norton and Hartlepool. The SHLAA also acknowledges the potential for Greatham to increase its population from the current number of around 1,000 occupants by indicating the potential for new housing sites within the village.</p> <p>The residential design guide “Manual for Streets” (MfS) advises that “walkable neighbourhoods are typically characterised by having a range of facilities within ten minutes (up to about 800m) walking</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>distance of residential areas....” (ref para 4.4.1). A wide range of facilities are currently available within such a walkable distance and it is expected these facilities will be even further enhanced in the future when the housing developments are implemented and the population of Greatham increases.</p> <p>With regard to any highways implications, it is clear that the site has a long established use as a major industrial site that included large vehicles accessing the site along Marsh House Lane. Whereas parts of Marsh House Lane narrow, there are no physical constraints to any localised widening therefore it is considered a suitable access can be provided to the site. Furthermore there are aspirations to improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity in the area therefore making the site more sustainable and reducing the need for car use.</p> <p>To the north is open farmland and the scale of the development would allow for appropriate assimilation with this landscape.</p> <p>In terms of national policy, the Council have confirmed they are unable to demonstrate a five year housing land and by virtue of paragraph 49 of the NPPF, “relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date” if a 5 year supply cannot be demonstrated. Instead, housing applications should be assessed under paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. That requires such applications to be granted unless they are not sustainable in terms of the NPPF, any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or other specific policies in the Framework justify refusal. The NPPF supports the development of brownfield sites and it is considered the development of the RHM site would</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>be compliant with the NPPF.</p> <p>I have already discussed the potential for developing the site with Hartlepool Borough Council who have confirmed that there was no objection to the principle of housing on the site could be acceptable, subject to development control issues being satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>The Rural Plan states housing development is not appropriate due to the presence of industrial uses nearby. However, this is not supported by any noise, air quality or other assessments and therefore should not be discounted. Upon visiting the site it is evident it is a quiet location with no discernible adverse smells. Furthermore, discussions have taken place with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Office of Nuclear Responsibility (ONR) and Northern Gas Networks (NGN).</p> <p>The HSE state the site is within an outer consultation zone of two hazardous installations and they would not object to a residential development on the site.</p> <p>Northern Gas Networks confirmed that they operate the pipelines that run adjacent to the railway line that borders the site and easements of up to 3m would be required. Such easements can be accommodated.</p> <p>The ONR confirmed the site is not within the consultation zone for Hartlepool Nuclear Power Station and that they would not wish to be consulted on any proposed residential development.</p> <p>Network Rail has not objected to the principle of housing</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>development.</p> <p>The site is not considered to carry any constraints that would preclude development and is available, deliverable, and achievable.</p> <p>Based on the above, the site is considered to be suitable for residential development in conjunction with delivering the desired community facilities. Therefore, it is requested that the draft Rural Plan be amended to include housing as one of the uses appropriate on the former RHM site. By including housing would allow for sufficient commercial funding to realise the other community based facilities, without such commercial funding the community uses could not be delivered on this privately owned site.</p> <p>In addition to the above and with specific regard to the basic conditions statement the following comments are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The draft policy is not considered to reflect national policies and advice contained guidance issues by the Secretary of State with regard to the delivery of housing on sustainable brownfield sites nor the presumption in favour of sustainable development when a five year housing land supply cannot be provided.</li> <li>- The first objective of the neighbourhood plan is to 'support the development of a <i>limited</i> amount of new housing within settlements commensurate with the current and future needs of local communities'. This approach does not reflect both national and local policy that is required to deliver significant amounts of housing and a local authority that cannot provide a five year housing land supply.</li> <li>- The draft policy is not considered to be in general conformity</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>with the strategic policies contained in the adopted development plan as the draft policy does not reflect adopted policy Hsg5 that seeks to deliver 75% of housing on brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The basic conditions statement states that the plan objectives includes a requirement to 'ensure that new housing development in the rural area contributes to the improvement of community facilities and open spaces to meet the needs of future residents'. The development of the RHM site for a mixed use of housing and community uses would be compatible with this approach but is not reflected in the undeliverable policy.</li> <li>- It is stated that 'there is little reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment uses'. However, if housing was not considered acceptable on the site, this would be the only commercially viable use for the site and therefore the land owner could be forced to offer the site to a commercial operator (that accords with the extant industrial use class for the site) to ensure a return for the land can be realised.</li> </ul> <p>I trust that you have all the information required to reconsider the proposed designation for the site and would be grateful if you can please confirm safe receipt of this submission. I would be interested in meeting to discuss the content of this letter and the consultation draft Rural Plan further if you would like to contact me.</p> <p>If you require anything further in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.</p>	
HRNP9	Jules Brown, Historic	Historic England	<b>Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 consultation</b>	Not stated



	Places Adviser		<p><b>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above. As the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England, we are pleased to offer our comments. We champion and protect England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, conserved and enjoyed.</p> <p>The plan contains a comprehensive and well-considered approach to protecting and enhancing the historic environment in the neighbourhood plan area. I am satisfied that it includes a positive strategy for the historic environment, and that conservation and enhancement of heritage assets is a strategic commitment. I am pleased that most comments we made on the consultation draft in June 2015 have been incorporated into the plan's wording; in particular it is very welcome to see the revised Heritage Assets policies so well developed after our comment that the original policy should be substantially redrafted.</p> <p>I note that a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) has not been prepared for the draft plan. When consulted on the June 2015 screening opinion, we concluded that SEA was needed, partly because we had seen no evidence that site allocations in the plan had been assessed for their impact on the historic environment, partly because of the weakness at that point of the plan's historic environment policies, and partly because the emerging Local Plan had been withdrawn thus leaving unclear the decision to rely on the Local Plan's sustainability appraisal to supplant a neighbourhood</p>	
--	----------------	--	---	--

			<p>plan SEA. The August 2016 version of the SEA screening opinion which accompanies the current consultation makes no reference to Historic England's July 2015 statutory SEA consultation comment (in our 22 June 2015 letter) and does not say how it was addressed. The revised screening opinion still concludes that SEA is not needed. Whilst I now agree with this conclusion, I do not agree with the reasons given. I am comforted that the neighbourhood plan's historic environment policies are now much more robust, that the council's April 2016 Draft Strategy for the Historic Environment provides an impact analysis for some (though not all) of the neighbourhood plan's site allocations, and that the new December 2016 version of the emerging Local Plan's sustainability appraisal also addresses some (though not all) of the neighbourhood plan's site allocations. With this revised context, I am prepared to accept that SEA of the neighbourhood plan is not needed, but I am concerned that these are not the reasons given for the conclusion in the August 2016 screening opinion. (Weak reference is also made to SEA in paras 6.1-6.2 of Basic Conditions Statement.) In conclusion, I am prepared to accept that SEA is not needed in relation to the historic environment, but not for the reasons given or the evidence used.</p> <p>Thank you again for consulting us. I trust these comments will be taken into consideration.</p>	
HRNP10	Andy Stephenson, Assistant Environment & Land Use Adviser	NFU North East	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan. I write in the capacity of local representative of the National Farmers' Union in the North East Region with particular interest in planning and economic development in rural areas.	Not stated

			<p><b>8 Policy GEN1 – Village Envelopes</b>  Our members have approached us in the past regarding issues with the interpretation of what is considered ‘essential for the purposes agriculture’. Whilst there are very straight forward cases where the need is demonstrated through direct employment, you will appreciate that there are many more instances where development is required to support the agricultural business in different ways. I would hope that this can be interpreted on a cases-by-case basis and assessed on its individual merits.</p> <p><b>8.6 (12) Best Most Valuable Agricultural Land</b>  I welcome the importance placed on BMV agricultural land. Such land is a finite resource and a significant value in terms of the rural economy and the wider economy as a whole in meeting food production needs. It should therefore be protected and should also not be sacrificed as part of flood alleviation schemes in favour of more urban/populated land.</p> <p><b>8.10 Surface Water Management</b>  All developments should be free from the risk of surface water flooding in a 1 in 100 year flood event, plus an allowance for climate change. Additionally, surface water runoff from green field sites should be restricted to the existing rate checked against agricultural runoff rate. The surface runoff rate from previously developed land, or land occupied by buildings or hard standing (such as farm buildings and access roads) should be established prior to redevelopment and runoff from the site restricted to 70% of this rate or to green field rates.</p> <p>Restricted runoff should be applied using flow control devices coupled with on-site attenuation and other Sustainable Drainage</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Systems (SuDS) measures. For smaller sites, for example less than 0.25ha, there may be limited opportunities for attenuation apparatus and source control measures alone may need to be considered to manage runoff. In accordance with current Building Regulations, in the first instance consideration should be given to infiltrate surface water into the ground wherever possible, followed by discharge into an open watercourse, discharge into a culverted watercourse and finally discharge into a combined public sewer system.</p> <p><b>Policy H4 – Housing in the Countryside</b>  The plan states that new housing will be supported in exceptional circumstances outside the village envelope ‘where it would re-use existing rural buildings and where the building is permanent, substantial and would not require extensive alteration, rebuilding or extension’. I would strongly support the policy of re-using existing rural buildings on agricultural holdings. This both enables agricultural businesses to house its workers and also helps preserve the un-used/redundant farm building which would otherwise fall into disrepair. Through this, both the character of the local area is preserved as is the long-term viability of the business. Often a certain degree of alteration is needed to ensure existing buildings can function as domestic dwellings; I would hope that sympathetic alteration to buildings to achieve this would be permitted by the Local Authority.</p> <p><b>8.6 Economy</b>  Running on from the last point, diversification is also a way in which the long term viability of agricultural businesses can be improved. Not only does this benefit the business in question but also the wider economy as a whole through tourism, leisure and associated</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>businesses.</p> <p>Whilst re-use is preferable in terms of preserving the character of an area, it must be recognised that modern agricultural practices have changed over time which necessitates some larger agricultural buildings in order for the business to function and grow. Whilst preserving character should involve traditional buildings, modern buildings have now become commonplace and also sit within a rural landscape.</p> <p>Telecommunications in more remote areas have been a huge issue for agricultural businesses often placing them at an economic disadvantage when compared to less remote businesses. I strongly welcome the inclusion within the plan of aims to improve telecommunications.</p> <p><b>Policy EC1 – Development of the Rural Economy</b>  Diversification of agricultural businesses is essential to preserve long term viability with diversification taking many forms. Planning policy must look favourably upon such diversification as whilst there are often fairly straight forward forms, such as converting outbuildings to holiday units, there are also more novel ideas which can be of equal benefit to rural businesses.</p> <p>With particular reference to small rural retail units (8.66), I would hope that the requirement that goods sold are ‘grown or manufactured on the premises or nearby’ can be interpreted with a degree of flexibility. Farm shops will often stock produce from their business, however, limiting the good which can be sold may make establishing a viable business difficult in certain cases.</p> <p><b>Transport and Movement</b></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Improving access to the countryside, bringing people to rural businesses, is to be encouraged, however, developing new rights of way (8.81) must be done carefully so as not to impact agricultural businesses. A significant number of cases are raised by our members each year where irresponsible users of such rights of way (often with dogs) cause stress to livestock which can have severe consequences. The location of any new rights of way must be carefully considered and consulted upon to avoid such instances.</p> <p><b>Policy NE2 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</b>  With appropriate controls, the NFU believe farming can play a key role in meeting the Governments renewable energy targets. The Government is committed to produce at least 15% of energy from renewable sources by 2020. Since 2007, the NFU has led a joint agricultural Climate Change Task Force in recognising the many opportunities for agriculture and land management to tackle climate change, and in developing a Greenhouse Gas Action Plan for our sector. We have submitted robust responses to government consultations on its Renewable Energy Strategy and incentive schemes for renewable electricity, heat and transport fuels. With 75 per cent of UK land area in the agricultural sector, the NFU believes that its members are well-placed to capture renewable natural energy flows, while maintaining our traditional role in food production as well as the delivery of other environmental and land management services. It is the NFU's stated aspiration that every farmer and grower should have the opportunity to diversify their businesses and create 'green' jobs by supplying renewable energy services.</p> <p><b>Policy PO1: Planning Obligations – Contributions to Meeting Community Infrastructure Priorities</b></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>We are strongly against any form of contribution levied from development by agricultural businesses which can ultimately result in the scheme becoming unviable. Whilst the vast majority of local authorities maintain CIL at a 0 rating there are exceptions. If an 'overage' payment is to be considered at a set point in the future this should be transparent from the start as although it may not involve an upfront payment being levied it still impacts the schemes viability.</p>	
HRNP11	Chris Martin, Senior Planner	Barton Willmore	<p><b>HARTLEPOOL RURAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (PUBLICATION DRAFT)</b></p> <p>We act on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England ("the Commissioners") in relation to their landholdings in Hartlepool Borough.</p> <p>The Commissioners own land around the village of Newton Bewley which has potential to accommodate future housing growth and have previously submitted representations to the Neighbourhood Plan in September 2014. Given their landholdings in the area they continue to have an interest in the Neighbourhood Plan and how it progresses. As such we would like to be kept informed of the process and any forthcoming future consultation or plan examination.</p> <p>Should you have any queries regarding this, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	Yes
HRNP12	Valerie Lister, Hon	Hartlepool Civic Society	<p><b>HARTLEPOOL RURAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION</b></p>	Not stated

	Secretary		<p>The Society has studied the Consultation Document and would commend the outcome of the obvious hard work which has been put into it over a long period of time, by the Rural Plan Working Group, supported by the Borough Council, etc.</p> <p>The Consultation Document is very thorough and has covered many aspects. We appreciate that the Group has had to be mindful of the proposals for the 'edge of town' developments in their considerations, particularly with regard to the road network. There are currently new proposals for traffic lights at the A19/A179 sliproad/flyover junction.</p> <p>The Society is pleased that policy nos HA1, HA2, HA3 and HA4 are included and are in themselves detailed, which should protect and sustain listed buildings and the rural Conservations Areas as well as recognising additional important rural buildings.</p> <p>It seems that proposals for additional housing for the villages ensures balance, though the figures for Hart in the Local Plan is higher than that proposed in the Rural Plan - particularly surprising after thorough consideration proposed by the Working Group. Currently, applications for Hart are being received by the Borough Council for sites not included in either plan. It is important that the special character and value of the rare villages in the whole Borough are maintained.</p> <p>We hope our comments will be useful to you.</p>	
--	-----------	--	--	--