

Proposed Main Modifications – 10th November 2017

The modifications below are expressed either in the form of strikethrough for deletions and underlining for additions of text or through a *description* if more appropriate. The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the Local Plan Publication Version (2016) as originally submitted to the Secretary of State and do not take account of the subsequent changes caused by the potential deletion or addition of text through any proposed modification.

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/GEN/01	-	Numerous	Update formatting of bullet points / numbering throughout document.	To ensure clarity within policies and remove ambiguity of numbering in policies.	Yes
MM/CHP01/01	1	1.3	The Local Development Framework will comprise documents known as Development Plan Documents (DPD`s) <u>(which includes neighbourhood plans)</u> and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD`s) (see Chart 1).	To provide clarity with regards to the status of neighbourhood plans	Yes
MM/CHP01/02	2	Chart 1	<u>Amend chart – move neighbourhood plans to DPD list</u>	To provide clarity with regards to the status of neighbourhood plans	Yes
MM/CHP01/03	2	1.6	The Local Plan is the key Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework. <u>The Local Plan sets setting</u> out the spatial vision <u>and</u> strategic objectives and strategic policies for the Borough for the next 15 years. <u>The plan contains a suite of policies to assist in delivering the spatial vision and objectives, all of the policies contained within the plan are considered to be strategic policies.</u> It has been produced following earlier consultation on the Issues and Options Discussion Paper in 2014. Chart 2 illustrates the delivery stages of the Local Plan through to adoption and is based on the timetable in the Local Development Scheme November 2016.	To provide clarity with regard to the status of the plan policies, this is of particular importance as a neighbourhood plan has to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in a local plan.	Yes
MM/CHP01/04	2	New paragraph 1.7	<u>Several Neighbourhood Development Plans are currently being progressed for different neighbourhood planning areas within the borough (the Rural Neighbourhood Plan, the Headland Neighbourhood Plan and the Wynyard Neighbourhood Plan). Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. All of the policies in the Local Plan are strategic policies. A neighbourhood plan attains the same legal status as the Local Plan once it has been made. At this point it comes into force as part of the statutory development plan. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</u> <i>Paragraphs 1.7 – 1.13 will require renumbering to 1.8 – 1.14.</i>	To provide clarity on the role of Neighbourhood Plans.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP01/05	24	KEY DRAGRAM	<p><i>Insert Key Diagram setting out broad areas of growth within the borough before Policy LS1.</i></p> <p><i>Appendix A in this document.</i></p>	To provide clarity to the reader.	Yes
MM/CHP06/01 Superseded by MM/CHP06/03	23	Para 6.26	<p>The Borough Council will look to protect, manage and actively enhance the biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape character and green Infrastructure assets of the Borough. Recreational disturbance can result from new housing, but also from new leisure and tourism opportunities. Mitigation, for the recreational disturbance of European site birds needs to be effective and should be chosen from a range of diverse and flexible measures. These include, but are not limited to, Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS), a financial contribution to the management of coastal issues and information packs. In delivering development, applicants should be required to demonstrate how this type of mitigation will be detailed, how costs have been identified for delivery and should also demonstrate a level of comfort that such initiatives can be delivered effectively and that a suitable delivery method has been identified. Mitigation will be delivered through established frameworks. For example, financial contributions will be used to implement the Durham Heritage Coast Management Plan (2017-2025) management actions. Information and interpretation panels relating to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar will be delivered as part of a refreshed European Marine Site Management Plan which INCA will initially co-ordinate.</p>	In response to comments from RSPB regarding seeking of mitigation via the HRA process at detailed development control application stage. As part of the ongoing work to support the plan the Council has agreed to produce a framework where financial contributions can be directed.	Yes
MM/CHP06/02 Superseded by MM/CHP06/04	24	Policy LS1	<p>Between 2016 and 2031 provision will be made through granting planning permissions and the allocations of sites for 6,199 new dwellings and 906 hectares of employment land to support 4350 net additional jobs and 1950m² retail / community floorspace.</p> <p>....New housing development</p>	Additional paragraph to be included in Policy LS1 to ensure the growth strategy for the town is clear.	Yes
MM/CHP06/03 Supersedes MM/CHP06/01	23	Para 6.26	<p>The Borough Council will look to protect, manage and actively enhance the biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape character and green Infrastructure assets of the Borough. Recreational disturbance can result from new retail, leisure and tourism opportunities as well as from housing. Mitigation, for the recreational disturbance of European site birds, needs to be effective and should be chosen</p>	In response to comments from RSPB regarding seeking of mitigation via the HRA process at detailed development control application stage. As part of the ongoing work to support the plan the Council has agreed to	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<u>from a range of diverse and flexible measures. These include, but are not limited to, Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS), a financial contribution to the management of coastal issues and information packs. In delivering development, applicants should be required to demonstrate how this type of mitigation will be detailed and how costs have been identified for delivery. Mitigation will be delivered through the Mitigation Strategy and Delivery Plan.</u>	produce a framework where financial contributions can be directed. This has been updated from MM/CHP06/01 following revisions to the HRA and agreement with Natural England.	
MM/CHP06/04 Supersedes MM/CHP06/02	24	Policy LS1	<u>Between 2016 and 2031 provision will be made through granting planning permission and the allocation of land in this Plan for at least 6,200 new dwellings, 4,350 net additional jobs and 1950m² retail / community floorspace.</u> New housing development	Additional paragraph to be included in Policy LS1 to ensure the growth strategy for the town is clear.	Yes
MM/CHP06/05	20	Para 6.12	<i>Amend paragraph as follows</i> The western extension of housing development beyond the existing limits can be developed in a sustainable form, however it is imperative to maintain the strategic gaps between the town and the surrounding villages, particularly in the vicinity of Hart and Greatham villages where the urban edge is in close proximity to the villages – further built development within these gaps could, over time, lead to the villages joining with the urban area and losing their identities. The strategic gap has been included to ensure the villages maintain their identities. While the immediate concern is the coalescence of Hart and Greatham villages with the urban area if not carefully managed, as the town expands at the South West Extension and High Tunstall, these developments will move the urban area towards the villages of Elwick and Dalton Piercy – as such the emerging Rural Neighbourhood plan have included a strategic gap along the western extent of the urban area. This Publication version of the Local Plan has sought to broadly reflect the Rural Plans proposal.	Deletion of wording to ensure soundness following recommendation from the Planning Inspector.	Yes
MM/CHP06/06	24	Policy LS1	<i>Paragraph 3 of the Policy to be replaced with</i> <u>Protection will be given to the rural character of the Borough avoiding coalescence between the urban areas of Hartlepool and surrounding villages. To maintain the separate character of directly neighbouring rural settlements, the generally open and undeveloped nature of the following strategic gaps, as shown on the Policies</u>	Wording for soundness following recommendation from the Planning Inspector.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p><u>Map, will be expressly protected:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Hartlepool and Hart</u> 2) <u>Hartlepool and Greatham</u> 3) <u>Billingham and Newton Bewley</u> <p><u>Development within these strategic gaps will only be permitted where:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>It would not diminish the physical and/or visual separation; and</u> (b) <u>It would not compromise the integrity of the gap either individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development; and</u> (c) <u>The landscape setting of the settlements would not be harmed.</u> 		
MM/CHP07/01	31	Policy CC1	6) Encouraging the re-use, adaptation and repair of existing buildings and vacant floors wherever possible <u>along with supporting energy efficiency improvements on existing buildings wherever possible.</u>	To better align policy with the NPPF and to reaffirm the council's commitment to supporting energy efficiency measures.	Yes
MM/CHP07/02	31	Policy CC1	<p>Bullet point 2. Footnote to be inserted after Major development.</p> <p><u>* Major development is defined within the glossary in Appendix 1</u></p>	To provide clarity to the policy.	Yes
MM/CHP07/03	31	Policy CC1	9) Requiring that major development ¹ (either new build or conversion) must secure where viable and where the building/s allow, feasible and viable a minimum of 10% of their energy supply from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources.	To prevent confusion regarding the word feasible, the requirement should be both feasible and viable and the two words have different meanings.	Yes
MM/CHP07/04	31	Policy CC1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible (insert footnote) to provide such energy generation measures on site then the provision of the equivalent energy saving must be made by improving the building fabric or a combination of energy provision and energy saving measures that equates to the equivalent of 10%. <p>Footnote – feasibility, in this instance, relates to the ability to physically provide the renewable energy infrastructure. The matter of viability (which in planning terms relates to cost) is considered in the final paragraph of policy CC1.</p>	To provide clarity regarding what, in this instance, is meant by feasibility and viability.	Yes
MM/CHP07/05	39	Policy CC4	Inclusion of following footnote after 'including appropriate topple distances'.	Inclusion of footnote to give further clarity on the requirement in relation to topple	Yes

¹ Major development is defined within the glossary in Appendix 1.

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p><u>An appropriate topple distance is the tip height + 10%. In the case of overhead lines it is whichever is the greater of the tip height + 10% or the electrical safety distance applicable to the voltage of the overhead line (source: Energy recommendation L44: Issue 1 2012: Sseparation between wind turbines and overhead lines: Principles of good practice – Energy Networks Association).</u></p>	distances.	
MM/CHP08/01	44	Policy INF1 preamble	<p><i>Insert following new paragraph after 8.5:</i></p> <p><u>The Tees Valley Combined Authority’s transport vision for the Tees Valley is ‘to provide a high quality, quick, affordable, reliable and safe transport network for people and freight to move within, to and from the Tees Valley’.</u></p> <p><u>The Combined Authority is currently developing a Strategic Transport Plan, due for publication in summer 2017. To facilitate the public consultation, ‘Connecting the Tees Valley’ has been developed, which sets out the sub-region’s transport priorities up to 2026 and explain how the Tees Valley Combined Authority wants to improve the Tees Valley’s local transport system. This document sets out the framework for the Strategic Transport Plan and invites stakeholders, interest groups and the public to help shape the final Strategic Transport Plan. In producing the Strategic Transport Plan, the Combined Authority aims to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improve local railways by having more, faster and better trains and stations, so that journeys by rail are quicker and more comfortable;</u> • <u>Maintain and improve roads so that they are safe and less congested;</u> • <u>Provide better bus services that are punctual and reliable, with improved passenger information and facilities, which provide access to where people want to go, when they want to go;</u> • <u>Provide safe walking and cycling routes to make it easier to travel on foot and by bike; and</u> • <u>Make it easier and safer to transport freight by road, rail, sea and air.</u> <p><i>Insert following footnote at page 45:</i></p> <p><u>Connecting the Tees Valley, Tees Valley Combined Authority, November 2016</u></p> <p><i>Insert the following reference in Appendix 3: List of Regional Plans, Policies, Guidance and Strategies:</i></p>	To update reference to Tees Valley Combined Authority work with respect to strategic transport and infrastructure.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			Connecting the Tees Valley – Tees Valley Combined Authority – 2016		
MM/CHP08/02	45	Para 8.11	Highways England (HE) has undertaken a modelling exercise to assess the implications of the development proposals in the Local Plan on the strategic road network (SRN) and its junctions, namely the A19(T) and its various access points. With regard to the likely impact of the key housing allocation in the Local Plan on the strategic network - High Tunstall - the conclusion of the HE modelling was that the development would create “greater than 30 twoway trips – further assessment of potential impacts required”. The impact of the High Tunstall development will be mitigated by the provision of an improved link to the A19(T) at Elwick, including a bypass to the north of Elwick village and a grade separated junction on the A19(T) itself at the northern Elwick access (see policy INF1 ‘Sustainable Transport Network’ and the Local Infrastructure Plan). In relation to housing development at Wynyard, the A689 committed scheme complements the Highways England Pinch Point Programme scheme at the A689/A19 junction, allowing a number of residential schemes at Wynyard to be implemented without further highway capacity improvements. However, further capacity improvements will be required to enable further development at Wynyard to be acceptable in highway terms and deliverable over the local plan period.	In response to comments from Wynyard Park	Yes
MM/CHP08/03	49	Policy INF2	<i>Recommended to insert following text after ‘All schemes identified in the Local infrastructure Plan will be delivered to conform to policy LS1’:</i> Development proposals which would require the upgrading of the Church Street level crossing in order to achieve pedestrian and/or vehicular access will be expected to contribute accordingly.	In view of Network Rail comments to ensure consideration is given to the upgrade of the Church Street level crossing.	Yes
MM/CHP08/04	50	Para 8.22	Based on current pupil projections the Local Education Authority is confident that the number of existing secondary school sites can cater for the expected growth from new housing development over the plan period. However some developments may be required to contribute towards school enhancements or extra provision (such as additional classrooms) at these sites on the basis of the cumulative impact that the development may have on schools in that locality.	In response to comments from the Education Funding Agency to clarify how the level of need may be met.	Yes
MM/CHP08/05	50	Para 8.23	With regard to primary school provision there are concerns over the capacity of	In response to comments from the Education	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			existing provision, particularly in the north west of the town. A new, oneform entry primary school will therefore be required as a result of the proposed housing development at High Tunstall. Elsewhere, a one-form-entry new primary school is <u>also</u> to be provided as part of the approved South West Extension development on an site that has sufficient land for it to be expanded into a two-form-entry primary school in the future. At Wynyard, a temporary primary schools is currently sited within Hartlepool however a one-form-entry new two-form entry primary school is to be constructed <u>to the south of the A689</u> , within Stockton-on-Tees. <u>As Wynyard develops out, there will also be a need for an additional new primary school to the north of the A689, within Hartlepool. The scale of new primary school provision, whether these are to be one-form or two-form entry, will be determined based on need and whether these are delivered by the Council or the Education Funding Agency (EFA).</u> In other areas of the town, where housing developments are assessed to have an impact on a local school, whether primary or secondary, in line with the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, contributions may be required to increase the capacity of existing schools.	Funding agency, to remove direct reference to the size of specific future primary school provision as this is yet to be agreed. Correction of typographical errors.	
MM/CHP08/05	53	Policy INF4	Update policy to read: 1) Protect, maintain and improve existing facilities where appropriate and practicable; <u>and</u> 2) Require and support the provision of new facilities to serve developments and to remedy any existing deficiencies.	Clarity on the intent of the policy.	Yes
MM/CHP09/01	64	Policy QP3	Recommended inserting the following text after point 6: <u>7) Recognise the wider benefits that safety improvements at level crossings can bring about.</u>	In line with comments from Network Rail.	Yes
MM/CHP09/02	72	Policy QP6	... Where appropriate all proposals must ensure that the following matters are investigated and satisfactorily addressed: 1) The status of any agricultural land and its importance to the Borough; 2) Development should take account of previously contaminated land including from historic landfill sites; 3) Any matters regarding flood risk, both on and off site, throughout the design life of the site;	In line with Historic England comments.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p>4) The presence of any landscape features and in particular protected trees;</p> <p>5) The presence of any heritage assets, <u>including any impact upon their significance</u> and the setting;</p> <p>6) The location of any high voltage overhead cables and gas, oil, water and other high pressure pipelines;</p> <p>7) The operation of air traffic and radar systems;</p> <p>8) The effects on, or impact of, general disturbance including noise, vibration, dust, fumes, smell and air quality;</p> <p>9) The water supply system is adequate, surface and foul main drainage is dealt with in a sustainable manner;</p> <p>10) The effects on wildlife and habitat; and</p> <p>11) The requirement to satisfy the relevant planning requirements of statutory consultees.</p>		
MM/CHP09/03	75	Policy QP7	If by virtue of the nature of the development it is not possible to satisfy the above criteria then <u>the Borough Council would encourage</u> an attempt must to be made to improve the fabric of the building 10% above what is required by the most up to date Building Regulations (Not the Building Regulations applicable at the time of submitting the initial building notice).	In view of comments from the Home Builders Federation, Gladman Developments and Persimmon Homes, it is agreed this aspect of the policy should not be a requirement.	Yes
MM/CHP09/04	65	Policy QP3	To maintain traffic flows and safety on the primary road network no additional access points or intensification of use of existing access points, other than new accesses associated with development allocated within this Local Plan, will be permitted on the following roads – A19(T), A689, A179. And A178 (south of Seaton Carew to Brenda Road/Tees Road roundabout) unless these have the approval of Highways England and/or the highways authority. This should be in conjunction with the proportionate provision of sustainable travel modes. <u>All roads to which this policy relates are shown on the proposals map.</u>	To provide visual clarity with regards to where the roads mentioned in the policy are located.	Yes
MM/CHP09/05	72	Policy QP6	The effects on, or impact of, general disturbance including noise, vibration and dust, fumes, smell, and air and water quality.	Clarity within policy.	Yes
MM/CHP09/06	60	Policy QP1	The Borough Council will seek planning obligations where viable and deemed to be required to address the impacts arising from a development. Planning obligations requirements are set out in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Planning obligations may be required for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Housing; • Children’s Play / Play Facilities; 	Agreed policy wording update on policy following Matter 15 hearing session.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playing pitches & Outdoor Sports / Exercise Provision; • Built Sport Facilities; • Highway and Rail Infrastructure and Sustainable Transport Measures; • Education Provision; • Community Facilities; • Green Infrastructure; • Training and Employment; • Heritage (protection / preservation / interpretation); • Maintenance; • Housing Market Renewal; • Flood Protection; • Renewable Energy & Energy Efficiency Measures; • Ecological Mitigation & Networks; • Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space and • Mitigation for recreational disturbance on the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/ Ramsar. <p><u>The detail on the planning obligation requirements is set out in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</u></p> <p>This list is not exhaustive and other mitigation / contributions may be required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In addition priorities set out in any made Neighbourhood Plan will be taken into account.</p> <p>In certain circumstances, if it is illustrated that the development is providing a significant regeneration benefit, such as the clearance of a problem building or renovation of a heritage asset, there may be an opportunity to reduce the developer contributions associated with that development, e.g. through the Vacant Building Credit.</p> <p>The sub-division of sites to avoid planning obligations is not acceptable. Where it is considered sub-division has taken place to avoid reaching thresholds within the Planning Obligations SPD the <u>wider contiguous</u> development will be viewed as a whole.</p> <p>Any contributions will be secured by relevant parties entering into a legal</p>		

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			agreement with the Borough Council or through unilateral undertakings.		
MM/CHP09/07	60	Policy QP1	<p><i>Update policy wording to:</i></p> <p>This list is not exhaustive and other mitigation / contributions may be required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In addition priorities set out in any made Neighbourhood Plan will be taken into account.</p>	Removal of word to acknowledge that Neighbourhood Plans can hold 'weight' prior to being formally 'made'.	Yes
MM/CHP10/01 Superseded by MM/CHP10/12	85	Policy HSG1	<p>The Borough Council will seek to ensure that new housing provision in the borough is delivered through housing sites that have already been permitted, newly identified sites both within the urban areas and on the edge of the urban area, villages in the rural area and sites elsewhere in the borough to, as a minimum, meet the housing need requirement set below.</p>	To clarify that the Council has a flexible approach to the housing requirement and does not intend to apply it as a rigid ceiling for sites that are consistent with the Locational Strategy and which will deliver sustainable development.	Yes
MM/CHP10/02	90	Diagram 1 (now diagram 2)	<p><i>(see Appendix B below)</i></p> <p><i>Agree to amend Diagram to show school land under Policy INF4 (Community Facilities).</i></p> <p><i>Also agree to amend the key on Diagram 2 to read:</i> <u>Indicative route of land</u> safeguarded land for <u>the</u> future road.</p> <p><i>In addition the amended diagram addressed concerns raised in relation to the clarity of the route of the proposed road.</i></p>	In view of comments from Persimmon Homes and discussions at the hearing session, the Council agree to amend Diagram 2 accordingly.	Yes
MM/CHP10/03	91	Policy HSG4	4) An access road through the site connecting the A689 and Brierton Lane with appropriate vehicular, pedestrian and cycle linkages to the adjoining urban area will be provided.	In response to comments from Persimmon Homes.	Yes
MM/CHP10/04	96	Policy HSG5	The Local Infrastructure Plan gives further detail on the infrastructure requirements linked to the site and Legal agreements will ensure the LGF (or alternative) funding for the road improvements linking to the A19(T) and associated Elwick grade separated junction is paid back by each of the phases <u>of the High Tunstall development, along with contributions from Quarry Farm 2 (HSG5a), Elwick Village (HSG7) and Briarfields (HSG3(3)),</u> on a pro rata basis.	Considered appropriate to reference Quarry Farm 2, Elwick Housing Site and Briarfields in policy wording for clarification.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP10/05	98	Policy HSG6	<p>1) No more than 6.7ha of land will be developed for new executive housing and associated infrastructure at the North Pentagon. Densities within this area will be restricted to a maximum of 15 dwellings per hectare. The development will incorporate a minimum of approximately 2.12ha of green infrastructure, informal open space and recreational and leisure land including the provision of a skate park <u>or suitable alternative play provision</u> on land adjacent to the play area associated with the southern pentagon area;</p>	In response to comments from Wynyard Park to ensure the policy allows for an appropriate degree of flexibility.	Yes
MM/CHP10/06	102	Policy HSG7	<p><i>Recommended to insert after criterion 5:</i></p> <p><u>6) The development will be expected to contribute, on a pro-rata basis with High Tunstall (HSG5), Quarry Farm 2 (HSG5a) and Briarfields (HSG3(3)), to the provision of the grade separated junction and bypass to the north of Elwick Village.</u></p>	In view of comments from Cecil M Yuill Ltd, it is agreed that reference to the proposed bypass of Elwick village would be appropriate in policy HSG7.	Yes
MM/CHP10/07	98	Policy HSG6	<p><i>Recommended reword:</i></p> <p>Reserved matters <u>Planning</u> applications will be determined in strict accordance with the following criteria:</p>	Reworded following agreed changes at hearing session.	Yes
MM/CHP10/08	99	Policy HSG6	<p><i>Recommended reword:</i></p> <p>In order to ensure that necessary utilities infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner a phasing plan should be submitted as part of the any initial planning applications.</p>	Reworded following agreed changes at hearing session.	Yes
MM/CHP10/09	102	Policy HSG7	<p><i>Recommended reword:</i></p> <p>The following site at Elwick Village is allocated for a total of approximately 35 dwellings as illustrated on the proposals map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potters Farm / North Farm – 2.07ha - approximately 35 dwellings. <p>The development will be phased over the plan period, with applications being determined in strict accordance with the following criteria:</p> <p>1) No more than 1.67ha of land will be developed for new housing. The development will incorporate a minimum of 0.40ha of green</p>	Reworded following agreed changes at hearing session.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p>infrastructure, informal open space and recreational and leisure land;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) The site will be accessed via Elwick Road at the North Farm access. No access will be permitted from the new bypass or via the village green 3) A landscape buffer, as illustrated on the proposals map, will be created between the site and the bypass to the north. No built incursion into the landscape buffer will be permitted other than for uses intrinsically linked to its use as a landscape buffer. 4) Development proposals for the site will be expected to take account of, respect and <u>conserve the significance and setting of</u> protect the adjacent heritage assets. 5) Appropriate pedestrian and cycle linkages to the adjoining areas of countryside and linking to Hartlepool along Elwick Road will be required as part of the residential development, along with a contribution towards a subsidised bus service to help maximise the sustainability of the site. <p>Specific site requirements, including design, access arrangements and development phasing will be secured through planning conditions and planning obligations secured through legal agreements where appropriate.</p>		
MM/CHP10/10	104	Policy HSG8	<p><i>Recommended reword:</i></p> <p>The two developments will be phased over the plan period, with applications being determined in strict accordance with the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) A landscape buffer, as defined by the site boundaries and illustrated on the Proposals Map <u>Policies Map</u> will be created between the Glebe Farm site and the bypass A179 to the south. No built incursion into the landscape buffer will be permitted other than for uses intrinsically linked to its use as a landscape buffer. <u>A further landscape buffer will be provided to the north of the Nine Acres site to ensure a buffer between development and the open countryside.</u> 	Reworded following agreed changes at hearing session and clarity on bypass being A179.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p>3) An area of land to the east <u>within the eastern area</u> of the Nine Acres site will be developed as a formal area of green infrastructure and designated under Policy NE2 to protect it from development in the future. Housing proposals for the overall site will be expected to be designed so that they overlook the green space to increase security. Planning permission will only be given for developments which relate to the use of land as protected green space or other amenity, recreational or landscaped open space.</p>		
MM/CHP10/11	112	Policy HSG13	<p><i>Reword policy to the following:</i></p> <p>Proposals for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites will be approved where the <u>following criteria are met: there is no significant detrimental effect on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining or nearby land uses. It would be required that:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is adequate access to the site and provision for parking, turning and servicing within the site. 2) The site is accessible to education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure. 3) The site is neither subject to unacceptable pollution by reason of noise, dust, fumes or smell, nor to potential nuisance or hazard created by existing or approved commercial or industrial activities. 4) The site is adequately screened and landscaped to ensure the development does not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area, including any natural and historic assets or features, and provides sufficient privacy and security while not isolating the community from the rest of the settled community. 5) If required, the size of the site is large enough to accommodate mixed or separate residential and business uses and additional parking space for extra caravans, cars and lorries. 6) Adequate space is available within the site to accommodate grazing animals to minimize any impact on neighbouring sites. <u>7) There is no negative impact upon the relationship with existing and proposed neighbouring land uses and the amenity of occupiers of</u> 	Change to policy updated following hearing session on Matter 16.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document																										
			<u>adjoining or nearby properties.</u>																												
MM/CHP10/12	85	Policy HSG 1	<p>The Borough Council will seek to ensure that new housing provision in the borough is delivered through housing sites that have already been permitted, newly identified sites both within the urban areas and on the edge of the urban area, villages in the rural area and sites elsewhere in the borough to, as a minimum, meet the <u>net housing need requirement identified below</u>. All sites are suitable, available and deliverable and are illustrated below:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: black; color: white;">Existing Urban Area</th> <th style="background-color: black; color: white;">Approximate Dwelling Provision</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Extant Residential Planning Permissions</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,283</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Urban Local Plan Sites</td> <td style="text-align: center;">169</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Urban Area Provision</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,452</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: black; color: white;">Urban Edge and Village Sites</th> <th style="background-color: black; color: white;">Approximate Dwelling Provision</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Extant Planning Permissions</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2,510</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Tunstall</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wynyard Park</td> <td style="text-align: center;">732</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarry Farm</td> <td style="text-align: center;">220</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elwick Village</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hart Village</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Rural Provision</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4,747</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Overall <u>Net Housing Requirement</u> Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6,199</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Existing Urban Area	Approximate Dwelling Provision	Extant Residential Planning Permissions	1,283	Urban Local Plan Sites	169	Total Urban Area Provision	1,452	Urban Edge and Village Sites	Approximate Dwelling Provision	Extant Planning Permissions	2,510	High Tunstall	1,200	Wynyard Park	732	Quarry Farm	220	Elwick Village	35	Hart Village	50	Total Rural Provision	4,747	Overall <u>Net Housing Requirement</u> Total	6,199	To ensure clarity that figures are net totals.	Yes
Existing Urban Area	Approximate Dwelling Provision																														
Extant Residential Planning Permissions	1,283																														
Urban Local Plan Sites	169																														
Total Urban Area Provision	1,452																														
Urban Edge and Village Sites	Approximate Dwelling Provision																														
Extant Planning Permissions	2,510																														
High Tunstall	1,200																														
Wynyard Park	732																														
Quarry Farm	220																														
Elwick Village	35																														
Hart Village	50																														
Total Rural Provision	4,747																														
Overall <u>Net Housing Requirement</u> Total	6,199																														
MM/CHP10/13	83	New Paragraph 10.20 – 10.23	<p><i>New Section Title and following new paragraphs to be added.</i></p> <p><u>The five year supply of deliverable housing sites</u></p> <p><u>10.20 Table 7 shows how the Council has projected housing delivery over the plan period. The following different sources of housing supply are listed within Table 7:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planning permissions</u> 	To provide further clarity on the five year supply of deliverable housing sites.	Yes																										

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites which the Council has resolved to grant planning permission for subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement. • Urban Local Plan Sites • Rural Local Plan Sites • Specific Sites <p>10.21 <u>Table 7 also shows how the five year supply of deliverable housing sites has been calculated for each of the five year periods covered by the plan and the current five year plan period (2017 to 2022). When the objectively assessment of housing need (OAN) was undertaken a 'strategic' backlog of housing under-delivery of 705 dwellings (net figure) was identified. Since the plan period began further under-delivery of 307 dwellings (net figure) has occurred. The strategic housing backlog was included in the OAN and spread across the plan period (the 'Liverpool' method) and therefore forms part of the baseline housing requirement for the plan period. The additional backlog has been added to the baseline housing requirement and also spread across the plan period.</u></p> <p>10.22 <u>Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should add a buffer of 5% or 20% to the five year housing supply requirement depending on whether or not there has been en persistent under-delivery. The Council accepts that there has been a record of persistent under-delivery (this will be kept under review through the annual monitoring process) and has therefore added a buffer of 20% to the requirement for the five year period 2017 to 2022. Also in accordance with paragraph 47 this has been moved forward from later in the plan period, rather than increasing the requirement over the whole of the plan period.</u></p> <p>10.23 <u>In the interest of clarity, this buffer is completely separate from the 20% 'buffer and affordable housing allowance' identified in Table 6 and which forms part of the annual housing requirement. Also in the interests of clarity, Table 7 clearly shows that the NPPF paragraph 47 buffer has been applied to the whole of the housing requirement for the period 2017 to 2022 (including that part of the requirement comprising backlog for previous under-delivery). The Council will continue to operate this approach for the annual updates of the five year supply of deliverable</u></p>		

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p><u>housing sites.</u></p> <p><i>The subsequent paragraphs in the Housing Chapter will be renumbered accordingly.</i></p>		
MM/CHP10/14	94	Policy HSG5	<p><i>Insert new criteria to the policy</i></p> <p><u>8) Development to accord with the key principles set out in concept diagram contained in the Plan; development to accord with an approved masterplan.</u></p> <p><u>9) Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to be provided given edge of settlement location.</u></p>	Wording agreed at Matter 8 Hearing session.	Yes
MM/CHP10/15	95	Policy HSG5a	<p><i>Insertion of additional detail on Criterion 4 of the policy:</i></p> <p>1) Approximately 3ha of multifunctional green infrastructure will be provided, <u>which will accommodate the provision of the required level of SANGS.</u> This will include formal and informal leisure and recreational facilities which will be allocated, developed and managed as amenity open space and green corridors in accordance with policy NE2. Planning Permission will only be given for developments which relate to the use of the land as parkland or other amenity, recreational or play space, landscaped open space, or for allotments or wildlife purposes.</p>	Wording agreed at Matter 8 Hearing session.	Yes
MM/CHP10/16	99	Policy HSG6	<p><i>Insert new criteria to the policy</i></p> <p><u>9) Development to accord with the key principles set out in concept diagram contained in the Plan; development to accord with an approved masterplan.</u></p>	Wording agreed at Matter 9 Hearing session.	Yes
MM/CHP10/17	91	Policy HSG4	<p><i>Recommended reword:</i></p> <p>The South West Extension benefits from full permission for 144 dwellings and outline permission for 1116 dwellings (subject to completion of S106 Legal Agreement) and covers approximately 97.25 hectares. The development will be phased over the plan period, with applications being determined in strict accordance with the following criteria:</p>	Wording agreed at Matter 10 Hearing session.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP10/18	TBC	New Policy HSG1a	<p><i>To be inserted after MM/CHP10/13</i></p> <p><u>HSG1a: Ensuring a Sufficient Supply of Housing Land</u></p> <p><u>A sufficient supply of housing land will be maintained over the plan period in order to ensure the delivery of the overall housing requirement as outlined in Policy HSG1. The rate of housing delivery and supply will be assessed through the annual monitoring process, with performance being measured against the housing trajectory (Table 7). If monitoring demonstrates that the number of completed dwellings falls below the cumulative target over the appropriate 12-month monitoring period (1 April to 31 March), the Council will prioritise the delivery of housing in the subsequent monitoring periods. This will be ensured through appropriate mechanisms which, depending on the scale and nature of potential under-delivery, will include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1) Preparation of an interim position statement and drawing on evidence from the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), which will be undertaken and updated as required, to identify additional housing land;</u> <u>2) Preparation of development briefs and use of the Council’s powers to support delivery, such as Compulsory Purchase Orders and, where appropriate, working in partnership with landowners and developers to support delivery. and/or</u> <u>3) A partial review of the Local Plan, including options for safeguarded land including allocated employment land will be undertaken if exceptional circumstances prevail.</u> <p><u>The Plan contains a range of proposals relating to housing, including the South West Extension, Quarry Farm and High Tunstall sites that are crucial to the delivery of the overall locational strategy and the Wynyard Park sites that are crucial to the shared ambition of Hartlepool and Stockton on Tees Borough Councils to see the Wynyard settlement developed as a sustainable community. The Council will work with developers and other stakeholders to ensure the timely development of these strategic proposals, including the associated key infrastructure requirements. Any material delay in the implementation of infrastructure necessary to sustain housing delivery, which would lead to under-delivery of supply, will inform whether the range of measures set out above are triggered. This process will ensure that plan-led corrective measures are put in</u></p>	Requirement of new policy agreed at hearing session.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<u>place at the appropriate time.</u>		
MM/CHP10/19	TBC	New Policy HSG1a supporting working.	<p><i>Additional supporting wording to support new policy HSG1a.</i></p> <p><u>10.24 The Government has consulted on a proposed housing delivery test and the council will ensure that the operation of Policy HSG1a is consistent with whatever final form this takes.</u></p> <p><i>The subsequent paragraphs in the Housing Chapter will be renumbered accordingly.</i></p>	Requirement of new policy agreed at hearing session.	Yes
MM/CHP10/20	97	Para 10.38	<p><i>Text to be updated as follows. NB. Page numbers and paragraph numbers will vary following main and additional modifications.</i></p> <p>The capacity of the road network has been an issue and Highways England (HE) has been involved in assessing the impact developments in the area will have on the strategic road network. Discussions have been ongoing with HE to assess the impact of the proposed allocations, and necessary improvements to the road network are highlighted within the Local Infrastructure Plan and will need to be secured as part of the developments. <u>To ensure delivery of housing in Hartlepool Borough, and to provide a degree of flexibility, it has been agreed between Hartlepool BC, Stockton BC and Highways England that the trigger for the mitigation measures at the A19 / A689 interchange should be the cumulative total of dwellings at Wynyard (both north and south of the A689) and the SW Extension, as modelled up to the total of 2,263 dwellings.</u></p> <p>Presently the development at the North Pentagon (<u>HSG6a</u>) within the policy is able to proceed, however, the other two sites (<u>HSG6b and HSG6c</u>) necessitate the need for improvements at the A19 junction including an additional lane for eastbound traffic to allow two lanes of traffic heading south onto the A19 and also the need for a pedestrian bridge adjacent to the main road junction. <u>The trigger for commencing these improvements at Wynyard will be reached upon the delivery of 2,263 dwellings across the identified committed development sites.</u></p>	Amended wording was agreed within the SOCG between Hartlepool Borough Council, Highways England and Wynyard Park relating to infrastructure delivery (EX/HBC/93).	Yes
MM/CHP10/21	98/99	Policy HSG6	<i>Update Policy wording to the following:</i>	Amended wording was agreed within the SOCG between	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			Development will be phased over the plan period, with site A available prior to any of the off-site road infrastructure improvements. Sites B and C are linked to the provision of off-site road infrastructure improvements, as identified in the Local Infrastructure Plan and as agreed with Highways England. <u>Any development at Sites B and C which exceeds the agreed cumulative trigger of 2,263 dwellings across Wynyard Park, Wynyard Village and the South West Extension on and</u> will not be permitted to commence prior to the installation of the highway improvements.	Hartlepool Borough Council, Highways England and Wynyard Park relating to infrastructure delivery (EX/HBC/93).	
MM/CHP10/22	94	Policy HSG5	<i>Update following wording:</i> The development will be phased over the plan period, with applications being determined in strict accordance with the following criteria:	Amended to ensure consistency in policy wording in the Housing Section of the Local Plan.	Yes
MM/CHP10/23	95	Policy HSG5a	<i>Update following wording:</i> The development will be phased over the plan period, with applications being determined in strict accordance with the following criteria:	Amended to ensure consistency in policy wording in the Housing Section of the Local Plan.	Yes
MM/CHP10/24 Supersedes AM/CHP10/10	105	Para 10.50	<i>Update wording as follows:</i> The previous 2012 Tees Valley SHMA identified an affordable housing need in the Borough of 27.5%. The 2015 SHMA continues to identify areas of affordable housing need in the Borough and advocates an annual affordable housing delivery target of approximately 144 dwellings. Compared to the net additional dwelling provision target of 400 <u>410</u> (adjusted from the 325 proposed in the SHMA to take account of demolitions and previous under-delivery), the net affordable housing delivery target is approximately 36% <u>35%</u> .	Updated working to amend topographical error.	Yes
MM/CHP10/25	106	Title	<i>Amend title as follows:</i> Hartlepool Affordable <u>Housing</u> Viability Assessment (2015)	Update to reflect the use of two evidence bases.	Yes
MM/CHP10/26	106	10.53	<i>Inclusion of the following as an additional paragraph below 10.52:</i> <u>10.53 In preparation of this Local Plan, further work on development viability</u>	Inclusion of text to include reference to the Deliverability Risk Assessment as an additional evidence base.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p><u>was undertaken through the development of the Deliverability Risk Assessment (DRA) document. This document assessed the economic viability of the development types which have been identified within this Local Plan. The DRA considered the constraints and costs of delivering in the current economic climate and then considered the cost implications of planning obligations (including affordable housing) on development viability. The evidence assumed a ‘worst case scenario’ to cost assumptions, based on local development indicators, standard development cost assumptions and through taking professional advice from local Agents and Borough Council officers.</u></p> <p>Requirement to update following paragraph numbers.</p>		
MM/CHP10/27	106	10.53	<p><i>Update text as follows:</i></p> <p><u>10.54</u> 10.53 The findings of the this most recent evidence base, <u>which details that affordable housing requirements can be met</u>; are generally supported by recent planning applications where the Borough Council has been successful in securing affordable contributions in the region of 15-18% on greenfield sites over the past two-three years. In order to ensure that any future developments are viable and not stifled by an onerous affordable housing requirement, the <u>affordable housing</u> policy is flexible enough to have regard to prevailing market conditions. This method will allow both for the maximisation of affordable housing on site and the viability of schemes aiding delivery in the long term.</p>	Update to reflect the use of two evidence bases.	Yes
MM/CHP10/28	TBC	HSG5	<i>Inclusion of concept diagram – Included as Appendix C</i>	Inclusion outcome of hearing session on Matter 8	Yes
MM/CHP10/29	TBC	HSG6	<i>Inclusion of concept diagram – Included as Appendix D</i>	Inclusion outcome of hearing session on Matter 9	Yes
MM/CHP10/30	80	Para 10.14	<p><i>Update following to include:</i></p> <p>10.14 The above mix of sites and existing permissions is reflected in the trajectory in table 7 below. <u>The methodology for Table 7 is set out in Appendix 14.</u></p> <p>Methodology included as Appendix 14, set out in this document as Appendix E.</p>	Inclusion to reflect Planning Inspectors actions.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP10/31	94	Policy HSG5	<p><i>Update text as follows:</i></p> <p>4) Approximately 12.00ha of multifunctional green infrastructure will be provided including formal and informal leisure, education related sports provision and recreational facilities will be allocated, developed and managed as a strategic green wedge, as defined on the Proposals Map Policies Map and in accordance with policies NE1-5. Planning Permission will only be given for developments which relate to the use of land within the green wedge as parkland or other amenity, recreational or landscaped open space, or for allotments or wildlife purposes.</p>	Update to provide clarity.	Yes
MM/CHP10/32	84	Graph 1	<i>Update of Graph 1: Graph 1: Delivery Trajectory of Housing Sites over the Next 15 Years. Detailed as Appendix F in this document.</i>	Update to reflect update to trajectory.	Yes
MM/CHP10/33	81	Table 7	<i>Updated Table 7 inserted.</i>	Updated Table 7 inserted to reflect Inspector's comments.	Yes
MM/CHP11/01	125	Para 11.36	In the south east of the Borough some of the specialist industrial land is located adjacent to or close to sites of international, national or local importance for nature conservation, including the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area/Ramsar site, Teesmouth National Nature Reserve and several Sites of Special Scientific Interest. European and UK legislation require these sites to be protected from development that may have a significant impact on their nature conservation interest. Industrial development near these areas may be restricted or be required to provide appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures in order to meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations. <u>In order to demonstrate strategic commitment to conserving European Sites, industrial companies will be encouraged to join INCA and participate in the Tees Estuary Partnership. If EMP4 sites are developed, this is likely to adversely impact upon neighbouring pSPA and SPA land. Construction and operation will need to mitigate adverse impact on European Sites, for example through timing of works and companies should consider this in their long-term planning.</u>	In response to RSPB comments.	Yes
MM/CHP11/02	128	Policy EMP6	<u>In order to make any underground storage deliverable, access will need to be from the portion of Greenabella Marsh that has no Natural Environment allocation, which will avoid the need for a structure to be built on the SPA. There is such a piece of land which adjoins the A178 and the EMP6 sites.</u>	In view of RSPB comments, it is considered that this will avoid stages 3 and 4 of the Habitat Regulations.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP11/03	126	Policy EMP4	<p><i>Recommended to insert the following text after criterion 2</i></p> <p><u>3) Development of essential infrastructure must avoid areas of high hazard unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP11/04	127	Policy EMP5	<p><i>Recommended to insert the following text as the final paragraph in the policy</i></p> <p><u>Development of essential infrastructure must avoid areas of high hazard unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP11/05	128	Policy EMP6	<p><i>Recommended to insert the following text between after criterion 3 and the paragraph below</i></p> <p><u>Proposals for the storage of toxic substances will not be allowed.</u></p> <p><u>Development of essential infrastructure must avoid areas of high hazard unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP11/06	128	Policy EMP6	<p><i>Amend wording as follows:</i></p> <p>4) any above surface structures are limited in scale, and not visually prominent <u>and will be designed with flat roofs to replicate any habitat lost.</u></p>	Updated following work on the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Yes
MM/CHP11/07	128	Policy EMP6	<p><i>Include following wording:</i></p> <p><u>Access to the sites is indicated on the Proposals Map.</u></p>	Updated following work on the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Yes
MM/CHP11/08	123	Policy EMP3	<p><i>Include the following working to the end of the policy:</i></p> <p><u>All proposals must be considered against all relevant policies in the plan. In particular policy NE1, given the close proximity of the some of the employment sites listed within this policy to designated sites for nature conservation.</u></p>	Inclusion of wording to ensure that policy links directly to the Natural Environment Policy.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP12/01	132	Para 12.20	In the rural area outside the development limits, beyond the agricultural permitted development rights, development should only <u>may</u> be permitted where it is essential for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, public infrastructure or to meet the social needs of the local community. <u>This and</u> other development that is appropriate to a rural area and supports the rural economy, agricultural diversification, rural tourism and leisure developments may be permitted where it respects the <u>tranquility and</u> character of the local countryside and does not have a significant impact on visual amenity in the setting of the landscape or <u>on</u> the local road network.	It is considered that reference to tranquillity should be made in view of CPRE comments.	Yes
MM/CHP12/02	135	Policy RUR2	The New Dwellings Outside of Development Limits SPD provides detailed guidance on the principle of a new dwelling in the countryside. <u>For new dwellings in the rural area, further to the criteria set out in this policy, the development must have regard to the provisions of the New Dwellings Outside of Development Limits Supplementary Planning Document</u>	To provide greater clarity with respect to the criteria set out within RUR2.	Yes
MM/CHP12/03	138	Policy RUR4	<i>Recommended to add following text after criterion 7:</i> <u>8) The proposal does not involve a significant, irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, those areas classed as grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification.</u>	In response to concerns from Greatham Parish Council and in line with emerging policy RUR3 (Farm Diversification).	Yes
MM/CHP12/04	133	Policy RUR1	<i>Update policy wording to the following:</i> 1) Be in accordance with the Hartlepool Rural Neighbourhood Plan and any other made -neighbourhood plan;	Removal of word to acknowledge that Neighbourhood Plans can hold 'weight' prior to being formally 'made'.	
MM/CHP13/01	147/148	Policy RC1	The Borough Council has identified and defined a hierarchy of retail and commercial centres that will offer a variety of sites that are economically attractive, diverse and in appropriate sustainable locations and/or locations where connectivity can easily be enhanced throughout the Borough. The defined hierarchy and sequential preference of the centres, for main town centre uses in the Borough are identified in table 14 and on the proposals map and are detailed below: 1) The Town Centre, then;	Clarification of policy wording.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p>2) Edge of Town Centre Areas and Retail and Leisure Parks then; 3) Local Centres.</p> <p>Proposals for main town centre uses, not located within a designated centre will be required to provide a robust sequential test. The test must consider all of the Borough's designated centres and follow the sequential hierarchy. Where it is established that no suitable sites are available within the designated centres, an alternative acceptable location may be a location accessible by a choice of means of transport and/or which offers significant regeneration benefits.</p> <p>Proposals for main town centre uses, within a local centre, in excess of with a floor area of 300m² floor space or above, will be required to provide a robust sequential test. The test must consider all of the Borough's designated centres and follow the sequential hierarchy. Where it is established that no suitable designated centres are available to accommodate the proposals, an alternative centre, accessible by a choice of transport and/or which offers significant regeneration benefits, may be acceptable.</p> <p>Proposals for main town centre uses, within an edge of centre or Retail and Leisure Park, in excess of with a floor area of with a floor area of 250m² floor space or above, will be required to provide a robust sequential test. The test must consider all of the Borough's designated centres and follow the sequential hierarchy. Where it is established that no suitable designated centres are available to accommodate the proposals, an alternative centre, accessible by a choice of transport and/or which offers significant regeneration benefits, may be acceptable.</p> <p>Proposals for retail, leisure and office development located in local centres, in excess of with a floor area of with a floor area of 300m² floor space or above, will be required to provide a robust retail impact assessment. In some instances it may be necessary to assess the impact of the proposal on the Town Centre, other designated centres and village businesses and community facilities. Proposals which would undermine Town Centre vitality and viability will not be permitted.</p> <p>Proposals for retail, leisure and office development with a floor area of 200m² or above, not located in the Town Centre or a local centre, will be required to provide a robust retail impact assessment. In some instances it may be necessary to assess the impact of the proposal on the Town Centre and other designated centres.</p>		

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			Proposals which would undermine Town Centre vitality and viability will not be permitted.		
MM/CHP13/02	168	Para 13.91	The Marina allocation in this Local Plan includes the water within the Marina. The water and waterfront are important features which the Borough Council seeks to ensure remain attractive features. The Borough Council wish to see the water enhanced with the provision of water based activities, connectivity infrastructure such as water taxis and the waterfront visually improved. Allowing built development on and/or over the water could hamper the opportunities to develop water based activities and the Borough Council will seek to strictly control any development on/over the water. Allowing poor design and poor connectivity along the waterfront could hamper the experience of visitors therefore any development should form a strong relationship between building/s and water's edge. <u>The Estuary Edges: Ecological Design Guidance which has been developed by the Environment Agency will be relevant for some types of development.</u>	Additional wording in line with comments of the Environment Agency.	Yes
MM/CHP13/03	169	Para 13.99	Advertising within the Marina plays a vital role in informing visitors what is on offer within the area and assists in capturing visitors for longer stays and increasing the spend whilst in the area. Currently the advertising within the Marina is limited and outdated. The Borough Council will encourage and support applications that seek to improve the overall signage quality across the area, particularly signs that are reflective of the area's history and/or function <u>and that promote the area's internationally important birds.</u> Poor quality signage will be resisted due to the detrimental impact it has on the visual amenity of the area.	This will increase public awareness of SPA birds.	Yes
MM/CHP13/04	188	Policy RC18	<i>Recommended that a new section 'Villages' is introduced which will read:</i> <u>A maximum of 1 hot food takeaway will be permitted within the limits to development of each of the villages in order to provide a local service to the village and where this is demonstrably supported locally</u> <i>It is also recommended that the text at 'All other locations' is amended to read:</i> Hot food takeaways will not be permitted outside of any designated retail or commercial centre <u>or the limits to development of any village.</u>	It is agreed that the policy needs to be more flexible in balancing the achievement of the policy aims with supporting rural services.	Yes
MM/CHP13/05	146	Para 13.21	Proposals for main town centre uses, within an edge of centre or retail and leisure parks, with a floor area of <u>below 250m² or above</u> , will be required to provide a robust sequential test.	Change of to ensure that the justification in paragraph is aligned with the policy.	

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP13/06	151	Policy RC2	Business will not be permitted to operate between the hours of 11.30pm and 7am <u>unless they are located within the late night uses area, as identified on the proposals map.</u>	For clarity with regard to the late night uses area (policy RC17).	Yes
MM/CHP13/07	Page 158	Policy RC5	<i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i> <u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/08	162	Policy RC7	<i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i> <u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/09	167	Policy RC11	<i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i> <u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/10	171	Policy RC12	<i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i> <u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/11	175	Policy RC14	<i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i> <u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP13/12	180	Policy RC16	<p><i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i></p> <p><u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/13	182	Policy RC17	<p><i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i></p> <p><u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/14	182	Policy RC17	<p>For businesses operating after 11.30pm and before 2am 7am the late night uses area identified on the proposals map will be the only appropriate location in the borough for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Shops (A1)</u> • Restaurants and Cafes (A3) • Drinking Establishments (A4) • Hot Food Takeaways (A5) • Nightclubs and Theatres (Sui Generis) • Assembly & Leisure (D2) • Business (B1) <p><u>No businesses will be allowed to operate from 2am to 7am.</u></p>	<p>Restricting operational hours to 2am ensures planning policy is aligned with licensing policy. This ensures that the Council, as a whole, are working collaboratively to tackle the problems associated with the night time economy.</p> <p>A1 units have been introduced as if they did operate until 2am within this area is envisaged that there would be no likely harm. Any concerns with regard to the sale of alcohol would be managed through the licensing regime.</p> <p>The final sentence has been added for clarity that no businesses can operate past 2am or before 7am.</p>	Yes
MM/CHP13/15	182	Policy RC17	<p>In order to adequately develop the immediate Church Street area and protect and enhance the Church Street Conservation Area the above uses, and other uses, will only be permitted providing that they do not adversely affect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the, property and the surrounding area and that they are in accordance with the Green Infrastructure and Planning Obligations</p>	Grammatical corrections	Yes

Hartlepool Local Plan 2016 – Examination in Public

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			SPDs.		
MM/CHP13/16	186	Policy RC18	Insert new sub area. <u>3) Museum Road/ South Lauder Street sub area - no A5 uses will be permitted</u>	Officer oversight as sub area was not show in Publication draft.	Yes
MM/CHP13/17	186	Policy RC18	3) 4) Church Street east sub area - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 10% 13%	Mathematical re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/18	186	Policy RC18	4) 5) Church Street West – the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 5%	Sub area re-numbering	Yes
MM/CHP13/19	186	Policy RC18	5) 6) Park Road sub area - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 8% 4%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/20	186	Policy RC18	6) 7) Victoria Road sub area – the amount of floorspace should not exceed 2%	Sub area re-numbering	Yes
MM/CHP13/21	186	Policy RC18	7) 8) York Road North sub area - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 2% 3%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/22	186	Policy RC18	7) York Road edge of centre - the amount of A5 floor space should not exceed 6% 7%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/23	187	Policy RC18	Insert space break between local centre 5 (Stockton Road/Spring Gardens) and 6 (Brierton Lane)	To provide break between areas were no A5 uses are permitted and areas that have a threshold set.	Yes
MM/CHP13/24	187	Policy RC18	7) Belle View Vue Way - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 7% 17%	Officer typo in publication draft	Yes
MM/CHP13/25	187	Policy RC18	8) Brus Corner - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 17% 10%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/26	187	Policy RC18	9) Brenda Road/Sydenham Road - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 3% 4%	Mathematical re calculation, figure has been rounded up instead of rounding down as would be the case if following the mathematical rule. Best option is to round up as floorspace cannot be rounded down if it already exists.	Yes
MM/CHP13/27	187	Policy RC18	10) Catcote Road - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 15% 9%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/28	187	Policy RC18	11) Chatham Road - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 18% 17%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/29	187	Policy RC18	13) Duke Street North - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 35% 32%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/30	187	Policy RC18	15) Fens Shops – the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 7% 13%	Recent application approved on appeal.	Yes
MM/CHP13/31	187	Policy RC18	18) King Oswy - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 10% 9%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/32	187	Policy RC18	20) Murray Street - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 13% 10%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes

Hartlepool Local Plan 2016 – Examination in Public

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP13/33	187	Policy RC18	22) Northgate/Durham Street - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 14% 10%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/34	187	Policy RC18	Insert 24) Owton Manor East - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 13%	Officer omission at publication stage	Yes
MM/CHP13/35	187	Policy RC18	Insert 25) Owton manor West - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 12%	Officer omission at publication stage	Yes
MM/CHP13/36	187/188	Policy RC18	Amend local centre number accordingly as number 24 and 25 have been added.	Local centre re-numbering	Yes
MM/CHP13/37	187/188	Policy RC18	24) 26) Oxford Street - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 10% 9%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/27	187	Policy RC18	25) 27) Powlett Road/Lancaster Road - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 44% 43%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/38	187	Policy RC18	26) 28) Raby Road/Hart Lane Corner - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 4%	Renumbering	Yes
MM/CHP13/39	187	Policy RC18	27) 29) Raby Road/ Brougham Terrace - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 17% 6%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/40	187	Policy RC18	29) 31) Stockton Road/Cornwall Street - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 18% 6%	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/41	147	Policy RC1	retail impact assessment	Factual correction	Yes
MM/CHP13/42	147	Policy RC1	retail impact assessment	Factual correction	Yes
MM/CHP13/43	147 / 148	Policy RC1	<i>Subsequent to MM/CHP13/01, the following wording for paragraph 5</i> Proposals for main town centre uses, within an edge of centre or retail and leisure parks, with a floor area of <u>below</u> 250m ² or above , will be required to provide a robust sequential test."	Correction to provide clarity on policy intention and ensure aligned with justification in preamble.	Yes
MM/CHP13/44	188	Policy RC18	8) 9) York Road South sub area - the amount of A5 floorspace should not exceed 2% 3%.	Retail survey re calculation	Yes
MM/CHP13/45	175 / 176	Policy RC12	Insert the following wording in the policy: <u>Where appropriate the Council will seek the provision of interpretation to increase public understanding of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar.</u>	Updated following work on the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Yes
MM/CHP13/46	175 / 176	Policy RC14	Insert the following wording in the policy: <u>Where appropriate the Council will seek the provision of interpretation to increase public understanding of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar.</u>	Updated following work on the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Yes

Hartlepool Local Plan 2016 – Examination in Public

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
MM/CHP13/47	Page 151	Policy RC2	<p><i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i></p> <p><u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP13/48	154	RC4	Update of Edge of Town Centres Areas diagram.	Reflect changes to area 8.	Yes
MM/CHP14/01	196	Policy LT1	Major leisure and tourism developments in Hartlepool which are likely to attract large numbers of visitors will be expected to locate within the Town Centre, <u>the Mill House Edge of Town Centre Area</u> or the Marina.	The Borough Council acknowledges that there is a strong case for Policy LT1 Leisure and Tourism also being applied as an overlapping designation to this area.	Yes
MM/CHP14/02	196-197	Policy LT1	Seaton Carew will be promoted and developed as a tourism destination which showcases and protects the EU designated bathing waters and Seaside Awards. Regeneration schemes which improve the vitality and viability of Seaton Carew whilst <u>protecting and enhancing the Conservation Area and</u> the settlement's open seaside character and protecting the Conservation Area will be promoted and actively supported by the Local Authority.	Amended to reflect Historic England advice.	Yes
MM/CHP14/03	196-197	Policy LT1	<p><i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i></p> <p><u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP14/04	Page 198-199	Policy LT2	<p><i>Recommended that the following text is inserted:</i></p> <p><u>'More Vulnerable' (See National Planning Practice Guidance flood risk vulnerability classification) development will not be allowed within Flood Zone 2 and 3a unless supported by a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development.</u></p>	Recommendation from the Flood Risk Exception Test (document reference EX/HBC/30)	Yes
MM/CHP14/05	203	Policy LT5	Insert the following wording in the policy:	Updated following work on the Habitats	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<u>Where appropriate the Council will seek the provision of a financial contribution under Planning Obligations, to manage recreation on the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar.</u>	Regulations Assessment.	
MM/CHP15/01	208	Policy HE1	The Borough Council will seek to refuse proposals which lead to substantial harm to, or result in the total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset <u>only in exceptional circumstances unless it is evidenced that the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit.</u>	Amended wording in line with Historic England comments to ensure compliance with NPPF.	
MM/CHP15/01a	208	Policy HE1	The Borough Council will seek to refuse proposals which lead to substantial harm to, or result in the total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset unless it is evidenced that the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit ² <u>in accordance with national policy.</u>	Clarity to ensure that the policy is consistent with National Policy.	Yes
MM/CHP15/02	217	Policy HE7	In exceptional circumstances where a heritage asset is at risk and requires significant repairs to maintain or enhance its heritage value and the cost for repair and/or investigation is undeliverable by any other means, the redevelopment of the wider site may be considered. However this will only be an option when the proposed development does not create substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset. In the case of less than significant harm to the heritage asset it must be demonstrated that any loss and/or harm is necessary and outweighed by the need to achieve substantial public benefit. <u>Where is it evidenced that risk has come about as the result of deliberate neglect or damage, enablement development will not be supported.</u>	Inclusion of caveat in Policy HE7 is considered acceptable in line with Historic England comments.	Yes
MM/CHP15/03	211	Policy HE3	<i>Additional text included in second and third paragraph.</i> In determining applications within Conservation Areas <u>and within their setting</u>	Clarity following the hearing session that the paragraph also covers setting of the Conservation area.	Yes

² Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting
- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<p>particular regard will be given to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The scale and nature of the development in terms of appropriateness to the character of the particular conservation area; 2) The design, height, orientation, massing, means of enclosure, materials, finishes and decoration to ensure development is sympathetic to and/or complementary to the character and appearance of the conservation area; 3) The retention of original features of special architectural interest such as walls, gateway entrances and architectural details; 4) Retention of existing trees, hedgerows and landscape features and appropriate landscaping improvements incorporated into design proposals; 5) The protection of important views and vistas and settings within and into / out of the conservation area; 6) Car parking, where required, should be located, designed and landscaped in such a way as to minimise impact on the character and appearance of the heritage asset, and 7) Guidance provided in relevant Conservation Area appraisals, management plans, visual assessments, design statements and supplementary planning documents. <p>Proposals for demolition within Conservation Areas will be carefully assessed, the Borough Council will only permit the demolition of buildings and other features and structures in a Conservation Area if it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The removal would help to conserve and/or enhance the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area, <u>and</u> 2) Its structural condition is such that it is beyond reasonable economic repair, or 3) The removal is necessary to deliver a public benefit which substantially outweighs the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. 	<p>Addition of wording to ensure clarity on how the three points in the list apply.</p>	
MM/CHP16/01	218	Para 16.1	<p><u>In line with the Government’s emerging Natural Capital agenda</u>, the Borough Council recognises the important role that Hartlepool’s natural environment plays in enhancing people’s quality of life and improving quality of place. The benefits of a high quality natural environment run as a cross-cutting theme through many of the policies and proposals of the Local Plan. A high quality environment can:</p>	<p>To strengthen the preamble to the chapter to include reference to Natural Capital in view of CPRE comments.</p>	Yes


Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage more people to live and work in Hartlepool • Complement efforts to attract new economic growth and investment • Help to increase the number of visitors and boost the tourism economy • Provide more opportunities for leisure and recreation with consequent benefits for people’s health and well-being • Support measures to adapt to and mitigate against the potential impacts of climate change 		
MM/CHP16/02	223-224	Para 16.23	<p>The concept of biodiversity accounting or offsetting may offer a future role in providing compensation for development which results in a loss of nature conservation value. Biodiversity accounting is a methodology offering potential to recognise and quantify the environmental impact of development, and generating extra investment for habitat creation by appropriate compensation schemes. A key principle of biodiversity accounting is that it is only after avoidance, mitigation and on-site compensation have been fully investigated that any residual environmental damage can be considered for compensation off-site. Biodiversity accounting needs to show measurable outcomes that are sustained over time. A pilot scheme has been operating with six local authorities in England and the evaluation of this pilot has provided some encouraging lessons for applying biodiversity accounting in practical situations <u>In 2012 Defra commissioned eight biodiversity offsetting pilots in six areas and these ran until 2014. Evaluation of the pilot has provided some encouraging lessons for applying biodiversity accounting in practical situations. At least one environmental consultancy is actively promoting biodiversity offsetting in the planning sector and has developed a ‘metric’ for assessing all the relevant criteria.</u></p>	In response to comments from the Durham Bird Club to update reference to biodiversity offsetting.	Yes
MM/CHP16/03	230	Policy NE1	<p>7) Existing woodland and trees of amenity value and nature conservation value are protected, and an increase in tree cover will be sought in appropriate locations in line with the Borough Council’s Tree Strategy. Areas of ancient woodland, including ancient semi-natural woodland (ASNW), plantations on ancient woodland sites (PAWS), and aged ancient <u>or veteran trees</u> outside ancient woodland, will be protected unless there are exceptional circumstances. The Borough Council will also ensure that development does not result in the loss of or damage to ancient woodland (including ASNW and PAWS) by requiring the implementation of a buffer of at least 15 metres between development and the ancient woodland site (depending on the size of the site). <u>For ancient or veteran</u></p>	In light of comments from the Woodland Trust and following advice from the Council’s Arboricultural Officer.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			<u>trees, a buffer 15 times the stem diameter or 5 metres beyond the drip line of the leaf canopy should be maintained, whichever is the greater.</u>		
MM/CHP16/04	245	Policy NE5	<p>3) where there is up to date, robust evidence (through for example an Open Space/Recreation Assessment <u>or the Playing Pitch Strategy</u>) that demonstrates an excess of provision of playing fields, or their re-location achieves a better dispersal of provision which meets the requirements of users and the local community, or</p> <p>4) where <u>a proposed development, including</u> school expansion or re-building, takes place and the loss of some playing fields does not adversely affect the quantity, quality or use of those playing fields <u>any playing pitches or any other sporting facilities on the site.</u></p> <p><u>5) where the provision of built sport facilities will result in the loss of playing pitches, the development is of greater benefit to sport than the playing pitches it will replace and the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.</u></p>	In light of comments and advice from Sport England and to ensure the policy is in line with Sport England's exception tests.	Yes
MM/CHP16/05	230	Policy NE1	<p><i>Update policy wording to the following:</i></p> <p>a) Internationally designated sites: these sites receive statutory protection. Development not connected to or necessary for the enhancement and/or management of the site will not be permitted unless it meets relevant legal requirements; A precautionary approach will be taken towards developments that may have indirect impacts on internationally designated sites and appropriate mitigation measures or contributions to avoid detrimental impacts will be sought <u>and delivered via the Hartlepool Mitigation Strategy and Delivery Plan.</u></p>	Update following action agreed at the Hearing Session on Matter 13.	Yes
MM/CHP16/06	232	Policy NE1	<p><i>Update policy wording to the following:</i></p> <p>13) All development proposals must have regard to the landscape character of the Borough. All development proposals, through the careful, sensitive management and design of development will ensure that the character, distinctiveness and quality of the Borough's landscape is protected and, where appropriate, enhanced. Any development within the Special Landscape Areas as defined on the Proposals Map Policies Map or which will have a visual impact on those areas will be required to demonstrate that they are in keeping with the area and will not have an adverse impact on the area's</p>	Update of wording following suggested amendment from the Planning Inspector.	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
			landscape character.		
MM/CHP16/07	222	16.16	<p><i>Update paragraph to the following:</i></p> <p>16) While the protection of internationally and nationally important nature conservation sites is clearly set out in existing legislation and guidance, the Borough Council will have regard to the indirect effects of developments proposed beyond the boundaries of these designated sites. For example a housing development could result in increased numbers of uncontrolled visits for dog walking or other activities which in turn could have a detrimental impact on the interest features of the site. In such cases it may be possible for example, to make alternative provision for such activities, reducing pressure on and potential damage to, nature conservation interests. <u>Some sites are close to internationally important sites and are used by birds which are an interest feature. These sites are functionally important to protected birds and development affecting them may need to be mitigated.</u> The Borough Council will therefore adopt a precautionary approach to such proposals.</p>	Update of wording following correspondence with RSPB.	Yes
MM/APP01/01	251	Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms	<p><i>Recommended to insert:</i></p> <p><u>Constructive Conservation - Constructive Conservation is a positive, well-informed and collaborative approach to conservation. It is a flexible process of helping people understand their historic environment and using that understanding to manage change.</u></p>	In response to Historic England comments	Yes
MM/APP02/02	256	Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms	<p><i>Recommended to insert:</i></p> <p><u>Natural capital - Natural capital refers to the elements of the natural environment which provide valuable goods and services to people. The Government focus that the state of natural capital matters, not just because people enjoy the aesthetic elements of landscapes and wildlife of England, but because of the wide-ranging economic benefits that natural assets provide when managed well.</u></p>	In response to CPRE comments.	Yes
MM/APP02/03	252	Appendix 1:	<i>Recommended to insert:</i>	In response to Planning Inspectors requested	Yes

Exam Mod Ref	Page No.	Policy/Site/ Para/Fig	Text with Proposed Modification	Reason for change	Change in Document
		Glossary of Terms	<u>Ecosystems Services Approach - The functions of ecosystems that are vital to support human life and health and well-being through provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural services. These include the creation of soil and the production of food, water and medicines; climate control, including floodwater storage; nutrient cycling and crop pollination and spiritual, cultural, educational and recreational benefits.</u>	actions.	
MM/APP12/01	295	Appendix 12	<i>Inclusion of Monitoring Framework as Appendix to Local Plan document, changes made within the document to reflect discussions at the Hearing Session on Matter 18 have been identified in red within the Monitoring Framework.</i>	To ensure monitoring framework is included in Local Plan document in light of advice from the Planning Inspector.	Yes
MM/APP13/01	296	Appendix 13	<i>Inclusion of Appendix document providing full list of policies within the 2006 Hartlepool Local Plan which will be superseded by this local plan.</i>	To ensure clarity on policy position following adoption of the 2016 Local Plan.	Yes

Appendix A




Crown Copyright Licence No100023390 (2017)

Scale N/A

DRAWN BY J.BROWN 2017
DEPT REGENERATION & NEIGHBOURHOOD
HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL

Appendix B




Crown Copyright Licence No100023390 (2016)

Scale 1:10,000@A4

DRAWN BY J. BROWN 2016
DEPT REGENERATION & NEIGHBOURHOODS
HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL

Appendix C




Crown Copyright Licence No 100023390 (2017)

Scale 1:10,000@A4

DRAWN BY: J. BROWN 2017
DEPT REGENERATION & NEIGHBOURHOODS
HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL

Appendix D



Crown Copyright Licence No100023390 (2017)

Scale 1:10,000@A4

DRAWN BY: LEIFENK 2017
DEPT REGENERATION & NEIGHBOURHOODS
HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL

Appendix E

Appendix 14: Table 7 methodology**(A) Baseline housing target**

The housing requirement for the plan period is 6150 dwellings. Pro-rata this is 410 dwellings per annum. However, in order to take account of the lead-in period for the strategic housing sites that the Council has allocated the housing trajectory has been staggered with an annual requirement for the first five years of 350 dwellings, an annual requirement for years 6-10 of 400 dwellings and an annual requirement for years 11-15 of 480 dwellings. For clarity, the annual housing requirement includes the following elements:

- 20% affordable housing delivery buffer
- Strategic (i.e. pre-2016) housing under-delivery backlog carried forward

(B) Add under-delivery 2016-2017 (Liverpool method)

Under-delivery which has occurred since 2016 has to be added to the housing target. There was under-delivery of 235 dwellings in 2016-2017. This has been added to the annual housing targets by spreading it over the plan period (the Liverpool method). So (B) is the baseline housing target plus the 2016-17 under-delivery.

(C) 20% NPPF paragraph 47 buffer target

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and annually update a supply of sufficient deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and completion in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing, the buffer should be increased to 20%.

For the period up to 1st April 2017 there has been a record of persistent under-delivery. Therefore a buffer of 20% has been added to (B) for years 1 to 6. As the NPPF states that this should be brought forward from later in the plan period, the same number of dwellings has been subtracted from (B) for years 11 to 15. So (C) is the baseline housing target plus both post-2016 under-delivery carried forward and the NPPF Para 47 buffer target.

Explanatory note - windfalls

It will be noted that the housing delivery sources in table 7 includes windfalls. These have been previously referred to in the Council's housing trajectory work as specific

sites. However, the Local Plan Inspector suggested at the hearing for Matter 7 – Housing Supply that these might be considered as windfalls. HBC officers have reflected on this suggestion and consider that there is compelling evidence that windfall sites will continue to come forward. An allowance has therefore been made based on specific intelligence that there are sites which will come forward as windfalls. Such intelligence includes the following:

- Sites owned by HBC and which do not have a planning permission for housing or do have a planning permission but the planning permission is unlikely to be delivered but which HBC Estates have advised that there will be housing delivery on the sites.
- Sites where there is strong developer interest and where development would be consistent with local and national planning policy.

The sources for the windfall allowance are therefore land owned by HBC Estates and which there is strong evidence will be developed for residential purposes and sites where there has been active discussions between HBC officers and developers or agents and there is clearly a strong commitment to implement a residential scheme on the site. In adopting this approach HBC officers have sought to avoid reliance upon past trends continuing but rather base windfall delivery projections on specific intelligence about potential windfall sites.

Appendix F **Graph 1: Delivery Trajectory of Housing Sites over the Next 15 Years**

