

**Hartlepool New Dwellings Outside of Development Limits Supplementary  
Planning Document**

**Consultation Statement – June 2015**

**Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The New Dwellings Outside of Development Limits (NDODL) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared by Hartlepool Borough Council. The draft SPD was published for public consultation on the 6<sup>th</sup> of March 2015 which ran for an 8 week period until 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2015.
- 1.2 Section 2 of this document outlines the consultation processes and provides details of those people and organisations that were consulted.
- 1.3 Section 3 of the document gives a summary of the consultation responses and provides the Council's response to each element i.e. whether the suggestion has been accepted and the document amended or whether the suggestion was not considered appropriate and the reason why.
- 1.4 Section 4 gives a brief overview of the next steps in the process of adopting the SPD.

**2. Consultation Process**

- 2.1 The public consultation began on the 6<sup>th</sup> of March 2015 and ended on 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2015. The documents made available in a range of ways, listed below:
  - As part of the regeneration committee meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2015 which approved the SPD for public consultation.
  - Copies of the documents were placed in the Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool.
  - Copies of the documents were placed in the following libraries and village post offices; The Central Library, Seaton Library, Mobile Library, Greatham post office and Elwick post office.
  - The Documents were uploaded onto the Planning Policy element of the Council's Website.
- 2.2 There was also a large number of consultees (239 external) sent letters and asked to comment. These included English Heritage (now Historic England), Natural England, The Highways Agency (now Highways England), The Environment Agency, Tees Valley Wildlife Trust, Parish Councils, Neighbouring Authorities, house builders, housing associations and many others. A Full list of consultees is attached as Appendix 1.
- 2.3 As well as external organisations and individuals there were a range of individuals within the Local Authority contacted for their views including Parks and Countryside officers, Development Control officers and housing officers.

### **3. Consultation Responses to 1<sup>st</sup> consultation and HBC Response**

- 3.1 During the consultation 9 responses were received by letter and email.
- 3.2 The 9 responses received were from the following people/organisations:
- Chris Scaife, Countryside Access Officer, HBC
  - Jim Ferguson, Planning Team Leader Development Control, HBC
  - Alastair Welch, Natural England
  - Alan Hunter, English Heritage
  - Gary Baker, Planning Strategy Officer, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
  - GVA Grimley Ltd on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited
  - Fran Johnson, Chairperson, Park Residents Association, Hartlepool
  - Valerie Lister, Secretary, Hartlepool Civic Society
  - Ben Stephenson, Persimmon Homes
- 3.3 Table 1 lists the issues raised within the representations received during the consultation and notes where the Council amended the SPD to reflect the comment.

**Table 1 – Comments Received and HBC Response**

Organisation / Individual	Representation	Planning Policy Response	Proposed Changes
English Heritage	1) Confusion with regard to the approach to dealing with heritage assets and redundant and disused buildings: the special circumstances involving the optimal use of an existing heritage site pertains whether or not the building is disused or redundant	The SPD does not restrict the appropriateness of a residential dwelling to rescue only disused/redundant heritage assets but to all types of assets in general regardless of their physical state	None
	2) Comments that the SPD draws justification criteria for the conversion/change of use/demolition/re-development of disused and redundant buildings from RUR12 which is no longer NPPF compliant at the time of writing the SPD.	Section 3.5 states <i>“RUR12” will only be considered when the five year supply of deliverable housing sites can be demonstrated.</i> Reference to RUR12 is made so that the SPD is flexible and remains valid in the event that a five year supply of deliverable sites is demonstrated by the Council.  Justification is also drawn from RUR 7 and NPPF paragraph 55	None
	3) Para 55 encourages re-use of redundant or disused buildings but does not allow for demolition and re-building as the SPD states. Reference to demolition is therefore out of scope of the special circumstances under which isolated dwellings will be allowed.	Noted	Criteria 3.2 to be deleted and make no reference to demolishing buildings
	4) Criteria subject 3 needs to note that some of the disused/redundant buildings could be a heritage asset. If so assessment of proposal should be based on paragraphs 132-136 of the NPPF in respect of safeguarding the significance of heritage assets and weighing or balancing the public benefit of a development proposal in relation to any harm to, or loss of, that significance.	Noted	Add to Subject 3 the following functional test criterion: <i>Is the redundant or disused building a heritage asset?</i>  Also add following statement in justification column: <i>“If building is a heritage asset, the assessment will be based in combination with Subject 2 Criteria (i.e. Heritage)</i>  Flag up NPPF paragraphs 132-136 in the heritage justification column
	6) In doing the above assessment in 4), the council needs to give regard to the English Heritage guidance on Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places	Noted. All the heritage functional test criteria were replicated from the English Heritage Policy on enabling development (2008)	None

	published in 2008, and replicate under functional test criteria 2.1-2.7.		
	7) Criteria subject 2: heritage deals with two distinct scenarios; (i) conversion/adaptation of existing heritage asset into dwelling(s) and (ii) erection elsewhere of a new dwelling(s) regarded as necessary to secure the future of an associated heritage asset. Suggestion is if proposal is for new dwelling(s) then most, if not all of the functional test criteria 2.1-2.7 should apply only to new dwelling(s). On the other hand if proposal is for conversion/adaptation then council can apply some but not all of the functional test criteria	Noted	Add to heritage subject the following justification:  The applicant also needs to satisfy/meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 132-136. Most if not all of criteria 2.1 to 2.7 will apply to any proposal justified through heritage. Relevant criteria will depend on the type of proposal, i.e. erection of new dwelling(s) regarded as necessary to secure the future of a heritage site or conversion of existing heritage asset into dwelling(s).
	8) In all circumstances council needs to assess proposals in relation to paragraphs 132-136 of the NPPF.	Noted	Addressed in point 4 above
GVA on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited	1) The definitions and 'Justification Test' provided in the SPD do not fully reflect the aims of the NPPF (March 2012) as they are overly general and seek to restrict all housing developments which are outside settlement limits. In particular, the SPD fails to apply the NPPF's wider policy tests including the requirement to boost the supply of housing (para 47) and the presumption in favour of housing applications (para. 49).	Noted.  The SPD in accordance with NPPF paragraph 55 seeks to restrict isolated dwellings in the countryside outside of development limits unless there is sound justification for the need thereof as outlined in the NPPF paragraph 55.  The SPD states in sections 2.10, 4.8 and Table 1 justification test criteria subject 5; that planning application assessment will not only be based on paragraph 55 but all other relevant policies in the current Local Plan and the NPPF.	Add to Criteria Subject 5. Relevant Policies <i>and other relevant material considerations</i>
	2) In addition, and most importantly, the document fails to provide a distinction between isolated dwellings in the countryside and land which is outside development limits but on the edge of the urban area. This land is often crucial to allowing the sustainable growth of settlements and policy tests which severely restrict all but a few specific types of housing would be contrary to the NPPF.	The Council is aware that land which is outside development limits but on the edge of the urban area or village settlements is in essence on sustainable locations and will allow sustainable growth of settlements. As such the emerging Local Plan will allocate sites on the urban edge and on edge of village settlements to boost housing supply in the Borough. New limits to development will be drawn to include these new sites within the urban limit.  Criteria subject 4: Vitality of the rural communities (functional test criteria 4.2) recognises the sustainability of sites adjoining village envelopes and the direction of the NPPF to promote	Insert in section 2.9 the following statement: The Council recognises that land outside of development limits but located on the edge of urban areas and village settlements is in essence sustainable and as such will allow sustainable growth of settlements. In accordance with the NPPF, all relevant policies and other material considerations, justification maybe sought if the proposal is on sites located at the urban edge or village envelopes. However, housing allocations of large sustainable sites on edges of rural settlements and urban fringes will be done through the Local Plan.

		<p>sustainable development in rural areas hence the SPD is not severely restrictive of housing in sustainable locations</p> <p>The main purpose of the SPD is to deal with isolated dwellings in otherwise unsustainable locations in the countryside outside of development limits.</p>	
	<p>3) We concur with the Council that policy RUR12 is out of date whilst there is no five year supply of deliverable housing. However we also consider that the parts of RUR7 which seek to heavily restrict the type of housing development which can be delivered in the countryside should be also considered out of date.</p>	<p>Policy RUR7 seeks to protect the countryside from all types of developments in general not specifically the supply of housing hence RUR7 is not considered out of date</p> <p>The SPD states in sections 2.10, 4.8 and Table 1 justification test criteria subject 5; that planning application assessment will not only be based on paragraph 55 but all other relevant policies in the current Local Plan and the NPPF therefore it conforms to the NPPF principles of sustainable development</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>4) The SPD does not conform to a number of the key NPPF principles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of <b>sustainable development</b> should be at the heart of decision-taking. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.</li> <li>• Development Plans should have a presumption in favour of sustainable development <i>‘so that it is clear that <b>development which is sustainable can be approved without delay</b>’</i> (paragraph 15 NPPF). A Local Plan without this provision is considered to be out of date</li> <li>• Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities are required to <b>boost significantly</b> the supply of housing.</li> <li>• Paragraph 49 goes on to state: <i>“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.”</i></li> <li>• Regarding rural areas the NPPF is clear that</li> </ul>	<p>Criteria subject 4: Vitality of the rural communities (functional test criteria 4.2) recognises the sustainability of sites adjoining village envelopes and the direction of the NPPF to promote sustainable development in rural areas hence the SPD does not restrict housing in sustainable locations</p>	<p>See (2) above</p>

	<p>policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a <b>positive approach to sustainable new development</b> (Paragraph 28).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local planning authorities should <b>also be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs</b> (Paragraph 54).</li> <li>The SPD seeks to impose a blanket ban on housing development in the countryside unless strict criteria can be met. This focus only on policy 55 of the NPPF is at odds with the NPPF's overall requirement for Local Planning Authorities to secure a planning balance in creating sustainable developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.</li> </ul>		
5)	<p>The proposed SPD seeks to restrict the delivery of sustainable housing development and is therefore not considered sound.</p>	<p>Criteria subject 4: Vitality of the rural communities (functional test criteria 4.2) recognises the sustainability of sites adjoining village envelopes and the direction of the NPPF to promote sustainable development in rural areas hence the SPD does not restrict housing in sustainable locations</p>	None
6)	<p>Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that SPDs should only be used to help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the burdens on development. As demonstrated above the proposed SPD will act to restrict otherwise sustainable development, above and beyond the requirements of the NPPF and will not facilitate positive planning. Therefore the proposed SPD is not compliant with the tests set out in paragraph 153.</p>	<p>See (5) above – it will not restrict sustainable development.</p> <p>In addition The SPD states in sections 2.10, 4.8 and Table 1 justification test criteria subject 5; that planning application assessment will not only be based on paragraph 55 but all other relevant policies in the current Local Plan and the NPPF therefore it conforms to the NPPF principles of sustainable development</p>	None
7)	<p>It is clear that the SPD and its "Justification Test" will restrict sustainable development and the supply of housing detracting from positive planning and the Council's own ability to respond to development needs on the edge of urban areas. It is not compliant with the NPPF in its current form.</p>	<p>See various comments at 2, 5 and 6 above</p>	None

	<p>8) Paragraph 55 of the NPPF explicitly states that it is in reference to 'new isolated homes in the countryside rather than all dwellings outside settlement limits. At paragraph 2.3 of the SPD document, the Council states that "<i>the majority of the new dwellings outside of development limits proposed will be justified through the rural enterprise housing need argument</i>". This assumption disregards the numerous larger sites which are outside settlement limits, in the "countryside", but which are on the edge of the urban area - often in sustainable locations for urban extensions which can boost significantly the supply of housing and the delivery of sustainable development. <b>The SPD is therefore ambiguous as to how it relates to larger sites on the edge of urban areas; this should be remedied should the SPD be adopted.</b></p>	<p>Noted – change proposed by point 2 above illustrates this SPD does not cover the large strategic sites which will be included within the Local Plan and within a newly drawn limits to development.</p> <p>Section 2.9 (Vitality of the Rural Communities) and functional test criteria 4.2 in the SPD seek to promote housing development on sustainable locations on the edges of rural settlements provided the proposals promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in the rural area.</p>	<p>See (2) above</p>
	<p>9) Criteria 4, Functional Test Criteria 4.2 – The test to show whether the proposed development is '<i>adjoining an existing village envelope</i>' is overly restrictive and not consistent with the NPPF and is therefore unjustified and unsound.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>10) Criteria 5, Functional Test Criteria 5.1 – The requirement to demonstrate that the proposed development is in accordance with <i>„all relevant policies in the Local Plan and NPPF</i> negates the fact that sometimes a planning balance is required. This is unjustified and unsound.</p> <p><i>On behalf of our client, Taylor Wimpey UK Limited, we object to the New Dwellings Outside Of Development Limits Supplementary Planning Document (March 2015) in its current form. The document does not comply with the tests set out in paragraph 153 of the NPPF, or the NPPF as a whole as it will restrict the supply of sustainable housing development; it is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy and is therefore unsound.</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Add to Criteria Subject 5: Relevant Policies <i>and other relevant material considerations</i></p> <p>It is considered that the changes suggested above, in particular in relation to strategic sites and the re-drawing of the limits to development once the new Local Plan is adopted should help to address Taylor Wimpeys concerns.</p>
<p>Hartlepool Civic Society</p>	<p>1) comment on section 2.2 of the SPD - need for new dwellings outside of development limits - outstanding design:</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>'New isolated homes in the countryside require special justification for planning permission to be granted. Local authorities should avoid isolated properties in the countryside unless it is of outstanding design.....'</p> <p>This is quoted as one which is of exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas</li> <li>• Reflect the highest standards of architecture</li> <li>• Significantly enhance its immediate setting and</li> <li>• Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area"</li> </ul> <p><i>While the Society would normally welcome steps to encourage high architectural standards in every instance - the judgement would have to be wholly <b>SUBJECTIVE</b>. Who would be responsible for deciding such? Would they have the necessary knowledge? It seems <b>dangerously vague</b> and would lead to unscrupulous applicants attempting to 'bend the rules' to comply with this condition causing unnecessary complications for Planning Officers. It could also leave it open to widespread abuse in all its connotations.</i></p> <p><i>The Society would strongly urge that unless the parameters can be more clearly defined then this item is <b>REMOVED</b> from the Local Plan.</i></p>	<p>This is highly subjective but it is outlined in the NPPF as one of the criteria upon which permission of isolated dwellings in the rural area may be sought. 'Outstanding design' is therefore included in the SPD. However due to lack of case studies/practice guidance thereof, the justification test assessment criteria could not be established.</p> <p>Assessment based on 'outstanding design' will be dealt with on a case by case basis and the applicant will be required to support their application, back it up with relevant evidence and case studies to give relevant justification (section 4.2)</p>	
<p>Park Residents Association</p>	<p>1) Comment on section 2.8 of SPD: Outstanding Design</p> <p><i>2.8 Notwithstanding the rural enterprise, heritage justification and re-use of redundant buildings, in exceptional circumstances, new dwellings outside of development limits may be permitted where the design is truly outstanding, groundbreaking, innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture and the development significantly enhances the immediate setting.</i></p> <p>Whilst I applaud high standards of architecture and groundbreaking innovative design I would say that this statement is purely subjective</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is highly subjective but it is outlined in the NPPF as one of the criteria upon which permission of isolated dwellings in the rural area may be sought. 'Outstanding design' is therefore included in the SPD. However due to lack of case studies/practice guidance thereof, the justification test assessment criteria could not be established.</p> <p>Assessment based on 'outstanding design' will be dealt with on a case by case basis and the applicant will be required to</p>	<p>None</p>



	<p>and believe it to be inappropriate for an official document that will be used to guide future development. There are no specific criteria in evidence and I feel it should be removed from the Local Plan or give specific criteria as to what constitutes "Outstanding Design". This could be interpreted in so many ways and would cause planners an inordinate amount of work when speculative designs are produced.</p>	<p>support their application, back it up with relevant evidence and case studies to give relevant justification (section 4.2)</p>	
Persimmon Homes	<p>1) Persimmon Homes agree with the principle purpose of the SPD to stop inappropriate development in the countryside; however the application of the policies within the SPD should contain sufficient flexibility in order to be reflective of the wider planning policy context of the borough with regards to housing supply.</p> <p>2) Despite laying beyond the development limits, and therefore within the countryside, <b>edge of settlement sites can provide sustainable locations for residential development.</b> Whether through applications in the event of no five year land supply or through the promotion and allocation of sites in the emerging local plan, boosting significantly the supply of housing and maintaining a 5 year land supply position should be at the fore front of the council's approach to planning.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council is aware that land which is outside development limits but on the edge of the urban area or village settlements is in essence on sustainable locations and will allow sustainable growth of settlements. As such the emerging Local Plan will allocate sites on the urban edge and on edge of village settlements to boost housing supply in the Borough and will redraw the limits to development to include allocated sites within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Criteria subject 4: Vitality of the rural communities (functional test criteria 4.2) recognises the sustainability of sites adjoining village envelopes and the direction of the NPPF to promote sustainable development in rural areas hence the SPD is not restrictive of housing in sustainable locations</p>	<p>Changes suggested above including reference to sites allocated within the new Local Plan and limits to development should address these concerns.</p>
Development Control HBC	<p>1) Fairly happy with SPD however have concerns to the exception relating to 4) <b>Vitality of the Rural Communities, exception</b> I can't remember this being in the original document. It seems to me that an argument could be made under these criteria for any site on the edge of a village, or elsewhere. It also doesn't appear to be one of the exceptions suggested by the NPPF so why have it? (If we have to have it at 2.9 and elsewhere in the document it is also not clear that this means housing on the edge of villages as suggested by the functional test criteria at the end of the document)</p>	<p>This is in the preamble to NPPF paragraph 55 exceptions. The exceptions listed are to assist towards meeting the requirements of preamble.</p> <p>Regarding rural areas the NPPF (paragraph 28) is clear that policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development.</p> <p>The SPD hence recognises the sustainability of sites on the edge of a village and any other sustainable sites in the rural area that will enhance or support services in a village nearby.</p> <p>This exception (4) has been added in order to fulfil the following</p>	<p>Add to section 2.9 in the SPD the following statement: The Council recognises that land outside of development limits but located on the edge of urban areas or village settlements is in essence sustainable and as such will allow sustainable growth of settlements. In accordance with the NPPF, all relevant policies and other material considerations, justification maybe sought if the proposal is on sites located at the urban edge or village envelopes.</p>

		<p>requirements of the NPPF regarding development in rural areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• paragraph 7 (delivery of sustainable development)</li> <li>• paragraph 15 (development which is sustainable should be approved without delay)</li> <li>• paragraph 47 ( local planning authorities are required to boost significantly the supply of housing)</li> <li>• paragraph 49 (consider <i>housing applications in context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development</i>)</li> <li>• <i>paragraph 54</i> (local planning authorities should also be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs)</li> </ul>	
	<p>Also in terms of Redundant and disused buildings I'm confused by Page 16 justification 3<sup>rd</sup> point. "If the development involves demolishing the redundant building, the applicant needs to demonstrate that the existing accommodation no longer meets modern standards and is incapable of economic repair or adaptation and is no longer required by the enterprise". This seems to be encouraging the rebuilding of such buildings rather than their conversion/reuse which is specified as the exception at 2.7</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Acknowledged that demolishing buildings in the rural areas is out of scope of the NPPF, Instead the NPPF in paragraph 55 encourages re-use of redundant or disused buildings.</p>	<p>Delete functional test criteria 3.2 and accompanying justification.</p>
<p>Rights of Way and Countryside HBC</p>	<p>1) Here is a criteria test and justification to add to the relevant categories:</p> <p><b>Test</b> Does the proposed development lie on land over which a public footpath/bridleway or multiple public footpaths/bridleways run?</p> <p><b>Justification</b> Where the proposed development does directly affect a single or multiple public footpath or bridleway then the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990, section 257 makes available or permits:</p> <p><i>Subject to section 259 of the Act, a competent authority by order to authorise the stopping up or diversion of any footpath or bridleway if they are satisfied that it is necessary to do so in order to enable development to be carried out—</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Criteria subject 4: <b>Vitality of the Rural Communities</b> is non-specific and more general hence has to be answered in all applications (see section 4.10). As such the rights of way test and justification applies to all applications hence will be added to criteria subject 4.</p>	<p>Test and justification added to criteria subject 4: Vitality of the Rural Communities.</p>

	<p>a) <i>In accordance with planning permission granted under Part III or section 293A of the Act , or</i></p> <p>b) <i>By a government department.</i></p> <p>In such cases the developer or their agent will need to discuss with the Council's Countryside Access Officer whether or not there is a need to consider the use of the appropriate legal procedure to divert or stop up the relevant public footpath or bridleway</p>		
Natural England	The topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not relate to our remit to any significant extent. We do not therefore wish to comment	Noted	None
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council	No specific comments, support the general approach of the SPD	Noted	None

**4. Next Steps - Adoption**

- 4.1 The comments received during the consultation periods have, where appropriate, will be included into the finalised version of the SPD prior to being taken to full Council on 6<sup>th</sup> August 2015 for adoption.
- 4.2 It will be important following the adoption that the documents are kept up to date and modified to reflect any changes in government regulations and emerging opportunities across the Borough.

**Appendix 1: List of People/Organisations Consulted**

<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Contact Name (if any)</b>
Councillor, HBC	Stephen J Akers-Belcher
	Barry Wilkinson
Councillor, HBC	Christopher Akers-Belcher
Anchor Housing Association	
Ancient Monuments Society	
Appletons	John Wilson
Association of North East Councils	
Avondale Centre & City Learning Centre	Noreen Orr
B3 Architects	
Banks	
Barret Homes Newcastle	
BDP Planning Limited	Andrew Teage
Bellway Homes	
BenBailey Homes	Ed Alder
Big Tree Planning Limited	
Billingham Town Council	Mrs D Rickaby
BNP Paribas Real Estate UK	Alex Willis
Brenda Road Properties Limited	
Bridge Community Association	Mary Mstert
British Butterfly Conservation Society,	S Kirtley
British Telecom	
British Telecommunications plc	
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	
British Waterways	Alan Slater
British Wind Energy Association	
Cameron Hall Developments Ltd.,	
Campaign for Better Transport	
Camping & Caravanning Club	Mr S Inness

Castle Eden Parish Council	Ms J Collins
Charlotte Boyes	
Chris Thomas Ltd	Chris Thomas
Churches Together in Hartlepool	Val Towler
Cleveland Buildings Preservation Trust,	
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit	Aurora Court
Cleveland Industrial Archaeology Society	Peter Lane
Compassion in World Farming	
Council for British Archaeology	
Council for the Protection of Rural England	Patricia Gorman
Country Landowners Association	Jane Harrison
County Fire Brigade	
CPRE	
Crown Estate	Kate Bruce
Dalton Piercy Parish Council	Michael Holt
Darlington Borough Council	Valerie Adams
David Barker	David Barker
David Stovell & Millwater	David Stovell
Davis Planning Partnership	
Dean and Chapter of Durham,	Mr H J Williams
DEFRA	
Defra Flood Management Division	Jim Hutchison
Dennis Doven Associates	
Department for Transport	
Dev Plan	Laura Ross
Development Planning Partnership	Faith Folley
Devereux Architects	Nic Allen
Dickenson Dees	Peter MCGowan
Dransfield Properties Ltd	Mark Dransfield
Drivas Jonas Deloitte	
DTZ	Andrew Cole
Durham Bat Group	Noel Jackson
Durham County Council	Mike Alum

Durham Heritage Coast	N Benson
Dyke House Area Residents Association	Linda Shields
Eastland Construction Limited	Mr D Brown
Elwick Parish Council	Minna West
Elwick Women's Institute	S K Jobson
Endeavour Housing Association	Mr C Hughes
England & Lyle	Ian Lyle
English Heritage	Alan Hunter
ENTEK UK	
Environment Agency	Lucy Mo
Esh Developments	Adrian Miller DipTP, MRTPI
Esh Property Services	
F Sturrock	F Sturrock
Fens Residents Association	Robert Smith
Fishburn Parish Council	Mrs K A Toward
Forestry Commission	Richard Pow
Franklin & Andrews	
G L Hearn	Jason Living
Garden History Society,	
George F White	Stephanie Linnell
Georgian Group	
Gerald Eve	
Gladman Developments	Daniel Chant
Go Ahead Northern	
Goldacre (Offices) Ltd	
Greatham Parish Council	John Cunliffe
Greatham Women's Institute	K Harrison
Greig Cavey	Peter Cavey
Grindon Parish Council	Mrs Johnson

Gus Robinson	Daniel Robinson
GVA	Rachel Whaley
GVA Grimley	
GVA Grimley	Chris Goddard
Halcrow Group Limited	
Hallam Land Management Ltd	Paul Burton
Hammond Suddards	
Hart Parish Council	Mr R Gray
Hart Village Women's Institute	J Nicholson
Hartlepool Archaeological & Historical Society	M Smith
Hartlepool Civic Society	Mrs S Bruce
Hartlepool Countryside Volunteers	Robert Smith
Hartlepool Environmental Network	Kevin Cranney
Hartlepool Natural History Society	Mr R T McAndrew
Hartlepool Partnership	c/o Cathryn Frank
Hartlepool People Ltd	
Haswell Parish Council	
Headland Parish Council	Gillian Elliston
Health & Safety Executive	
Hedley Planning Services	Sean Hedley
Helios Properties	Trevor Cartner,
Henry Boot Developments Ltd	David Anderson
Highways Agency	Kyle Maylard
Highways Agency Northern	Daniel Gaunt
Home Group Ltd	
Homes & Community Agency	Ann Barker
Housing 21	
Housing Hartlepool	Cath Purdy
Huntsman Tioxide Ltd	Allan Wise
Hutton Henry Parish Council	Mrs M Wilson
HVDA	
Hyams & Brownlee	
I.N.C.A.,	Geoff Barber

ICI	Mr PS Gill,
Indigo	Mr Simon Grundy
JacksonPlan Limited	Ted Jackson
James Hall, Planning Partner	Barton Willmore
John Herbert	Mr John Herbert
Jomast Construction Ltd	
Jones, Lang & LaScelles	
Kebbell Developments Ltd	
Keepmoat Partnership	Carol Watkin
King Sturge	Mr Atam Verdi
King Sturge LLP	Joanna Gabrilatsou
Kirkwells	Michael Wellock
La Farge Aggregates	
Lambert Smith Hampton	
Landmark Information Group	James Tippins
Landmark Partnership	
Langtree Properties Limited	Stephen Barnes
Leebell Developments Limited	
Legato Properties	
Limes Development	
Lorne Stewart	
Lovell Partnerships Limited	
Malcolm Arnold	
Malcolm Judd and Partners	
Mandale Properties	
Manners & Harrison	
Manor Residents Association	
Matthews & Goodman	
McAlpine & Sons	
McGough Planning Consultants	Christopher McGough
Mcinally Associates,	
McNicholas Bros	
Middlesbrough Borough Council	Paul Clarke
Miller Homes	Tim Williams



Mobile Operators Association	Ginny Hall
Monk Hesleden Parish Council	Mrs L A Wardle
MP	Mr Iain Wright, M.P
Mr & Mrs D. Ogle	Mr & Mrs D Ogle
Mr & Mrs P A Wood	Mr & Mrs P A Wood
Mr P Jenkins	
Mrs P Harkness	
Nathanial Lichfield and Partners	Michael Hepburn
National Farmers Union	Miss Laurie Norris
Natural England	
Natural England	Marney Harris
Natural England North East	
NEDL	
Nesbitt Parish Meeting	Mr T Bird
New Deal for Communities Trust	Christopher Barnard
Newton Bewley Parish Meeting	Mrs Christine Nowell
Park Residents Association	Mrs F Johnson
Peacock & Smith	Lucie Jowitt
Peel Holdings plc (Durham Tees Valley Airport)	Strategic Planning Director
Persimmon Homes	Richard Tindale
Prism Planning	Alison Baines
Railway Housing Association	
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council	Alex Conti
RIBA North East	Mark Crosby
River Green Developments PLC	
Robert Turley Associates	
Roger Tym & Partners	
Rokeby Developments	Adrian Goodall
Ron Greig Estate Agents	
Rural Housing Trust	
Sanderson Weatherall	Emma Hulley
Sanderson Wetherall	
Savills	Melys Pritchett
Savills	Trevor Adey

Savills	Rebecca Housam
Sedgefield Town Council	Mrs L K Swinbank
Shepherd Homes	
Signet Planning	Nick McLellan
Smiths Gore	A M Hutton MRTPI
Spawforths	David Rolinson
SSA Planning Limited	Mark McGovern
Stockton Borough Council	Rosemary Young
Stonham Housing Association	
Storey Edward Symmonds	Martyn Lytollis
Storey Sons & Parker	Mark Brooker
Strutt & Parker	R W Close
Talyor Wimpey UK Limited	
Tees Valley Housing Association	
Tees Valley Living	Jim Johnsonsone
Tees Valley Local Access Forum	Beryl Bird
Tees Valley Rural Community Council	Doff Pollard
Tees Valley Unlimited	Malcolm Steele
Tees Valley Wildlife Trust	Dr S Antrobus
Terence O'Rourke Plc	
The Crown Estate	Emily Forsythe
The Guinness Trust	
The Home Builders Federation	Matthew Good
The Hospital of God at Greatham	John Quinn
The Planning Bureau Ltd	
The Planning Inspectorate	Steve Carnaby
The Woodland Trust	Nick Sandford
Three Rivers Housing Group	
Tilly Bailey and Irvine	
Trimdon Foundry Parish Council	Mrs K Tweddle
Trimdon Parish Council	Mrs A Delandre
Turley Associates	Bethany McQue/Rebecca Robson
University of Newcastle	Jackie Dunn
URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd	Robin Newlove

Walsingham Planning	
Walton & Co	Vicki Richardson
Ward Hadaway	Andrew Moss
Wates Development	
White Young Green	John Whittaker
Whitestone Weavers	Steve Byrne
Wingate Parish Council	Mr G Reid
Wolviston Parish Council	Mr P Healey
Woodland Trust	Nick Sandford
WSP Development	
WSP Development	
Wynyard Park Limited	Chris Musgrave
Yuill Homes	
Groundwork North East	Leah Remington