



## **Residential Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Statement May 2026**

### **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Residential Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared by Hartlepool Borough Council. This document provides a summary of the consultation process, the responses received and any modifications made to the SPD before adoption.

### **2. Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

- 2.1 The council's SCI was adopted in September 2019. It outlines how the council will consult and involve people in the preparation of Local Plans and other planning documents, such as SPDs. Consultation on the SPD has been carried out in line with the principles of the adopted SCI.

### **3. Stage one consultation (September – November 2024) – preparation of SPD.**

- 3.1 During the preparation stages of the SPD the Council sought the views of residents on what they value about where they live and how future new developments should be designed. The consultation ran for 8 weeks from 16<sup>th</sup> September 2024 till 16<sup>th</sup> November 2024. The consultation consisted of a series of public drop in events throughout the borough, engagement with a local youth group and an on-line survey with a mapping tool.
- 3.2 The Consultation Statement dated March 2026 provides a detailed summary of the stage one consultation process and responses.

### **4. Stage 2 consultation (March - April 2026) – Draft SPD**

- 4.1 An 8-week public consultation on the draft SPD commenced on 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 2026 and closed on the 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2026. The consultation was conducted via HBC's online platform 'Your Say' where the documents were made available and an electronic survey was provided for comments on the SPD. The Land Use Policy element of the council's website provided a link to the Your Say consultation platform.
- 4.2 Paper copies of the SPD and consultation survey were also made available at the Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool and the Community Hub Central, York Road, Hartlepool.

- 4.3 An email was sent to 359 consultees on the Land Use Policy database. An email was also sent to anyone registered on the Your-say platform.
- 4.4 A total of 9 responses were received, 6 via the online survey and 3 via email.
- 4.5 As well as external organisations and individuals there were a range of individuals within the Local Authority contacted for their views including Highways officers and Development Management officers.
- 4.2 Appendix one lists the issues raised within the representations received during the consultation and notes where the Council amended the SPD to reflect the comment.

## **5. Next Steps - Adoption**

- 5.1 The comments received during the consultation period have, where appropriate, been included in the final version of the SPD prior to it being taken to full Council for adoption.

## Appendix 1: Stage 2 - Consultation Responses

### Authority Wide Code

Response ID	Consultation comment	Land Use Policy Response	Modification
4591124 (Anonymous)	<p>I request that the below be included within the introduction section of the Code.</p> <p>There are relevant sections within the guidance covering most aspects of the Code, however as an overarching reference could I ask this be included?</p> <p>Cleveland Police encourages developments incorporating the guidelines of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).</p> <p>Cleveland Police operate the “Secured by Design” initiative.</p> <p>Secured by Design (SBD) is the official police security initiative that is owned by the UK Police Service with the specific aim to reduce crime and help people live more safely. We seek to improve the physical security of buildings using products, such as doors, windows, locks and walling systems that meet SBD security requirements. In addition, we include proven crime prevention techniques and measures into the layout and landscaping of new developments, such as maximising natural surveillance and limiting excessive through movement.</p> <p>We do this by working closely with builders, developers, local authorities and registered housing associations to incorporate our police crime prevention standards from initial concept and design through to construction and completion. Police forces throughout the UK have specially trained Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) who offer police designing out crime and Secured by Design advice free of charge.</p>	<p>The layout principles of secured by design have been incorporated into the SPD for instance ensuring there is natural surveillance and perimeter block development.</p> <p>The design code does not go into details on the individual furnishings of properties.</p>	None
4601345 (Anonymous)	<p>I am writing to express significant concern about the direction of residential design, planning guidance, and development priorities within Hartlepool. While I understand the need for modern housing and long-term growth, it is increasingly clear that future plans must take far more account of the current state of the town itself—its condition, its communities, and its existing housing stock.</p>	<p>Comments on regeneration, renewal and location of housing land are not applicable to the design code SPD.</p> <p>The Adopted Local Plan (2018) sets out the locational strategy and land allocations for housing growth within Hartlepool. The Residential Design Code does not</p>	None

	<p>Hartlepool has many areas where properties are boarded up, neglected, or left to deteriorate. Entire streets and neighbourhoods would benefit from meaningful regeneration without needing to build on more green space. Before approving further large-scale developments, especially those on previously undeveloped land, I believe the council should prioritise:</p> <p>Restoring and repurposing existing homes that stand empty or derelict Investing in the maintenance and improvement of older residential areas that have been visibly declining for years Focusing redevelopment on brownfield sites rather than sacrificing valued green space.</p> <p>Local villages in and around Hartlepool are also being impacted. Ongoing expansion risks overwhelming these communities, eroding their character, and putting unsustainable pressure on roads, schools, and essential services. Building more and more housing around these small villages stretches them beyond what they were designed to support and threatens the very qualities that make them unique.</p> <p>A truly effective residential design code for Hartlepool should be grounded in the reality of the town—its current challenges, its existing built environment, and the strong desire from residents to see regeneration of what is already here. Hartlepool deserves development that strengthens its communities, restores pride in its neighbourhoods, and makes use of the resources we already have before expanding further outward.</p> <p>I hope that future planning decisions will reflect these priorities and take a more balanced, sustainable, and community-centred approach.</p>	<p>allocated land for residential development, regeneration or renewal.</p>	
<p>4601345 (Anonymous)</p>	<p>I would like to suggest that ALL NEW BUILDS SHOULD NOT have any grass verges in front of any properties in the future as GRASSED VERGES are being used as extra PARKING and are being destroyed by cars, vans etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Stage 1 public consultation responses identified the availability of planting and public greenspaces as the most positive feature of residential streets. To ensure greenery, landscaping and trees are retained it is important to ensure they are placed in areas not in</p>	<p>None</p>

	As soon as a house / bungalow etc are occupied council tax should apply immediately (i don't know if this is the case or not?)	the ownership of residents. It is therefore a priority of the code to ensure street trees are planted within verges.  Comments on inappropriate parking on verges are noted and would be considered on a case-by-case basis of each planning application when the design is assessed.	
4608585 (Community Campaigner David Barton)	Traditional Architecture Design Codes should be a central component across this entire consultation and its various chapters and sections especially concerning new construction. It performs strongly on economic, ecological and environmental grounds as can be attested to by leading figures and organisations with academic studies that corroborate this. Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation for the various merits outlined including Placemaking and Greenery Proposals. A ban on demolition of buildings constructed prior to 1950 should be enacted as soon as possible with reconstructions of previously demolished historic buildings listed or not given full support for restoration and reuse.  Historic buildings should be duly reconstructed authentically as they were.	The design code does not prescribe an individual architectural style as HBC do not want to be overly prescriptive or stifle innovation. The SPD is area specific to Hartlepool and highlights within each of the area types the architectural features which are predominant. Code BF1: Character Analysis also requires for proposals to undertake a through character analysis of the site and ensures proposals reflect the positive features identified.	None
4618978 (anonymous)	1. Movement & Parking (Pages 19-24): I would like to see a requirement for 'Filtered Permeability' included in the design of all new layouts. This ensures that pedestrians and cyclists always have a more direct, shorter route to local amenities than cars, making active travel the most convenient lifestyle choice. Additionally, while the code addresses allocated parking, it should explicitly mandate dedicated delivery bays or slightly wider 'activity streets' to accommodate the reality of modern home deliveries and visitor parking. This will prevent pavement-blocking, which currently compromises safety and accessibility for residents with prams or mobility aids.	Code MN2: Pedestrian and Cycle Connections address the need to provide pedestrian and cycle connections in new developments. Modal filters are also included within the Design Code under each Area Type to ensure connections are provided between cul-de-sacs and shared surface streets.  The parking standards are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021). The specification does not currently set a requirement for visitor parking.  The provision for visitor parking is encouraged with the SPD.	Parking section within each Area Type modified to include:  <a href="#">Visitor Parking</a> <a href="#">The provision for visitor parking is encouraged within proposals to prevent inappropriate parking.</a>  <a href="#">Visitor Parking Guidance</a> <a href="#">Where visitor parking is provided it should:</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Be spread throughout the proposal</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Not reduce the provision of verge in accordance with the relevant street type codes.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Be screened by planting when located adjoining areas of open space.</a></li> </ul>
	2. Homes and Buildings / Code HB2 (Pages 28-31): I strongly support the adoption of the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) to ensure high-quality living	Noted. Flexible home working space would be a purchasing choice. The local plan recognises a need for	None

	environments. To further improve resident lifestyle in the modern economy, I suggest adding a requirement for 'Flexible Home-Work Space.' New dwellings should demonstrate they have a dedicated, well-lit area suitable for a desk/office that does not compromise the primary function of bedrooms or living areas.	a range of house sizes and updated evidence is currently being produced.	
	3. Nature and Public Space / Code N1-N10 (Pages 32-39): To ensure green spaces provide genuine social value, the Code should require functional 'social infrastructure' such as integrated seating, community orchards, or natural play elements (boulders/logs) rather than just aesthetic green buffers. I also request that the Council provides clear policy on the long-term adoption and maintenance of these spaces to protect residents from uncapped private management fees (often referred to as 'fleecehold'). Furthermore, given the local climate, public spaces should incorporate 'sheltered micro-climates' through clever planting or structure to ensure they are usable during windier or wetter months.	The 'social infrastructure elements' of community orchards and play are covered within Codes, N4: Community Growing and N7: Informal play.  The adoption and maintenance of open space provided will be considered during the course of each application and secured via legal agreements as set out within Code N2: Green Space Design. The mechanism for securing management fees is beyond the remit of HBC.	<b>N2: Green Space Design</b> - Include tree planting <a href="#">for shade and shelter</a> . - <a href="#">Include seating in accessible locations</a> .
	4. Resources & Waste / Code R1 (Page 40): The guidance on waste should be more prescriptive to avoid 'bin blight' on the street scene. I suggest a requirement for integrated, screened bin stores for all three standard bins (General, Recycling, Garden) to be designed into the front or side of every property. This keeps pavements clear and tidy. Finally, EV charging points should be a mandatory 'Active' requirement for every home with a private driveway to future-proof the borough's transport needs.	The guidance on refuse storage pg31. includes the screening of bins to the front of properties to remove their visibility in the street scene.  The provision of EV charging for each new residential unit is covered under building regulations.	None
001 (Civic Society)	Code SA1: Site Analysis – should include a mention of local style, character and identity.	Character and identity are covered under Code BF1: Character Analysis and within each Area Type built form section.	None
	Buildings should not turn their back on main connecting routes or public realm. This can be achieved by introducing a variety of house types which cater for different tenures, age groups and family composition. This ensures that places re-used more effectively over longer periods of the day.	Code BF4: Active Frontages and Code MN2: Pedestrian and Cycle Connections address frontage onto routes and the public realm. Local Plan policies seek a mix of housing in new residential developments.	None
	Code BF1: Character Analysis. Agree with statement that when buildings and spaces are well designed they will reflect local character and create a sense of place. The list of character analysis should include dominant/vernacular architectural styles.	Noted and additional point added to Code BF1: Character Analysis.  There are areas within the borough where volume housing building has occurred and has limited distinctive features and can be considered as	<b>BF1: Character Analysis</b> The character analysis must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Predominant house types e.g. apartments, bungalows, terraced, semi-detached, detached.</li> <li>• Predominant building heights.</li> <li>• Density.</li> </ul>

	<p>The final paragraph “where an area has limited, or no positive architectural features which contribute to character, design precedents must be provided” – there are no such areas, Hartlepool is full of local architectural character which can provide references.</p>	<p>‘anywhere’ housing. The final bullet point is to address these areas being referenced in a character analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massing.</li> <li>• Distinctive buildings which positively influence the character of the wider area.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Predominant architectural styles.</a></li> <li>• Window proportions, rhythm and treatments.</li> <li>• Entrance treatments e.g. canopies, porches.</li> <li>• Features e.g. chimneys.</li> <li>• Building materials and colours.</li> <li>• Landscaping.</li> </ul>
	<p>Code MN5 PRoW Urban Path. Urban path states it must be constructed of a tarmac surface. Tarmac may be cheap but it is problematic in that it cannot be lifted and replaced if utility works are need – the results are patching which becomes unsightly. Alternative surfaces should be considered.</p>	<p>HBC officers confirm that tarmac is the preferred surface for maintenance and management of PRoW in these areas.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code MN6 PRoW on Urban Edge says they may be constructed of a bound surface or aggregate. Tarmac will not be considered an appropriate surface. Agreed</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Across the PROW codes it states, “use natural materials e.g boulders to prevent vehicle access”. Boulders can often look incongruous in a more rural setting – styles or even bollards can be less obtrusive.</p>	<p>Noted, where the use of natural materials would not be appropriate would be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code BF5: Building Line ADD – must respect existing street patterns and avoid rear gardens facing onto existing streets.</p>	<p>Noted, additional bullet to BF4: Active Frontage and wording to BF5: Building Line.</p>	<p><b>Code BF4: Active Frontages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Proposals must not present rear boundaries onto existing residential areas.</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Code BF5: Building Line</b> New residential developments must follow the established building line where it exists <a href="#">and provides frontage onto the public realm.</a></p>
	<p>Code BF6: Heritage and Conservation “Any proposals for new residential development within a conservation area must take into consideration the relevant Conservation Area Management Plans and / or Visual Assessments, where applicable”. This should not be just “WITHIN” but also “ADJOINING”.</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to BF6</p>	<p><b>Code BF6: Heritage and Conservation</b> Any proposals for new residential development within a conservation area <a href="#">and its setting, and/or the setting of heritage assets</a> must take into consideration the relevant CAMPs, <a href="#">Character Appraisals</a> and/ or visual assessments, where applicable.</p>

	Code HB3: Private Amenity Space Could this be potentially excessive in older built-up areas? – access to open space and nature is essential – this may be a public park. This policy should be related to the location – town and even village centres may have reduced spaces for example back yards. It is no use providing gardens for people who are not interested or willing or have time to enhance these spaces – options. Alternatively provide allotments off site.	The code for private amenity space does not set an amount of space required, only that it be commensurate to the size of the dwelling. This can be accommodated, and be appropriate, to all areas of the borough. Enabling space for food growing opportunities for individual properties can be as little as a space for a container garden.	None
	Code N2: Green Space Design Protect spaces from unauthorised vehicular access, by using sensitively placed obstacles, such as rocks or vegetation. – Why not include bollards? These could be of an interesting and appropriate design and reflect the area, a form of “Street Art” within and natural environment.  Add – faced onto/overlooked for security? Natural surveillance.	National design guidance seeks to reduce the level of man-made street clutter. The use of natural materials and planting visually sits better within the function of green space than the introduction of bollards. Natural surveillance is covered in Code BF4: Active Frontages	None
	Code N3: Creating a Network “where feasible, wildlife movement”. – feasible will result in failure – remove “where feasible”.	Noted. Guidance on creating a network provided	<b>Code N3: Creating a Network</b> 3. Where more than one green space is provided on site, connections must be provided between them. Connection must be for pedestrians <a href="#">and</a> ; <a href="#">cycleists</a> <del>and where feasible, wildlife movement.</del>  <a href="#">Creating a Network Guidance</a> <a href="#">When creating a network of green spaces, wildlife friendly movement should be considered.</a>
002 (Litchfield's on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)	Code SA1: The requirement for site analysis is supported in principle, given that this already forms a standard component of residential planning applications and the design process and reflects the National Design Guide and NPPF.  However, the SPD sets out a non-exhaustive list of information to be provided as part of the site analysis without sufficient clarity on how this requirement is intended to be applied. In particular, there is no explanation as to whether the site analysis is expected to be provided as a standalone document, or whether it is acceptable for the relevant information to be presented across various documents in any submission. Furthermore, there is no distinction between the level of information expected for pre-application	Support welcomed.  Site analysis should be undertaken as part of a Design and Access Statement to inform design proposals as set out in National Planning Policy Guidance. The level of information and type of information will be dependent upon the type of application and the site specifics and will be determined on a case-by-case basis.	<a href="#">Site Analysis Guidance</a> <a href="#">The site analysis information should be provided within a Design and Access Statement in plan form.</a>

<p>submissions, outline planning applications, and detailed applications and this should be clarified.</p> <p>Codes MN1 and MN2: The principle of ensuring that new residential development integrates with existing pedestrian, cycle and vehicular movement networks is supported.</p> <p>However, it is unclear whether the guidance expects the pedestrian and cycle connections to be created within the site boundary only, or whether they also require connections and improvements to be provided outside the site boundary. Without an explicit request from a statutory consultee, the design code should not expect developers to deliver improvements to existing routes or networks beyond what is directly related to the proposed development. It is also necessary to acknowledge that through Active Travel Audits, whilst improvements may be identified as being desirable, there are occasions where improvements cannot be delivered due to, for example, physical constraints, land ownership or viability.</p>	<p>Support welcome</p> <p>Modification to MN2 to clarify on and off site.</p> <p>Justification can be provided when connections are not feasible as set out in demonstrating compliance section.</p>	<p><b>MN2: Pedestrian and cycle connections</b></p> <p>1. New pedestrian and cycle <del>connections</del> routes must be provided <u>within proposals</u>.</p> <p>2. Connections must be <u>made, where appropriate, to provided and create direct existing networks to ensure links to</u> existing and/ or proposed <u>routes to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure corridors.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way.</li> <li>Permissive routes.</li> <li>Pedestrian and cycle routes.</li> <li>Key locations identified within site analysis. e.g. local centres, employment areas, schools and transport hubs.</li> <li>Green spaces within 800m of the site.</li> </ol>
<p>Code MN3: The requirement for pedestrian and cycle routes to benefit from natural surveillance is supported. However, clarification is required as to whether a kitchen is deemed a habitable room for the purposes of providing natural surveillance.</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to glossary</p>	<p><b>Glossary:</b></p> <p><u>Habitable Room: Generally, includes a room used for dwelling purposes including a kitchen but not a bathroom or utility room.</u></p>
<p>Code MN4: Clarification is required on the extent of connections that are expected to be made to existing Public Rights of Way and permissive route networks. In particular, and similar to code MN2, the SPD should clarify whether this requires connections within the site boundary only or requires connections and improvements to PRowS beyond the site boundary.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Code MN4 is for the treatment of existing PRow within a site.</p> <p>Justification can be provided when connections into the existing PRow network are not feasible as set out in demonstrating compliance section.</p>	<p><b>Code MN4: Treatment of PRow and Permissive Routes</b></p> <p>1. Where PRow and permissive routes are located within a proposed residential development site, the route must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>be retained, either in its current alignment or diverted</li> <li><del>PRow existing or diverted must</del> be located within a green route or open space.</li> <li><del>Connections must be</del> provided <u>connections</u> into the existing PRow network and proposed/existing active travel routes to create an accessible neighbourhood.</li> </ol>
<p>Code MN5: It is unreasonable to require urban PRow routes to not run alongside proposed or existing highways. In both urban and suburban contexts, PRow routes can function effectively as long as appropriate separation (e.g. an</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to MN5: PRow Urban Path</p>	<p><b>Code MN5: PRow Urban path</b></p> <p><del>h. Not run alongside proposed or existing highways.</del></p>

	<p>appropriate landscaping buffer) and safe points of access are provided.</p>		
	<p>Code MN6: Similar to Code MN4 and MN2, clarification is required regarding the extent of connections that are expected to be made between development sites and the wider Public Rights of Way network where PRowS are located on the urban edge.</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to MN6: PRow - Urban Edge.</p>	<p><b>MN6: PRow on - Urban Edge Path</b>            1. The design of routes located within open space of residential development must:            a. Provide connections <del>into the wider countryside network, the green infrastructure network and</del> between the developable area and the PRow.</p>
	<p>Code MN8: The requirement for all new residential development to be within 400m walking distance of a bus stop is not always achievable and would be highly restrictive for Outer Neighbourhood sites located at the edge of existing settlements.</p> <p>It should be noted that the CIHT ‘Planning for Walking’, which the 400m standard is often cited from, is based on research which is more than two decades old. This is particular of note given the rise of people working from home in the past decade. It is also important to note that, the same guidance acknowledges that walking neighbourhoods can reasonably extend to distances of around 800m, especially where connectivity, quality of routes and the availability of facilities are strong.</p> <p>It should be clarified that the 400m distance is a recommended distance which would gain support from the SPD, rather than a firm requirement to be applied with full weight in all circumstances. Flexibility should be applied where developments demonstrate good overall accessibility to local services, even where bus stops fall beyond this distance.</p>	<p>Active Travel England advise bus stops to be located within 400m of buildings.</p> <p>The public transport guidance provided additional information where 400m cannot be met. Modification to Code MN8: Public Transport to clarify, contributions are covered in the Planning Obligations SPD.</p>	<p><b>MN8: Public Transport:</b>            2. All new housing must be within 400m walking distance of a bus stop <del>(this may not always be possible in the more remote parts of the borough).</del></p> <p><b>Public Transport Guidance</b>  <del>• This may not always be possible in the more remote parts of the borough but in larger developments (over 200 units); developers may be required to contribute towards a bus service.</del></p>
	<p>Code MN9: Clarification is required as to what constitutes a ‘sustainable location’. Should this be linked to Code MN8, then this would be highly restrictive. The text in MN9 should also be amended to refer to locations that are currently sustainable or can be made sustainable.</p>	<p>Where car free developments are proposed their reduced car dependency will be based on access to sustainable transport modes. This type of development is not anticipated to be delivered in areas where public transport is not accessible.</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>Code BF1: The requirement to undertake a character analysis as part of the design process is accepted as standard practice. However, clarification is required to ensure that character analysis is used to inform the design response, rather than to constrain development by requiring proposals to replicate existing building typologies or detailing.</p> <p>For example, the SPD refers to the presence of chimneys as elements of character in some areas. While this may form part of an areas character, they are not required to include features where they do not serve a functional purpose or may result in pastiche design.</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to wording for clarity.</p> <p>The design code does not prescribe an individual architectural style as HBC do not want to overly prescriptive or stifle innovation.</p>	<p>A character analysis must be undertaken and must be <a href="#">referenced used to inform</a> in the design of the proposed built form.</p>
	<p>Code BF2: The principle of providing corner-turning buildings where both the front and side elevations address the public realm is supported. However, where a development has a limited mix of house types, differentiation through materials (rather than a separate house type) should be considered acceptable.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Code BF2: Corner Buildings includes a change in house type <u>or materiality</u> must be provided.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code BF3: Clarification is required that the provision of landmark buildings should be proportionate to the scale and nature of development. Smaller residential schemes, or developments comprising predominantly two and three-bedroom dwellings, would not typically necessitate landmark buildings.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The bedroom size of the units should not determine the need for landmark buildings which would be determined by the layout of the proposal. Smaller residential proposals would potentially not have all the identified key areas and would therefore not be required to provide multiple landmark buildings.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code BF4: The requirement to provide active frontages to streets and public spaces is supported in principle. However, similar to Code MN3, clarification is required as to what constitutes a habitable room for the purposes of meeting this requirement. For example, a kitchen (which is regularly occupied) should be deemed acceptable in providing an active frontage and natural surveillance.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Modification to include definition.</p>	<p><b>Glossary:</b>  <a href="#">Habitable room: Generally, includes a room used for dwelling purposes including a kitchen but not a bathroom or utility room.</a></p>
	<p>Code BF5: Clarification is required where adherence to an established building line would conflict with minimum separation distance standards or other residential amenity considerations from planning policy. This reiterates the importance of flexibility in how the SPD will be applied with design considerations being reviewed on a site-by-site basis.</p>	<p>Noted. Instances of conflict between building line and separation distance are anticipated to be minimal and would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code HB1: Code HB1 states that reduced separation distances may be considered where it can be demonstrated</p>	<p>Noted. This would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>that this would assist in creating a variety of streets or an exemplar development.</p> <p>Whilst this flexibility is welcomed, the wording is open ended and should be clarified to provide examples of when and how flexibility can be applied.</p>		
	<p>Code HB3 states that buildings should be orientated to benefit from good levels of daylight. It should be clarified that daylight does not equate to direct sunlight, as it is not practical for all dwellings within a residential development to have south or west-facing gardens.</p>	<p>Noted. Solar gain is guidance to acknowledge that not all elements can be met by all proposals.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code HB4: Guidance on refuse storage provision for apartments would be welcomed. In particular, clarification is required as to whether communal refuse stores are acceptable and whether these can be reduced in size compared to individual storage requirements for dwelling houses.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>Code HB6: Clarification is required as to whether there is a minimum dimension which applies to cycle storage provision, and whether sheds are considered an acceptable form of cycle storage for dwelling houses.</p>	<p>Types of cycle storage and dimensions are not provided to enable flexibility and preferences within proposals.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>Code N2: It is not practical or desirable for every area of green space within a development to meet all of the listed requirements set out in Code N2. A range of green spaces with different functions should be encouraged, rather than one which follows a checklist-based approach and we consider the SPD should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. Code N2: Green Space Design modified to reflect scales of green space.</p>	<p><b>Code N2: Green Space Design</b> Proposals for green space within new residential development must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide active ground floor windows onto green space.</li> <li>• Avoid presenting rear boundaries onto <del>open green</del> space.</li> <li>• Ensure entrances and access points into green spaces are conveniently located on desire lines for walking and cycling.</li> <li>• <del>Provide attractive, clear and direct pedestrian and cycle routes in accordance with Code MN2 and constructed of tarmac.</del></li> <li>• <del>Be multifunctional spaces.</del></li> <li>• Incorporate drainage solutions (see Code N11).</li> <li>• Include areas that are nature-rich and provide opportunities to improve biodiversity through planting.</li> <li>• Include tree planting for shade and shelter.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• <a href="#">Include seating in accessible locations.</a></del></li> <li>• Place landscaping to discourage anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Protect spaces from unauthorised vehicular access, by using sensitively placed obstacles, such as rocks or vegetation.</li> <li>• Provide a space which facilitates informal play and socialising.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Provide appropriate management that is secured under a s106 agreement or other such secure arrangement.</a></li> </ul> <p><u>Green spaces over 0.5ha must also:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Provide attractive, clear and direct pedestrian and cycle routes in accordance with Code MN2 and constructed of tarmac.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Be multifunctional spaces.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Include seating in accessible locations.</a></li> <li>• Ensure sports facilities are in locations that limits disturbance to properties and avoids conflict with other users, <a href="#">where required.</a></li> <li>• Ensure barriers around sport pitches are permeable and made of high-quality materials (<a href="#">where sports pitches are required</a>).</li> <li>• Provide lighting for well-used footpaths and games areas, their type and placement must avoid light spillage.</li> <li><del>• <a href="#">Provide appropriate management that is secured under a s106 agreement or other such secure arrangement.</a></del></li> </ul>
	<p>Code N4: Clarification is required as to how community growing spaces are expected to be provided and managed, including who is responsible for the maintenance and management of these areas.</p> <p>Clarification is also required as to whether this applies to green spaces which, combined, are over 1ha.</p>	<p>The management of community growing spaces would be considered on a case-by-case basis and secured through a s106 agreement. It is anticipated that they will be managed by a management company.</p> <p>Modification to Code N4: Community Growing to clarify single space over 1ha.</p>	<p><b>Code N4: Community Growing</b>  <a href="#">A green spaces</a> of over 1 hectare must provide community growing facilities such as communal allotments or orchards.</p>

	Code N5: The SPD should specify that the size and number of landscape pockets should be proportionate to the type and scale of development, as a 50 sqm landscaped pocket may not be achievable on every site.	Analysis of recent developments has indicated that 50m2 landscape pockets can be accommodated in most proposals. Where proposed development cannot accommodate landscape pockets justified will be considered.	None
	Code N9: Tree retention may not always be appropriate or preferred, particularly on smaller sites or those with complex topography. This should not be required as a 'must'.  Clarification is also required as to how potential canopy cover within the curtilage of a development is to be calculated, and whether detailed landscape assessments demonstrating projected crown size are required at planning submission stage.	Noted. In the majority of proposals, trees can be retained on-site. Where this cannot be achieved justification must be provided and considered by the LPA.  It is anticipated that a visual assessment will be carried out to calculate canopy cover until the British Standard is released.	None
	Code N10: The requirement for street trees is supported. The SPD should detail who is expected to undertake the long-term maintenance of street trees.	Support welcomed.  The maintenance will be dependent on location of the trees. Within adopted areas the maintenance is anticipated to be carried out by HBC. In non- adopted areas, maintenance should be provided by the developer. This is anticipated to be via a management company.	None
	Solar Gain Guidance: The solar gain guidance is impractical to implement across an entire residential development. It is not realistic for all dwellings to have principal elevations within 30 degrees of due south with ridge lines running east-west.  This guidance also conflicts with other design requirements relating to street hierarchy and landmark buildings. Matters of overheating and solar performance are already addressed through Building Regulations and should not be duplicated through the SPD.	Noted. Solar gain is guidance to acknowledge that not all elements can be met by all proposals.  The code acknowledges that a balance is required between the principles of solar gain and the other elements of the code.	None
003 (Historic England)	The NMDC states that schemes should respect the historic assets of the site and its surroundings.  SA1: Site Analysis includes 'conservation designations.' We request this is amended to 'Heritage Assets.' The 'setting' of heritage assets should be added as an additional criteria referencing our Good Practice Advice Note 3 Setting of Heritage Assets.	Noted. Modification to criteria.	<b>Code SA1: Site Analysis</b> <a href="#">Built heritage</a> designations, heritage <a href="#">assets and their setting</a> .  <b>Glossary</b> <a href="#">Heritage asset: A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions.</a>

	<p>Another criteria for Non-Designated Heritage Assets, where identified in a Neighbourhood Plan, or a Local List adopted by the Council is recommended.</p>	<p>'Heritage assets' can include designated and non-designated. Modification to glossary.</p>	<p><a href="#">Heritage assets are the valued components of the historic environment.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Heritage assets are of two types.</a></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Those which have been recognised as being nationally important and have been designated as such; these are designated heritage assets, and</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Heritage assets that have not been designated, nevertheless some of which may be of national importance.</a></li> </ol>
	<p>We support the requirement for Site Analysis, Code SA1, this must be undertaken to ensure residential proposals address their site and surrounding context. Where a site has a direct or wider relationship with the historic environment this requires detailed analysis.</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>In the section on Built Form, we support the reference to Hartlepool's rich and varied built environment. The Borough's historic rural villages and characterful coastal Victorian and Edwardian villas are highlighted as good examples. Are there any modern developments in the Borough that can be highlighted as examples of successful place making?</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code BF1: Character Analysis primarily draws upon traditional architectural details. Does this solely refer to those parts of the Borough characterised by vernacular and traditional architecture?</p>	<p>The character analysis applies to all areas of the borough and includes many areas of detailed design.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code BF6: Heritage &amp; Conservation does not provide a detailed analysis of conservation areas. We support the signpost to the Conservation Area Management Plans or Visual Assessments and that new residential development within these designated areas must consider these supporting documents. However, sites are more likely to be at the edge of conservation areas and not necessarily within them. Also, which Visual Assessments does this refer?</p> <p>Any site adjoining a conservation area must also factor in the associated conservation area documents, as a starting point, but provide a more detailed site analysis to establish the historic character of the surroundings. Hartlepool has eight Conservation Areas. All of which have an adopted Conservation Area Character Appraisal. Four of these have</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Modification to Code B6: Heritage and Conservation to reflect setting.</p>	<p><b>BF6: Heritage and Conservation</b></p> <p>Any proposals for new residential development within a conservation area <a href="#">and its setting</a> must take into consideration the relevant CAMPs, <a href="#">Character Appraisals</a> and/ or visual assessments, where applicable.</p> <p>Coding Plan modification to include conservation areas.</p>

	<p>an associated Conservation Area Management Plan. This should be clarified in the SPD.</p> <p>We suggest the Conservation Area boundaries are mapped where they relate to the area type codes, most importantly the Village Codes (VL), on page 91.</p>		
--	---	--	--

## Outer Neighbourhood

<p>4618978 (anonymous)</p>	<p>I support the move toward a clearer street hierarchy, but I would like to see more emphasis on 'Primary Streets' being designed as 'Boulevards' with consistent tree planting. For a resident, this makes the neighbourhood feel more established and less like a sprawling housing estate. The 'Secondary' and 'Tertiary' streets should also include 'natural traffic calming'—using build-outs and planting rather than just speed bumps—to create a more pleasant, quiet environment for families.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>All primary streets within the code include the provision of verges with tree planting.</p> <p>Lanes guidance and Code N10: Street Trees also includes build-out for trees.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>2. Parking &amp; Pavement Integrity (Pages 55-59): The guidance for 'On-plot' and 'On-street' parking is comprehensive, but I would suggest a stricter policy against 'Front Garden Parking' that results in the total loss of greenery. Where on-plot parking is provided, the Code should require a minimum percentage of the front garden to remain as permeable soft landscaping. This is essential not just for flood prevention, but for the 'kerb appeal' and mental well-being of the residents living on that street.</p>	<p>Minimum requirement of retained front gardens is covered in code ON16: Parking to Plot Ratio, WY21: Parking to Plot Ration and VL14 Parking to Plot Ratio.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>3. Built Form &amp; Variety (Pages 60-64): To avoid the 'identikit' feel of many modern estates, I suggest that the Code requires greater architectural variety within a single street scene. This could include a mix of rooflines and subtle variations in materials. Furthermore, Code ON9 regarding 'Corner Buildings' is vital; these should be encouraged to have dual-aspect windows (windows on both sides) to ensure 'eyes on the street,' making the neighbourhood feel safer and more lived-in.</p>	<p>Noted on variety in street scene. Removal of authority wide guidance on street scene and creation of Codes ON26: Street Scene and WY30: Street Scene.</p> <p>Corner turning properties are provided in authority wide code BF2: Corner Buildings and requires dual frontage properties.</p>	<p><del>Street Scene</del> <del>Careful consideration needs to be given to the house types proposed and how they will be read within the street.</del> <del>Street Scene Guidance</del> <del>• House types proposed should create a coherent street scene taking into consideration the scale of the properties and the elevational detailing.</del>  <del>Street Scene</del></p>

			<p><u>Careful consideration needs to be given to the house types proposed and how they will be read within the street.</u></p> <p><b>Code ON26: Street Scene</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Within proposed streets there must be the provision of a variety of house types with changes in:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ <u>Elevational detailing</u></li> <li>➢ <u>Materiality</u></li> <li>➢ <u>Roof line and/ or ridge height.</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>House types proposed must create a coherent street scene when read as a whole.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>Code WY30: Street Scene</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Within proposed streets there must be the provision of a variety of house types with changes in:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Elevational detailing</u></li> <li>○ <u>Materiality</u></li> <li>○ <u>Massing</u></li> <li>○ <u>Roof line and/ or ridge height.</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>House types proposed must create a coherent street scene when read as a whole and in relation to the existing housing of Wynyard.</u></li> </ul>
	<p>4. Urban Edge &amp; Transitions (Page 65): For those living on the 'Urban Edge,' the transition to the countryside is a key part of the lifestyle. I suggest that the guidance for the 'Rural Edge' explicitly prohibits high, close-boarded timber fences facing the open countryside. Instead, we should require 'soft edges' like hedgerows or post-and-rail fencing to maintain the connection to nature and prevent the estate from looking like a walled fortress from the outside.</p>	<p>Noted. Treatment of rural edges is covered in Code UE4: Frontage.</p> <p>Boundary treatment moved from guidance to Code.</p>	<p><b>Code UE6 Boundary Treatments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>To optimise the integration of the built form into the countryside boundary treatments are not encouraged.</u></li> <li>• <u>Where a clear distinction between public and private space is required, the following must be provided:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ <u>Low-level hedge.</u></li> <li>➢ <u>Estate fencing.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p>AREA TYPES: Three Area Types are identified - Outer Neighbourhood, Wynyard &amp; Villages (Core and Edge) but a lot of the codes appear to be identical. Could not those that are repetitive be put in the Area Wide or as an introduction to the Area Types? This would reduce the length of the document and add emphasis to the different requirements between the three areas.</p>	<p>Noted. The Authority Wide codes cover the whole borough and will incorporate areas such as the urban area and headland where the codes and guidance within the area types would not relate to the character of those areas.</p>	<p>None</p>

		The Area Types have been put forward so that all information relating to proposals in those areas are within one place for ease. There are subtle variations within the majority of the area type codes to reflect the area specifics.	
001 (Civic Society)	Code ON14 3 bedroom = 2 parking spaces clearly doesn't cut it with the longer time grown up children stay with parents and increased car ownership. Perhaps there should be as many parking spaces as there are bedrooms.	Parking standards are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021).	None
	Parking Methods. Garages seem to be rarely used for cars these days and are frequently converted into rooms. Therefore they should not be included in parking provision.	Parking standards are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021). The specification incorporates garages with internal dimensions 6mx3m which allows for vehicle parking and storage space.	None
	BUILT FORM (ON) Layouts should avoid the frontage of houses overlooking private spaces of adjacent properties.	Residential amenity is covered by Local Plan Policy QP4.	None
	Code ON26 spelling – “vehicles entering and existing the plot” – entering and exiting the plot?	Noted	Amended
	Code UE4 Frontages. Presenting rear elevations and boundary fencing onto the Urban Edge will not be considered an appropriate response. This is historically unusual – traditional villages look inwards fronting onto village greens and streets, they would back onto the countryside.	This requirement applies to urban edge; however, it is noted that traditionally villages do look inward. New sites on the edge of a village should provide a gradual transition between urban and rural and presenting a rear fence onto views is not considered appropriate.  Image on pg.65 illustrates how a new urban edge and countryside should integrate.	None
002 (Litchfield's on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)	Code ON1: The requirement for a minimum 2m verge on main connection streets is supported in principle. However, achieving verge provision along 70% of the total street length may be impractical where a high proportion of driveways is required, particularly on schemes with smaller house types. The extent of verges should be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Support welcomed. The provision of verges and tree lined streets is key to achieve aim one and three of the SPD. The code reduces front of plot parking dominance through parking codes and the ability to maintain 70% verge is considered achievable.	None
	Code ON4 does not allow sufficient flexibility for layouts where dwellings are accessed via shared private drives, particularly where a Neighbourhood Street also functions as a bus route. In these cases, dwellings are typically set further back from the main carriageway to avoid vehicle reversing movements onto a bus route. The SPD should recognise this arrangement as acceptable.	Noted. Guidance modification to reference when access is not provided directly from Neighbourhood Street.	<b>Neighbourhood Street Guidance:</b> <a href="#">Where direct access from a Neighbourhood Street is not provided and access is via a private drive or lane (see diagram on pg.72) the setback for the relevant street type should be followed.</a>

	Code ON5: To provide the opportunity for green spaces and landscaped pockets, there should be flexibility to allow landscaped areas adjacent to carriageways, with footways routed through landscaped areas, rather than being rigidly aligned to the carriageway edge.	The code does not specify the route of paths only their width and whether they need to be provided on both sides of the carriageway.	None.
	Code ON6: The requirement for landscape pockets of a minimum size may conflict with the need to provide visitor parking, particularly where there are numerous driveway crossings associated with smaller house types.  It should be clarified that providing larger and more meaningful green spaces can be preferable to providing smaller pockets in constrained areas.	The inclusion of landscaped pockets is to address resident's views from the stage one consultation and meet aim one and three of the SPD to ensure the greening of the street and reduce parking dominance.  Visitor parking is not a requirement within the parking standards are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021); however, it is encouraged in appropriate locations.	None
	Code ON7 is too prescriptive and offers limited opportunity to create interesting streetscapes where the building line undulates.	The level of setback proposed allows for a 3m of flexibility is considered an appropriate level for the street type whilst ensuring amenity for neighbouring properties.	None
	Code ON8 requires a change in surface material for lanes. As these streets are intended to be adopted, clarification is required as to which surface materials will be acceptable to the highway authority.	Noted. Modification to Lanes Guidance	<b>Lanes Guidance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Changes in material can include block paving or coloured tarmac for the whole of the street or as a 2m transition strip.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Block paving and <del>Note:</del> coloured tarmac</a> will be subject to a commuted sum for maintenance.</li> </ul>
	Clarification is required as to how landscape pockets are expected to be accommodated within shared surface streets, and how private garden space is intended to be distinguished from landscape pockets where there is no defined footway.	Noted. Lanes guidance provides examples of where landscape pockets can be accommodated. Boundary treatment section sets out that they must be used to distinguish between public and private space and be appropriate to the location.	None
	The maximum private drive length of 25m is restrictive and limits the range of house types that can be accommodated on a shared drive. A longer shared private drive should be permitted where appropriate turning provision is incorporated to maintain manoeuvrability and emergency access.  In addition, the minimum width of 3.7m may be insufficient where ad-hoc visitor parking occurs. This could impact on access and increase the risk of neighbour disputes.	Private drive length is set by Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021). The maximum length ensures building regulations, accessibility and safety are maintained.  The width of private drive width is a minimum to allow for flexible design solutions	None  None
	Code ON14: The requirement for two parking spaces per one-bedroom dwelling is excessive and difficult to accommodate on many sites. More flexibility is required here	Noted. Parking standards are set by Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021).	None

	to avoid pressure on layouts and reflect actual car ownership levels.		
	<p>Code ON15: The restriction limiting a maximum of 60% of parking to the front of properties is overly prescriptive. Experience shows that residents generally prefer side-by-side parking and that, where tandem parking is provided, residents often choose to park on street to avoid manoeuvring difficulties.</p> <p>Where front parking is provided, there should be a maximum of 4 spaces to be provided in a row with landscaping between.</p>	<p>The stage one consultation finding indicated residents preferred front and side parking.</p> <p>The aim of the SPD is to reduce the dominance of car parking on street scene. 60% is based on assessments across the borough comparing acceptable and unacceptable levels of car parking dominating a street scene. The 60% requirement is considered to strike to correct balance in reducing the dominance of parking whilst not fundamentally undermining development viability.</p> <p>Agree see Code ON17: In Curtilage - Front of Property Parking</p>	None
	<p>Code ON16: The minimum landscaped front garden requirement for semi-detached dwellings (25%) is difficult to achieve on smaller house types and can significantly reduce plotting efficiency and may necessitate side-of-plot parking where front parking could otherwise be accommodated. Increasing this to 35% would be more achievable. Clarification would also be welcomed as to what information is required to evidence compliance, as detailed plot-by-plot calculations would be an excessive requirement.</p>	<p>Noted. The aims of Design Code are to reduce car dominance and increase landscaping. This can be achieved through increasing side of plot parking.</p> <p>Currently there is no requirement for plot-to-plot calculations. It is envisaged that the requirement can be achieved by a visual assessment of the scheme. HBC Officers will keep this process under review to refine.</p>	None
	<p>Code ON17: The requirement of providing a maximum of four consecutive spaces to the front of properties is supported in principle. However, requiring minimum landscaping widths between parking spaces will limit the range of house types that can be accommodated, particularly for narrower or smaller dwellings.</p> <p>The requirement to provide 6m x 3m parking bays, alongside additional manoeuvring space, exceeds typical standards. For example, under building regulations, a parking bay needs to be 2.4m wide and there must be a 0.9m wide access path.</p> <p>Clarification is also required as to whether compliance with accessibility requirements (ADM4(2)) would necessitate further increases in parking bay widths beyond those already specified.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Modification to ON17: In Curtilage - Front of Property</p> <p>The SPD is minimum requirements, should building regulations require additional space for M4(2) properties this would be expected to be provided at the planning application stage.</p>	<p><b>ON17: In Curtilage - Front of Property</b> <a href="#">Additional 0.6m to enable the movement of people and refuse facilities.</a></p>
	Code ON18: The specified 3m parking bay width, alongside the additional 0.6m manoeuvring allowance, exceeds	Noted. Modification to ON18: In Curtilage - Side of Property	<p><b>ON18: In Curtilage - Side of Property</b> <a href="#">Additional 0.6m to enable the movement of people and refuse facilities.</a></p>

	<p>Building Regulations requirements and may be difficult to achieve, particularly on narrower plots.</p> <p>Clarification is also required as to whether further width would also be required to comply with accessibility requirements (ADM4(2)), as this would further reduce plotting efficiency.</p>	<p>The SPD is minimum requirements, should building regulations require additional space for M4(2) properties this would be expected to be provided at the planning application stage.</p>	
	<p>Code ON22: The requirement for on-street parking bays to be 6m in length is excessive, especially in the context of Building Regulation only requiring 4.8m. Shorter bay lengths would generally be sufficient and would reduce the visual impact and land take of on-street parking.</p>	<p>Noted: Modification to code ON22: On Street Allocated &amp; Unallocated</p>	<p><b>ON22: On Street Allocated &amp; Unallocated</b>          Be 2.4m in width x 6m in length <del>per space</del>, <u>for central spaces. End spaces must be 2.4m in width by 4.8m in length.</u>          Provide an area of soft landscaping with tree planting measuring a minimum of 2.4m in width x <del>6</del> <u>4.8</u>m in length after every 4th space. Where more than 4 spaces are provided.</p>
	<p>Code ON23: Clarification is required on the application of parking and landscaping requirements for terraced properties, as the combination of bay length, manoeuvring space and landscaped plot requirements will be difficult to achieve on standard terrace widths.          It would be appropriate to clarify that these landscaping requirements do not apply to mid-terrace units where this would make compliant parking provision impractical.</p>	<p>Code ON16: Parking to plot ratio does not set landscaping requirements for terraced units.</p> <p>A terrace of 3-4 units will be able to accommodate parking in a front and side combination as set out in Code ON23 and figure 22 whilst ensuring a level of landscaped garden.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Code ON24 requires pedestrian permeability to be provided within cul-de-sacs. This approach should be applied on a site-by-site basis and informed by advice from Police Architectural Liaison Officers.</p> <p>Requiring pedestrian links within all cul-de-sacs is not efficient, as additional corner-turner dwellings and increased separation distances are often required to avoid routes running alongside gable elevations.</p>	<p>Noted. Where layouts are appropriately designed with perimeter block development cul-de-sacs and cut throughs will be avoided.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>The housing mix guidance states that where access alleys are required for the rear of terraced properties, these should not negatively impact upon rear garden sizes. Clarification is required as how this is interpreted.</p> <p>Where gated access to rear alleys is required, it should also be noted that accessibility requirements may necessitate additional space for gate openings which could increase distances between plots and therefore impact plotting efficiency.</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to guidance to clarify wording.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p><b>Housing Mix Guidance:</b>          Not <del>negatively impact upon</del> <u>reduce</u> the rear garden sizes of adjoining properties to <u>unacceptable levels.</u></p>

	Code ON25: The principle of providing gateway features and landmark buildings is supported. However, the code should clarify that this should only apply to larger-scale developments as smaller residential schemes would not typically necessitate gateway buildings or features of this nature.	Support welcomed. Code ON25 Gateways does not set where gateways are proposed only what they should consist of if proposed. The supporting intro text sets out that gateway features are important for schemes over 200 units.	None
	Code UE2: The comments previously made on codes ON16, ON17, ON18 and ON19 apply here.	Noted	None
	Code UE3: The comments previously made on MN4, MN5, and MN6 apply here.	Noted.	None.

### Wynyard Area Type

4618978 (anonymous)	1. Connectivity and Permeability (Pages 71-78): The analysis acknowledges that Wynyard currently suffers from 'reduced permeability' due to gated communities. I would like to see Code WY2 strengthened to explicitly discourage any further gated developments. For a better lifestyle for all residents, it is vital that new phases of Wynyard are fully integrated with public footpaths and cycleways that allow people to move freely between neighbourhoods without having to use the main road (the A689).	Noted. Gated developments will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and may be appropriate.	None
	2. Street Character & Verges (Page 73): The requirement for wide green verges and street trees is a defining feature of Wynyard. I suggest that the Code includes a 'Management Plan' requirement for these verges at the planning stage. This ensures that the 'woodland' character is maintained by the developers until adoption, preventing the trees from dying off due to lack of water or care in the first two years of a new phase.	Maintenance and management of street trees will be secured through planning conditions. Modification to code N10: Street Trees to clarify.	<b>Code N10: Street Trees</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Tree planting and landscaping within verges must be supported by a management and maintenance plan to ensure successful establishment and long-term retention.</a></li> </ul>
	3. Parking and Garages (Pages 79-83): Given that Wynyard homes often have 3 or 4 cars, I support the requirement for larger-than-standard garages (Code WY10). However, I would suggest that the Code also requires 'In-curtilage' turning circles for houses on busier primary loops. This prevents the dangerous lifestyle habit of residents having to reverse out onto main estate roads, which is a major safety concern for children playing in the area.	Support welcomed.  Parking standards are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021).	None
	4. Architectural Variety & Materials (Pages 84-88):	Noted. The code states 'It is not the intention of this code to be prescriptive in terms of setting materiality or	None

	The 'Wynyard Matrix' is quite specific about materials like 'Buff brick'. To ensure the area doesn't become architecturally stagnant, I suggest the Code allows for 'High-Quality Contemporary Exceptions' where a resident or developer can demonstrate that a modern design uses sustainable materials that still respect the scale of the area. This would allow for more innovative, energy-efficient homes that improve the long-term lifestyle and running costs for residents.	elevational detailing of proposals or stifle innovative designs. The materials and elevational detailing section is guidance only.	
001 (Civic Society)	Boulevard Guidance "Crossings should be located on or close to desired lines so that pedestrians find them convenient and pleasant to use". Excellent at last pedestrians will not be expected to detour in all weathers to make things easier for motor vehicles. Perhaps this should be part of the code not just guidance and repeated in all areas or Code MN2.	Noted. Modification to MN2: Pedestrian and Cycle Connections	<b>MN2: Pedestrian and Cycle Connections</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Crossings for pedestrians and cyclists must be located on or close to desire lines.</a></li> </ul>
	Code WY25: Courtyard Parking. 3rd bullet point - Typo plating should read as planting. Same on ON21	Noted	Corrected
	Code WY26: On Street Allocated & Unallocated. 3rd bullet point - Typo plating should read as planting. Same on ON22	Noted.	Corrected
	"Rear parking will not be considered appropriate" – would this cause difficulties for segregation of traffic and pedestrian / cyclist?	HBC do not envisage this to be an issue.	None
002 (Litchfield's on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)	Code WY1: The requirement for planted verges along Boulevards is supported in principle. However, clarification is required as to whether direct driveway access will be acceptable from Boulevard streets where these also function as bus routes.  Reference should also be made to earlier comments regarding the practicality of achieving required verges where visitor parking and access arrangements are necessary.	Support welcomed. Noted. Guidance modified.  Noted.	<b>Boulevard Guidance</b> <a href="#">Where direct access from a Boulevard is not provided and access is provided via a private drive or lane (see diagram opposite) the setback for the relevant street type should be followed.</a>
	Code WY5, WY6, WY9, WY12, WY15, and WY18 The comments previously made on setbacks apply here	The level of setback proposed allows for flexibility and is considered an appropriate level for the street type whilst ensuring amenity for neighbouring properties.	None
	Code WY6: As with Code ON1, the requirement for a verge to be provided along 70% of the street length may be difficult to achieve where smaller house types are proposed, due to the cumulative impact of driveway crossings.	The provision of verges and tree lined streets is key to achieve aim one and three of the SPD. The SPD reduces front of plot parking dominance through parking codes and the ability to maintain 70% verge is considered achievable.	None
	Code WY11: The comments previously made on ON6 and ON9 apply here	Noted.	None

	Code WY13: The requirement for a change in surface material raises concern where lanes are intended to be adopted. Clarification is required as to which surface materials will be acceptable to the highway authority.	Noted. Modification to Lanes guidance	<b>Lanes Guidance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Changes in material can include block paving or coloured tarmac for the whole of the street or as a 2m transition strip.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Block paving and Note:</a> coloured tarmac will be subject to a commuted sum for maintenance.</li> </ul>
	Code WY14: The concerns raised for Code ON9 apply here. The requirement for minimum-sized landscape pockets may conflict with visitor parking provision, particularly for developments comprising smaller house types	Noted. Lanes guidance provides examples of where landscape pockets can be accommodated. Boundary treatment section sets out that they must be used to distinguish between public and private space and be appropriate to the location.	None
	<p>Code WY16: The maximum private drive length of 25m is short and limits the variety of house types which can be located on a shared private drive. The code should allow for a longer length shared private drive, but where over 25m, it should include for a turning head for manoeuvrability/fire tender access.</p> <p>3.7m is also too narrow for a shared private drive and may cause issue with ad-hoc visitor parking and manoeuvrability which may contribute to neighbour disputes.</p>	<p>Private drive length is set by Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021). The maximum length ensures building regulations, accessibility and safety are maintained.</p> <p>The width of private drive width is a minimum to allow for flexible design solutions</p>	None
	<p>Code WY20: The 60% maximum for front parking across the developments in Wynyard is restrictive. A significant number of larger house types have integral garages with front parking. The larger house types with larger front gardens and opportunities for landscaping mitigates against overdominance of car parking.</p> <p>Clarification is required as to whether garages at 90 degrees to the front of the house (as is prevalent in Wynyard) would be classed as front parking.</p>	<p>The aim of the SPD is to reduce the dominance of car parking on street scene. 60% is based on assessments across the borough comparing acceptable and unacceptable levels of car parking dominating a street scene. The 60% requirement is considered to strike to correct balance in reducing the dominance of parking whilst not fundamentally undermining development viability.</p> <p>Detached garages at 90 degrees will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Detached garages should be behind the building line not in front of the property.</p>	None
	Code WY21: The comments previously made on ON16 applies here.	<p>Noted. The aims of Design Code are to reduce car dominance and increase landscaping. This can be achieved through increasing side of plot parking.</p> <p>Currently there is no requirement for plot-to-plot calculations. It is envisaged that the requirement can be</p>	None

		achieved by a visual assessment of the scheme. HBC Officers will keep this process under review to refine.	
	Code WY23: The comments previously made on ON18 applies here.	Noted. Modification to WY23: In Curtilage – Side of Property.  The SPD is minimum requirements, should building regulations require additional space for M4(2) properties this would be expected to be provided at the planning application stage.	<b>WY23: In Curtilage – Side of Property.</b> <u>Additional 0.6m to enable the movement of people and refuse facilities.</u>
	Code WY25, WY26, and W27: The comments previously made on ON22 and ON23 apply here.	Noted	<b>WY26: On Street Allocated &amp; Unallocated.</b> Be 2.4m in width x 6m in length <del>per space</del> , <u>for central spaces. End spaces must be 2.4m in width by 4.8m in length.</u> Provide an area of soft landscaping with tree planting measuring a minimum of 2.4m in width x <del>6</del> <u>4.8m</u> in length after every 4th space. Where more than 4 spaces are provided.
	Code WY28 and WY29: The comments previously made on ON24 and ON25 apply here.	Noted	None
	General comments on Wynyard Area: There is limited differentiation between the Wynyard Area Type and the Outer Neighbourhood Area Type. This is evidenced by the similarity in requirements across Codes WY1–WY21 and ON1–ON23, and the reuse of identical imagery	Noted. There are subtle differences between the codes to reflect the variation between the Outer Neighbourhood and Wynyard, however the same elements of design need to be covered across the various area types. Imagery is provided to aid in visualising the requirements.	None

### Village Area Type

4618978 (anonymous)	1. Village Character and "Sense of Place" (Pages 92-94): I support the emphasis on the 'Village Matrix' and local vernacular. To ensure a high-quality lifestyle for village residents, Code VL1 should be more explicit about protecting 'Key Views' out to the open countryside. The "gap" between the existing village and any new development is essential to prevent the feeling of "urban sprawl." I suggest the Code requires a 'soft' transition with increased green space at the boundary where the new meets the old.	Support welcomed. New developments adjoining the Villages should be integrated into the existing community. Providing a buffer between the existing and new would create the feeling of segregation from the existing community.	None
	2. Street Network & Rural Pedestrian Safety (Pages 95-99): Village streets are often narrower and used by farm machinery as well as residents. I suggest that Code VL5	Noted. Modification to Code MN2 Pedestrian and Cycle Connections.	None

	(Street Network) specifically requires 'Safe Pedestrian Crossings' at the point where new estate paths meet existing high-speed village roads. For a resident, the ability to walk safely to the village pub, church, or school is the most important factor in village life, and the design must reflect this "rural connectivity."		
	3. Parking and the "Tarmac Effect" (Pages 100-104): Code VL12 requires a high number of parking spaces (2-3 per unit). In a village setting, this can lead to streets looking like car parks. I suggest the Code mandates the use of 'Permeable Paving' and 'Hidden Parking' (behind the building line) to ensure that cars do not dominate the historic street scene. We should avoid large expanses of black tarmac which detract from the rural aesthetic.	Parking requirements are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021). Introduction of parking and landscaping codes will address streets 'looking like car parks.' Permeable paving and block sets are included within the parking material guidance.	None
	4. Building Heights and Scale (Pages 105-110): While the Code allows for 2.5 storeys in "key locations," I would caution that this should be used very sparingly. To maintain the lifestyle and character of Hartlepool's villages, the "prevailing height" should strictly remain at 1.5 to 2 storeys. Anything higher risks "overlooking" existing village gardens and blocking natural light, which is a major concern for current residents.	The villages are characterised by a range in building heights due to changes in the era of construction. Providing a range of heights within new proposals will align with the existing character. Residential amenity is covered within Local Plan Policy QP4.	None
001 (Civic Society)	There should be an opportunity for extending the identity and character of the historic village, village core, into new developments in the wider village area. Community Identity.	Noted	None
	The over-use of black tarmac can create an urban feel and is therefore not encouraged in the Village Area Type – why is this only guidance and not included in a code?	Provided as guidance to enable flexible design solutions or surface materials in proposals.	None
	Code VL24: Elevational Treatment – should also reference Village Design Statements.	Village Design Statements are referenced within the Rural Neighbourhood Plan policies; it is not necessary to repeat existing policy.	None
	Boundary Treatment – should include low walls topped with iron railings.	This type of boundary treatment has not been identified as a common feature in Villages. Should proposals include them, they will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	None
	Code RE1: Rural Edge Street Types: Street typologies must include Village Lanes and Village Private Drives. Village Streets will not be permitted on the rural edge. = Unless it is a continuation of an existing village street.	Village streets have the highest volume of traffic and would not be considered a suitable street type for the rural edge where a soft transition between urban and rural is expected.	None
	Code RE4: Rural Edge Frontage Presenting rear elevations and boundary fencing onto the rural edge will not be considered an appropriate response. – but this is not historically accurate, the village form usually does present	Presentation of rear boundary fences onto long distant views and acting as a gateway into a village is not considered an appropriate design response for new residential development.	None

	rear gardens adjoining the rural fields. It may also be more beneficial for wildlife offering less busy areas adjoining countryside.		
002 (Litchfield's on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)	Code VL1: Careful consideration is required to ensure that new footpath requirements integrate with historic street patterns within Village Cores. Introducing short or isolated lengths of footway risks them being arbitrary and poorly related.  Clarification is also required that parking and access arrangements within Village Cores should reflect established patterns, and that level access requirements (as per Building Regulations Approved Document M) where proposed housing have limited setback.	Noted: A new residential development must have pedestrian connections which link to the village to be considered a sustainable development.  Noted. Modification to Village Core Guidance and Parking section.	<b>Village Core Guidance:</b> <a href="#">Parking within the Village Core should follow the prevailing method and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</a>  <b>Parking (pg100)</b> <a href="#">The following parking codes and guidance only apply to residential development outside of the Village Core.</a>
	Code VL2: Consideration needs to be given to how level access arrangements, to comply with Building Regulations Approved Document M, can be facilitated when proposed housing have limited setback.	Noted. Considered on a case-by-case basis.	None
	Code VL4: As raised previously under Codes ON1 and WY6, the requirement for verge provision along 70% of the street length may be difficult to achieve where smaller house types are proposed and driveway crossings are prevalent.	The provision of verges and tree lined streets is key to achieve aim one and three of the SPD. The SPD reduces front of plot parking dominance through parking codes and the ability to maintain 70% verge is considered achievable.	None
	Code VL7: The flexibility to deliver Village Lanes as either standard highways or shared surfaces is welcomed. However, the success of shared surfaces is dependent on the quality of materials which should be in keeping with the village vernacular.	Support welcomed. Noted. Modification to village lane guidance to incorporate additional materials.	Village Lane Guidance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Changes in material can include block paving or coloured tarmac for the whole of the street or as a 2m transition strip.</a></li> <li><a href="#">Block paving and <del>Note</del>: coloured tarmac will be subject to a commuted sum for maintenance.</a></li> </ul>
	Code VL9: The comments previously made on ON11 and WY16 apply here.	Private drive lengths are set by the Tees Valley Highways Design Guide and Specification (2021). The maximum length ensures building regulations, accessibility and safety are maintained.	None
	Code VL13: The restriction limiting a maximum of 60% front parking is overly restrictive within Village Areas.  As identified in the Village Area analysis, historic village streets typically comprise a mix of front parking and informal street/layby parking. To ensure developments reflect the village character, greater flexibility is required, rather than applying the same approach as Outer Neighbourhood or Wynyard areas.	Village Cores are characterised by on street unallocated parking. Modification to parking codes to clarify they apply to development outside the Village Core.  The aim of the SPD is to reduce the dominance of car parking on street scene. 60% is based on assessments across the borough comparing acceptable and unacceptable levels of car parking dominating a street	<a href="#">A range of parking methods must be provided</a> with a maximum of 60% of parking proposed can be to the front of properties. This includes in curtilage (driveway) and allocated on-street parking bays.

		scene. The 60% requirement is considered to strike to correct balance in reducing the dominance of parking whilst not fundamentally undermining development viability.	
	Code VL14: The landscaped front garden requirements for detached and semi-detached dwellings conflict with the Village Area analysis, which identifies minimal setbacks and limited front gardens as characteristic features.	Modification to Parking section to clarify that the codes and guidance only apply to development outside the Village Core.	<a href="#">The following parking codes and guidance only apply to residential development outside of the Village Core.</a>
	Code VL15: The comments above, and previous comments on ON17 and WY22 apply here	Noted. Modification to VL15: In Curtilage – Front of Property.	<b>VL15: In Curtilage – Front of Property</b> <del>Additional 0.6m to enable the movement of people and refuse facilities.</del>
	Code VL16: The comments above, and previous comments on ON18 and WY23 apply here.	Noted. Modification to VL16: In Curtilage – Side of Property.	<b>VL16: In Curtilage –Side of Property</b> <del>Additional 0.6m to enable the movement of people and refuse facilities.</del>
	Code VL19: Flexibility should be applied to allow on-street parking to be provided in a variety of forms, including perpendicular or layby styles where this reflects established village patterns and character.	The SPD does not provide a restriction on the type of on-street parking. Modification to Code VL19: On Street Allocated & Unallocated to address parking bay sizes.	<b>VL19: On Street Allocated &amp; Unallocated</b> Be 2.4m in width x 6m in length <del>per space</del> , for central spaces. <a href="#">End spaces must be 2.4m in width by 4.8m in length.</a> Provide an area of soft landscaping with tree planting measuring a minimum of 2.4m in width x <del>6</del> 4.8m in length after every 4th space. Where more than 4 spaces are provided.
	Code VL21: In Village settings, flexibility in separation distances and localised reduction in separation distances should be encouraged within this guidance to help create interesting street scenes which are more reflective of historic street patterns.	Separation distance section sets out that a reduced distance may be considered where it can be demonstrated that this will assist in creating a variety of streets or an exemplar development. Justification will be required where proposals deviate from Codes.	None
	Code VL24: While consideration of traditional detailing within villages is supported, this should not be used to require pastiche designs or to add features which have no function.	Support welcomed Noted.	None
	While some differentiation is made between Village Areas and other Area Types, a number of requirements and images are repeated across Wynyard, greater clarity would be beneficial to demonstrate how the Village Area Type is intended to achieve a distinct character.	Noted. There are subtle differences between the codes to reflect the variation between the areas, however the same elements of design need to be covered across the various area types. The Village Area Type has codes and guidance which are specific to the area. Imagery is provided to aid in visualising the requirements.	None
003 (Historic England)	Village Codes VL1 to VL25 and RE1 to RE4 are proposed.	Noted. Modification proposed to Code VL24: Elevational Treatment.	<b>VL24: Elevational Treatment</b> Proposals within <a href="#">the setting of built heritage assets Greatham and Elwick</a> must

	<p>Residential developments at the edge of these villages could fall within the setting of these conservation areas. For example, where the conservation area boundary adjoins the open countryside. The associated CACAs should be referenced in the village codes and the conservation area boundaries included on page 91.</p>		<p>be informed by the conservation <a href="#">area visual assessments / area appraisals relevant CAMPs, Character Appraisals and/ or visual assessments.</a></p>
	<p>In some scenarios, a residential development site may include, or be close to a designated heritage asset, such as a scheduled monument or listed building. All five villages include designated heritage assets, even where they are not covered by an area-based heritage designation.</p>	<p>Noted. These instances are covered through Code BF6: Heritage and Conservation and Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Where the core of the village has a relationship with the open countryside, these heritage assets fall close to the settlement boundary. Taking Hart as an example, whilst the village is not a conservation area, it includes a group of scheduled monuments and listed buildings on its northeast edge around the Grade I listed Church as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishponds 70m north of St Mary Magdalene's Church (1018947)</li> <li>• Great house 50m west of St Mary Magdalene's Church (1018945)</li> <li>• Church of St Mary Magdalene (1249898)</li> </ul> <p>The village codes should cross reference SA1, BF1 and BF6 and require a detailed historic character analysis to inform design where sites are in proximity to heritage assets.</p>	<p>Noted. Modification to guidance and codes to cross reference codes SA1: Site Analysis and BF1: Character Analysis.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p><b>Village Street Guidance:</b> The level of setback provided should be consistent with the character analysis undertaken through Code CA1 and <a href="#">Code BF6</a></p> <p><b>Urban Form Guidance (Village Area Type):</b> <a href="#">The Site and Character Analysis (Code SA1 &amp; BF1) as well as any relevant built heritage analysis (Code BF6) should inform the urban form of proposals.</a></p> <p><b>VL24: Elevational treatment</b> Proposals within <a href="#">the setting of built heritage assets Greatham and Elwick</a> must be informed by the conservation <a href="#">area visual assessments / area appraisals relevant CAMPs, Character Appraisals and/ or visual assessments.</a></p>

**General/Any other comments**

<p>4618978 (anonymous)</p>	<p>Enforcement and "SPD Weight": As a resident, I am concerned that while this Guidance is excellent in theory, it may be "negotiated away" by developers during the planning process. I would like the Council to confirm that this SPD will be given significant weight in decision-making and that "viability" will not be used</p>	<p>The SPD will be a material consideration on the assessment of planning applications as is viability, however, officers will seek to ensure that the code is complied with, and this should not be to the detriment of other necessary infrastructure.</p>	<p>None</p>
--------------------------------	--	--	-------------

	as an excuse to bypass the high standards for green space, parking, and building quality set out in this document.		
	<p>2. Accessibility and Inclusion: The document should place a stronger emphasis on 'Lifetime Homes.' I would like to see a requirement that a set percentage of new builds in every development are designed to be easily adaptable for residents with limited mobility or those wishing to "age in place." This ensures that neighbourhoods remain diverse and that residents aren't forced to move away from their community if their physical needs change.</p>	A SHMA is currently being prepared to provide evidence on the housing needs of the borough. This will inform the formulation of policies within any future Local Plan on providing M4(2) and M4(3) houses.	None
	<p>3. Construction Quality and Post-Occupancy: I suggest the Council implements a 'Post-Occupancy Evaluation' (POE) process. A year after a development is completed, the Council should survey residents to see if the Design Code actually delivered the promised lifestyle benefits (e.g., "Is the parking working?", "Are the green spaces used?"). This would allow the Code to be a "living document" that learns from real-world resident experience in Hartlepool.</p>	Noted	None
	<p>4. Climate Resilience: Given the increasing risk of extreme weather, the Code should be even more ambitious regarding "Urban Heat Islands" and flood resilience. I would like to see "Green Roofs" or "Solar Ready" orientations made a preferred standard for all new builds to reduce long-term energy costs for residents and improve the borough's overall environmental impact.</p>	Solar gain and renewables are covered within authority wide codes.	None
	<p>5. Clarity of Terms: To ensure residents can hold developers to account, I suggest adding a "Resident Summary" or a simplified checklist at the start of the document. This would allow laypeople to quickly understand what they should expect from a new development in their area without needing to be a planning expert.</p>	A compliance checklist with a list of the codes will be provided.	None
4631209 (anonymous)	<p>A general comment on fundamental issues</p> <p>Whilst there are increasing levels in car ownership, at the same time there is a desire to encourage use of public transport. Modern life and public transport is an incredibly difficult balancing act. More and better public transport is required and this needs to be fully integrated in development plans.</p>	Noted.	None

	New developments increasingly look like gardenless car parks with a high concentration of small footprint three storey properties. Is this what society actually needs?		
001 (Civic Society)	The Design Guide is generally a very good document where it deals with the layout of developments. It is however weaker regarding what most people see – the style and character of the buildings above ground. The National Planning Design Code includes a statement “That developments should take account of local vernacular, character, heritage, architecture and materials”. Not all places are the same and care must be taken to build onto positive distinctiveness and develop opportunities to foster place identity.	Noted. Within Section 2: Area Types, each area type provides an overview analysis of the local character and vernacular and provides Area Type codes and guidance which reflect these to make distinctive places. The area types still cover a wide area, and each proposed development site will be required to undertake a detailed character analysis which reflects the site specifics (Code BF1: Character Analysis).	None
	There should be a statement/code along the lines that Standard house designs must be avoided as well as using the excuse that there is a lack of distinct local character, to roll out more placeless development. Serious efforts must be taken to adapt the elevations of standard house types to complement or develop local character. Quality and detail matters and new development proposals will be measured on these merits.	Noted. Modifications made to guidance for house types to reflect local characteristics.	<b>Materials &amp; Elevational Detailing Guidance</b> (Outer Neighbourhood): <a href="#">Standard house types should be altered to reflect the characteristics identified through Code BF1.</a>  <b>Material &amp; Elevations Detailing Guidance</b> (Wynyard Area Type): <a href="#">Standard house types should be altered to reflect the characteristics of Wynyard</a>
	We strongly support the section on Heritage Assets and suggest that in the first paragraph of the section 30.1 <u>economy</u> should be included in the 'list'. It currently states Hartlepool's heritage assets make a significant contribution to character, attractiveness and historical legacy of the area.	Unclear reference.	None
	We totally agree that shops, GPs, dentists and school provision should be included in development proposals, we feel that the policing of this currently is lacking and perhaps a “bond” taken from the developer and held until such provisions are built could ensure that the much needed associated public services are completed in a timely manner.	Infrastructure requirements will be determined on each planning application submission when assessed against the Local Plan policies and Planning Obligations SPD.	None
	The document addresses the need to future proof dwellings but seems to concentrate, in our opinion, excessively on the assertion that the nation will become one that devotes itself to cycling. ‘Every unit must be provided with cycle parking space’. The idyllic pedal along has been superseded by would be Barry Sheen’s on electric bikes that appear to travel at super speeds. The thought of that type of machine interacting with toddlers on a 3 m wide shared route is not acceptable in our view.	Walking, cycling and public transport are the preferred methods of sustainable transport in alignment with the NPPF. Public transport is covered through Code MN8. To encourage the use of walking and cycling codes are provided on ensuring movement networks are connected and appropriate storage facilities are provided in homes to encourage their use.	None

002 (Litchfield's on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)	<p>The overall structure of the SPD is clear. However, as mentioned, the document should be more clear in distinguishing between borough-wide principles and area-specific principles.</p> <p>The use of illustrative imagery throughout the SPD is welcomed and helps to explain design intent. However, the quality of the images provided are relatively generic and do not always clearly communicate the intended design. It would also be beneficial for the SPD to utilise more local or regional precedents within the SPD in this regard.</p>	<p>The SPD is divided into two distinct sections, authority wide and area types.</p> <p>Support welcomed Noted.</p>	None
	<p>The SPD provides definitions for 'codes' and 'guidance': 'codes' are defined as requirements for all new residential development, which must be followed; and 'guidance' is defined as a specific set of guidelines which may be applicable to residential development proposals and should be followed. The document then states that justification with evidence will be required for proposals which cannot meet or deviate from the codes or guidance.</p> <p>While the SPD distinguishes between codes and guidance in definition, the distinction in practice is unclear. In particular, the requirement that justification and evidence is needed for deviation from both codes and guidance implies that even guidance is intended to operate as a mandatory requirement, which clearly goes above what is expected of a Supplementary Planning Document. Furthermore, the SPD does not provide any clarity on the type or extent of evidence required to justify deviation from either codes or guidance.</p> <p>As the NPPF is clear at paragraph 133 that Design Codes and Guides should provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, we consider that this should be clarified, noting that any evidence request should be proportionate and relevant.</p>	<p>Compliance checklist will be provided alongside the SPD and applies to codes only.</p> <p>Modification to demonstrating compliance wording. The level of justification would be dependent upon which code is being deviated from and the reasons.</p>	Where a departure from <del>the a</del> code is proposed within an application, a robust justification must be provided, along with any associated evidence to enable the council to appropriately determine whether the departure is acceptable.
	As a whole, Taylor Wimpey supports the Council's objective to improve the quality and consistency of residential development in Hartlepool. The matters raised in these representations relate to ensuring clarity, proportionality and proper use as a supplementary planning document and, importantly, the need for reviews to be undertaken on a site-by-site basis.	Support welcomed. Noted.	None
003 (Historic England)	Hartlepool Borough Council's draft Design Code & Guidelines seeks to cover new residential development only.	Noted	None

	<p>Once adopted, it will set out a vision to create attractive, distinctive and sustainable places to live within Hartlepool.</p> <p>The historic environment is only briefly mentioned in the draft Design Code &amp; Guidelines SPD.</p> <p>Residential development sites may fall within area designations (conservation areas), include designated heritage assets, or fall within their setting, or include non-designated heritage assets, those on a Local List for example, or with archaeological potential.</p>	<p>Detailed guidance on development which impacts upon heritage assets is already provided within Local Plan Policies and CAMPS. It is not the intention of the SPD to repeat this.</p>	
	<p>There will be some development scenarios when the historic environment must be considered in design formulation, and a clear understanding of site context and identity are required. The draft SPD could draw this out more succinctly in its design parameters. In these situations, a historic environment analysis must inform residential designs from the outset to establish and understand the site and its surroundings.</p> <p>The Site Analysis code (SA1) touches on this but little detail is included. The significance of heritage assets and their settings is particularly relevant for the Village Area codes. The VL codes should be cross referenced with SA1, BF1 and BF6 to require a detailed historic character analysis to inform design where sites are in proximity to heritage assets.</p> <p>The Glossary must also include Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings / Non-Designated Heritage Assets.</p>	<p>Taking heritage assets into consideration during design formulation and site analysis is included within Codes SA1: Site Assessment, BF1: Character Analysis and BF6: Heritage and Conservation Areas</p> <p>Modification to Village Area Type guidance and codes to cross reference Codes SA1: Site Assessment and BF1: Character Analysis.</p>	<p><b>Village Street Guidance:</b> The level of setback provided should be consistent with the character analysis undertaken through Code CA1 and <a href="#">Code BF6</a>.</p> <p><b>Urban Form Guidance:</b> <a href="#">The Site and Character Analysis (Code SA1 &amp; BF1) as well as any relevant built heritage analysis (Code BF6) should inform the urban form of proposals.</a></p> <p><b>VL24: Elevational treatment</b> Proposals within <a href="#">the setting of built heritage assets Greatham and Elwick</a> must be informed by the conservation <a href="#">area visual assessments / area appraisals relevant CAMPs, Character Appraisals and/ or visual assessments.</a></p> <p>Glossary: <b>Heritage Assets:</b> <a href="#">A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets are the valued components of the historic environment. Heritage assets are of two types.</a> 1. Those which have been recognised as being nationally important and have been designated as such; these are designated heritage assets, and</p>

	<p>Format: The National Model Design Code (NMDC) refers to 'a set of design requirements that provide specific detailed parameters for physical development of a site or area'. It recommends a three-stage process. Step 1 - Analysis (1a scoping) and (1b baseline) Step 2 – Vision (2a design vision) (2b coding plan) and (2c master planning) and Step 3 – Code (3a guidance for area types) and (3b code wide guidance).</p> <p>The National Design Guidance (NDG) sets out ten characteristics of well-designed places as a helpful starting point. These are mostly covered in the draft SPD. Taken together the characteristics contribute towards the cross-cutting themes for good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Hartlepool Borough's draft SPD has two sections which draw out the NMDCs recommended Step 3. Section 1 covers area wide codes. These are applicable to all new residential developments across the entire Borough. Section 2 provides area type codes, three in total, informed by those parts of the Borough which are earmarked for residential growth including Village Codes. Two of the villages identified in Section 2 include designated conservation areas.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p><a href="#">2. Heritage assets that have not been designated, nevertheless some of which may be of national importance.</a></p> <p>None</p>
--	---	--------------	--