

## **Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Statement (June 2026)**

### **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The **Planning Obligations** 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 prior to adoption.

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

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

### **3. Preparation of the draft SPD**

- 3.1 During the drafting process for the SPD, planning officers engaged with numerous HBC officers to ensure that all relevant matters were considered and set out accordingly. The Consultation Statement dated March 2026 provides a detailed summary of the engagement process.

### **4. Formal Consultation periods**

- 4.1 The following formal consultation periods were undertaken:
- Consultation round one - 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2025 to 16<sup>th</sup> January 2026.
  - Consultation round two - 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 2026 and closed on the 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2026.
- 4.2 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.

- 4.3 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.
  - 4.4 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.
  - 4.5 A total of 16 `Your Say` responses were received and seven letters were received.
  - 4.6 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 periods have, where appropriate, been included in the final version of the SPD prior to it being taken to full council for adoption.

Appendix 1 – responses received and the HBC actions/view

Organisation/ resident	Comments	HBC response	Action
Neighbourhood and Regulatory Services Committee October 2025	Is the SPD clear that Veterans should be a priority when assessing applications for DMV affordable homes.	The requirement to accept applications for those last employed in the armed forces was applicable after 3 months.	Those whose last employment was in the armed forces now applies from the outset and the SPD has been updated to reflect this.
Anonymous (1)	<p><b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b> I would like to see developers include cycle lanes in any new larger development. Greater need for car parking and road side charging stations as we switch over to electric cars. This should be part of the infrastructure of any development at the developers expense. Social housing need to be included I any new developments. Provision of green space and play areas are also required.</p>	<p>Cycle infrastructure is included in the green infrastructure section of the SPD and officers will continue to include this in obligations negotiations. Car parking standards are set out in separate guidance and comments provided to planning officers by the Council's Highways team, such infrastructure would be at the expense of the developer. Policy HSG9 (Affordable Housing) of the Hartlepool Local Plan sets out the requirements in this regard. Noted in relation to green space and play, this SPD does set out that these are required.</p>	None.
	<p><b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</i></b> Affordable Housing, Play Facilities, Green Infrastructure.</p>	Noted.	None.

<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> Yes. Social housing NOT affordable housing there is a significant difference.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b> Yes.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> Yes. I presume this cost would be for the developer? If not then no.</p>	The fee should be received at application stage, this fee could be covered by the developer or the applicant. Future re-sales would also incur the fee to cover the cost of processing the applications, this may be payable by the vendor or future purchaser/applicant.	Text added to SPD to clarify that the developer, applicant or seller could pay the fee.
<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes. See above statements.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes. It makes financial sense.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</b> Yes. Education Education Education T Blair</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes. Climate change.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.

Resident (2)	<p><b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b>  There are new ways of doing things and the council needs to keep on top of them.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</i></b>  Affordable housing.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</i></b>  Don't know how it works now.</p>	The SPD sets out that A fee of £250 per Discount Market Sale Housing application should be paid along with the DMSH application and evidence.	SPD updated to clarify that the developer, applicant or seller could pay the fee.
	<p><b><i>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</i></b>  Yes. Look at the new one at the Marina.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</i></b>  Yes. Growing up, we played all day at Greyfields, near where we lived.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b>  Yes. If it available.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b>  Possibly more important things on which to spend money, considering the number of people who would use them.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</i></b>  Don't know what it is.</p>	Noted. The SPD sets out the calculation with regard to how education construction sums are calculated.	None.

<p><b><i>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b> No. Public transport to Ward Jackson Park would be very helpful.</p>	<p>Noted, sustainable transport links form part of the obligations sought towards green infrastructure.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b> Yes. People should support their town.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you have any comments regarding the review of baseline figures?</i></b> No.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</i></b> No.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the council should prioritise?</i></b> Affordable Housing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</i></b> No.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</i></b> Yes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</i></b> Yes.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree that the council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</i></b> Don't know. It depends on the type of residents.</p>	<p>Noted, however who would be living in the development in future is not a material planning consideration so could not inform obligation calculations.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p><b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where in-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes. Safety and physical upkeep is important.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> Yes. These are facilities every council should provide/encourage use of.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes. As the town grows outwards, green spaces within the borough become more and more important.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<b>Resident (3)</b>	<p><b>Do you think the council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. New housing is springing up all over the town, primarily on greenfield sites so it would make sense to try and use commercial house builders to improve the existing brown field sites and decrepit existing housing stock.</p>	The council would seek to apply planning obligations as set out in the SPD to housing developments regardless of whether they were on greenfield sites or brownfield sites.	None.
	<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the council should prioritise?</b> Affordable housing, community facilities, green infrastructure.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> No. depends on the local facilities already in place.</p>	Noted. In some instances a 'case-by-case' approach may be taken to determine whether new provision is required, however on large housing schemes it is generally considered that these should provide	None.

		facilities for future occupiers on site, rather than relying on provision elsewhere.	
	<b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b> No. see above, existing facilities may suffice.	Noted, as above, a case-by-case approach may indicate existing facilities are sufficient, an assessment would be made regarding the likely impact of the development and whether improved facilities are required.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that the council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b> Yes. Speaking as a bowler I would see this at an imperative.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree with the council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b> Yes. Important to preserve this aspect of the environment.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</i></b> Yes. Important to make road systems safer but it is important to consider the need to make more areas pedestrianised, include cycle lanes and no go areas for cars.	Noted, green infrastructure obligations would be sought where such facilities are deemed appropriate.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that the council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b> Yes. Good idea to preserve the historic culture of the town and not just display the culture as being union flags tied to lamp posts.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Resident (4)</b>	<b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b> Yes. The planning applications can radically change the shape of the town, we need to protect some of our open	The Guidance in the Planning Obligations SPD will seek to offset the impact of developments by securing infrastructure or payments towards it. The document will not influence the locations of new development	None.

	spaces and build on brown site and not always go to green field sites.	(i.e. brownfield or greenfield), which will be guided by policies in the Local Plan.	
	<b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Affordable Housing, Community Facilities, Highway Infrastructure	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> Don't know. The so called road improvement schemes in the town seem to slow down traffic flow and make drivers and pedestrians dissatisfied.	Noted. The SPD will seek contributions towards highway infrastructure where required, however the specific requirements/improvements themselves will be determined by the Council's Highways engineers rather than planning officers.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes. We should all be proud of our towns heritage and make sure that future generations understand the hard work that made things happen.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Resident (5)</b>	<b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. The council work for the people and it their duty to be transparent not hide guidance and plans on a substandard website	Noted, agreement welcome.	None.
	<b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Education, Green Infrastructure, Heritage Assets.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> Yes. What is it?	The SPD sets out that only in certain circumstances will it be acceptable for provision to be made off-site, and applicants will be required to provide sound, robust evidence to detail why the affordable housing cannot be incorporated on site.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b>	This relates to discount market value new-build properties and proposes a discount of 40%. This does not relate to the private	SPD updated to remove

No. If this is buying you council house the 40% of the market price is a lot for those on minimum wage with no other benefits or income.	purchase of existing social housing by tenants.	reference to maximum.
<b><i>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</i></b> No. As above.	Noted. The fee can be paid by the developer, applicant or seller. The fee does not have to be for the buyer if the seller chooses to pay it.	SPD updated to reflect that the fee can be paid for by the developer, buyer or seller.
<b><i>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</i></b> Yes. Hartlepool needs to support and encourage those already involved in sport and offer opportunities to those that don't to try and address its health issues.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b><i>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</i></b> Don't know. The answer should be yes but the question should be MAKE developers provide facilities and if they don't find them or stop them building.	Noted. It is not within the remit of the SPD to MAKE applicants pay for infrastructure; infrastructure is only required if it makes proposals acceptable in development terms. The SPD sets out when infrastructure may be required, it is for the decision maker to determine if the obligation MUST be secured and paid or not.	None.
<b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b> Yes. Play facilities become a no go area when they are used by groups of older children but we cannot just not have them - children need to play and need areas to play in.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b> Yes. As long as it's funded maintained and managed.	Agreement welcomed.	None.

	<p><b>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</b> Don't know. I haven't read it but education is a priority above everything else.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Don't know. I haven't read it but the council are having a laugh asking about access to countryside - their idea of accessing it is to build houses on it</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> Don't know. I haven't read it but if what's happening at the moment is an example of their planning and infrastructure i don't hold our much hope.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes. Speaks for itself - we need to preserve our heritage assets - however - if that means selling them and turning them into hotels next to hotels that have closed because they don't have parking then I'm not so sure.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</b> I had better go back and read them. I have very little respect for Hartlepool planning and despair that all the plans Hartlepool had for the actual town 40 years ago have not been implemented and overridden by selling off land in the outskirts.</p>	Noted.	None.
<b>Resident (6)</b>	<p><b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b></p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.

<p>Yes. There have been hundreds of changes to planning rules, and home owners and businesses need clarification to help navigate this. Planning portal does help.</p>		
<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Affordable Housing, Play Facilities, Highway Infrastructure.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b> Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> Yes.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes. This also need to be looked at, where a development has started small, e.g. 50 houses. Then extended another 60 houses. But on separate planning applications. The burden should not be on the second 60 houses, but a consideration needs to be taken where this has happened and new developments are lacking outside provision of facilities.</p>	Noted - each application will be considered on its own merits and by and large the council cannot retrospectively seek planning obligations. However, the SPD sets out that planning obligations will be sought on developments below the specified thresholds if the council believes that the site is part of a larger development site. When determining contributions, the council will look at the cumulative impact of a number of adjoining small developments.	None.

	<p><b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> No. These are under utilised, and there needs to be a cost benefit. If it was, the facility was created by the council, and run by a franchisee, that is different, but there needs to be a need for that facility.</p>	Requesting and securing built sport infrastructure and/or contributions will be done in liaison with the council's Sport and Recreation team, who are best placed to advise where additional provision is required and where existing capacity remains and does not therefore require additional funding.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> Yes. Again this needs to be a needs analysis decision. Some high way decisions are not thoroughly thought through, and considerable sums of money are spent unnecessarily.</p>	Noted. The SPD will seek contributions towards highway infrastructure where required, however the specific requirements/improvements themselves will be determined by the Council's Highways engineers rather than planning officers.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes. The borough has some fantastic heritage facilities and assets. These should be highlighted and used more effectively to help secure funding.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
Resident (7)	<p><b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b></p>	Noted.	None.

Community Facilities, Green Infrastructure, Heritage Assets.		
<b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.	Noted.	None.
<b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b>	Agreement welcomed.	None.

	Yes.		
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<b>Resident (8)</b>	<b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. I know of people who are frustrated with the planning process and decisions are not explained satisfactorily in their opinion.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Affordable Housing, Education, Community Facilities. None.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the</b>	Agreement welcomed.	None.

	<b>countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes.		
<b>Resident (9)</b>	<b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. The reason for this so that people can understand what is going on in the local community.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Play Facilities, Community Facilities, Training and Employment.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> No. Because more people would be struggling even more with cost of living.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> Yes. Because it will be a safe haven for younger people and stop them getting into trouble.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes. Because of the world we live in and it would be safer.	Agreement welcomed.	None.

	<b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b> Yes. Safety reasons.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b> Yes. Because it will give more things for young people to do.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</i></b> Yes. Because education is very important.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b> Yes. Because it would give people who are disabled to access the countryside easier.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b> Yes. Because it would give more insight into the history of Hartlepool.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you have any comments regarding the review of baseline figures?</i></b> No.	Noted.	None.
	<b><i>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</i></b> No.	Noted.	None.
<b>Resident (10)</b>	<b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b> Yes. Firstly to provide a simplified overview of the document, if you cant make the effort then AI can do it for you reliably in a few minutes.	An overview of document has been provided within the first few chapters. The subject of Planning Obligations is complex, however the SPD has been proof read by two none planners and looks to	None.

	<p>Secondly to stop the (in my guess) lazy habit of pasting a link to a whole document for further details instead of finding and sourcing the further details.</p> <p>Finally to address the accuracy (or relevance) of three figures that are prominently used in calculations; "2.3" regardless of where you get the precedent I think you should acknowledge that in "For types of development which involve the provision of multiple units with shared facilities (HMO's, Student Accommodation, etc.) the number of units for the purposes of calculating costs will be based on the average bedroom number across Hartlepool of 2.3 persons per dwelling. " you are comparing a HMO which has a vested interest in maximising bedroom occupancy with residential that have underutilized bedroom occupancy, the "18%" (for example para 21.14)that I couldn't find exact reference to , but I suspect is old central government data and the "20" minute drive guideline for access to certain leisure a facilities, which should be updated to address sustainability and replaced with provision of cycle lanes and times recalculated based on cycling and walking ( although I am aware that the majority of access is still likely to be via a car).</p>	<p>provide information in as plain English as possible, however due to the legal and theoretical technicalities associated with the subject matter that has not always been the case. Officers are available to discuss all planning documents should further clarity be required.</p> <p>Links to further detail are necessary to avoid creating duplication within the SPD.</p> <p>The council did not consider that applying the maths once to a whole HMO was an appropriate methodology, equally to apply the maths per HMO room appeared excessive. The council considered that the most appropriate calculation to use was that of the number of people in an average dwelling in Hartlepool. That figure is 2.3.</p>	
	<p><b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</i></b></p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Outdoor Sport, Green Infrastructure, Heritage Coast.		
<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b></p> <p>I don't see any evidence of the local nature/transitory of calculation. An old across borough calculation type assessment isn't exact enough. You have more accurate location (and circumstance) based data, use it.</p>	Noted. No other methodology has been put forward for officers to consider.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b></p> <p>No. You acknowledge flexibility, so have it as a guideline but not an absolute.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p><b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b></p> <p>No. No is a bit harsh, but I would like to see cycle lanes incorporated into this categorization to help fund them.</p>	Sustainable transport links, such as cycle lanes, are generally secured under the category of Green Infrastructure contributions rather than built sports.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b></p> <p>Yes. Improved environment, health benefits, social responsibility, quality of life.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b></p> <p>Yes. In principle , but case by case for practicality.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b></p> <p>Yes. Improved environment, health benefits, social responsibility, quality of life.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
<p><b>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</b></p> <p>No. Not an appropriate source.</p>	Noted. No information submitted with regard to what may be a more appropriate source. The source and methodology re aligned with the 2015 SPD and that SPD has been	None.

		tested on appeal many times and is thus deemed to be robust.	
	<p><b><i>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b></p> <p>Yes. Yes, but I also think the provision and upkeep of allotments has dropped down the priority and plays an underestimated part in Improved environment, health benefits, social responsibility, quality of life. By all means attempt to 'smarten them up' in terms of aesthetics and sustainable practices, but include an sincere attempt to make them available and promote them to young old, busy or not.</p>	Noted, in the first instance, developers are encouraged to provide allotments on site, additionally, allotments may be funded via green infrastructure planning obligation contributions. Notwithstanding that, the allocations and management of allotments is not within the remit of this SPD but the point is noted and officers will work with the Parks and Countryside team to ensure allotments are available to all.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</i></b></p> <p>No. I am too upset that the new development near Claxton has brought about unjustified 50 mph speed limits. Work with people don't just impose.</p>	Noted. The SPD will seek contributions towards highway infrastructure where required, however the specific requirements/improvements themselves will be determined by the Council's Highways engineers rather than planning officers.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. Too easy to neglect in forward thinking new development, deserves consideration and funding sources.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you have any comments regarding the review of baseline figures?</i></b></p> <p>No.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</i></b></p> <p>No.</p>	Noted.	None.
<b>Resident (11)</b>	<p><b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b></p>	Noted. Decisions relating to the 'Elwick Bypass' are not within the remit of this	None.

<p>Yes. With regards to Elwick By-pass I attended a meeting in 2017 in the W.I. building where a planning officer from H.B.C. produced a outline plan for a Elwick By-pass this would cost 18 Million GBP and be completed by 2020 he said. The reason for the By pass was that High Ways England would not allow the building of the 2500 approx. houses that HBC wanted building between 'Elwick Road' (Dalton crossroads area) and Greatham as this would put too much traffic through Elwick Village. Please note the residents of the village did NOT ask for this By-pass but saw the advantages, Plans were drawn up and the villagers had a chance to agree/disagree Then HBC decided to withdraw these plans and produce new plans, by this time I for one give up trying to follow the planning procedure ,We where/are being treated roughshod HBC will just do what it wants!! We are now in 2026 and still no new By-pass 6 years late, eventually it will be built then the problem will be a massive increase of traffic on a country road coming to a standstill at High Tunstall School roundabout HBC came up with the great Idea of closing the road from the village past the church to the A19 A road /path/lane that has been there for a thousand years without consulting Elwick residents This is part of our Heritage (see next question No 6).</p>	<p>document. HBC are progressing with the plan to facilitate the delivery of the bypass as soon as possible.</p>	
<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Green Infrastructure, Highway Infrastructure, Heritage Assets.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p><b><i>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</i></b></p> <p>No. 'I do not agree with Discount Housing people apply for housing through the council, go on a list when they have enough points are allocated a house, after a period of time they apply to buy the house at a discount , buy it and another house is not available. My day you saved up went without a lot of things when you had enough for a deposit you committed yourselves to a mortgage and struggled I must admit as a person born before WW2 I am interested but not full conversant with the latest offers.</p>	<p>This relates to discount market value new-build properties and proposes a discount of up to approximately 40%. This does not relate to the private purchase of existing social housing by tenants.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</i></b></p> <p>No. That would be like giving with one hand taking it away with the other. These people will become ratepayers so HBC should consider this a welcoming gesture.</p>	<p>The fee relates to covering the delivery of a non-statutory service.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. You can never have too many facilities as long as these are self funding once established.</p>	<p>Agreement welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. As long as these are safe and well maintained I would expect them to be safer for children.</p>	<p>Agreement welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. See answer to 16 (previous question).</p>	<p>Agreement welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b>  Don't know. Over the years we have had these and they are not sustainable.</p>	<p>Requesting and securing built sport infrastructure and/or contributions will be done in liaison with the council's Sport and Recreation team, who are best placed to advise where additional provision is required and where existing capacity remains and does not therefore require additional funding.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</i></b>  Don't know. Do not know what the calculation is.</p>	<p>The calculation is set out within the SPD.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b>  No. I suggested To HBC that while they were doing the Elwick Bi-pass that they should include a footpath to Elwick so that people could walk to Elwick then walk by country foot paths to Dalton Piercy then on to High Springwell or Dalton Piercy to Greatham THIS WAS REJECTED Enough said!</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</i></b>  Don't know. Send me a copy of the draft SPD so that I can comment.</p>	<p>Respondent answered anonymously so no details available to provide a hard copy.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b>  Yes. If this means we can keep the likes of the road from Elwick past St Peters Church open, at least 1000 years of heritage! But I have no doubt heritage will not come into it, convenience will.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><i>Do you have any comments regarding the review of baseline figures?</i></b>  Do not know baseline figures please explain.</p>	<p>The baseline figures are those within the 2015 Planning Obligations SPD.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p><b>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</b> Do not know draft planning obligations SPD? I am a very ordinary rate payer who is non political but interested and need more information for better feedback.</p>	Respondent answered anonymously so no details available to provide a hard copy.	None.
<b>Resident (12)</b>	<p><b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. Too many complications that cost residents time effort, money and stress. More needs to be done for the council to be pragmatic and help people.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Play Facilities, Outdoor Sport, Highway Infrastructure.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> Yes. Explain more and is it of value to the tax payer.</p>	The SPD sets out the off site affordable housing calculation. The council are of the view that it is a fair methodology that strikes the balance between the current prices within the borough and the provision of a sum that could look to assist in providing affordable housing across the borough.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> No. Cap it £100 then categories higher rates based on property size and or complexity of change.</p>	The fee relates to covering the delivery of a non-statutory service and is calculated on the level of resource required not the value of the property.	None.
	<p><b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> No. Seaton ward is terrible for facilities.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes. Create a community with a community, play facilities are essential for parents / grandparents and</p>	Support welcomed.	None.

children. This must cover private and council estates, private estates are always left out when it's the private estate tax payers who contribute into the system.		
<p><b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. Summer hill and Seaton areas are now removed or in need of replacement, we want to attract people to the town and areas to spend money and people won't go where children can't have fun.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. They had these and then sold them off for housing developments, with the change in technology and generations of people, more modern sports need to be catered for such as skate parks / bikes / CrossFit or obstacle courses outdoors / basketball / running tracks / dog walking and dog running tracks etc.</p>	Requesting and securing built sport infrastructure and/or contributions will be done in liaison with the council's Sport and Recreation team, who are best placed to advise where additional provision is required and where existing capacity remains and does not therefore require additional funding.	None.
<p><b><i>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</i></b></p> <p>Don't know. Need more information.</p>	The calculation is set out within the SPD and has been created in liaison with the council's education team.	None.
<p><b><i>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b></p> <p>No. We have green field land and brownfield land wasted in town, at some prime locations for camping / water sports / events / beach days and yet it's left to collect litter and dog waste.</p>	Noted. Without specific reference to parcels of land, Land Use Policy can offer no response to this comment.	None.
<p><b><i>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</i></b></p> <p>Don't know. Need more detail on this.</p>	Noted. Information within the SPD sets out that highway infrastructure mitigation will be required on a site by site basis.	Table on page 43 deleted, thresholds are not appropriate as mitigation

			must be applied on a case by case basis and it is not the size of the site that dictates impact, it is a culmination of factors that must be set out in transport assessments.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b></p> <p>No. Why pay for heritage when some of it is not eco friendly, costs a lot to maintain and is unreliable long term, money, sell them off as private developments with preservations orders for limited modifications.</p>	Noted, the heritage assets within the Borough contribute to Hartlepool's unique character and it is an HBC priority to maintain and enhance such features.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you have any comments regarding the review of baseline figures?</i></b></p> <p>Need more info.</p>	The baseline figure are those within the 2015 SPD.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. Would like an invite to meetings to hear and see what the figures are and plans long term.</p>	Noted.	None.
<b>Resident (13)</b>	<p><b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. To many developers come in and buy farms and green land and building housing. The brown field sites should be redeveloped with more affordable housing, the carbon foot print would be improved because if they</p>	The Guidance in the Planning Obligations SPD will seek to offset the impact of developments by securing infrastructure or payments towards it. The document will not influence the locations of new development (i.e. brownfield or greenfield), which will be guided by policies in the Local Plan.	None.

are around town centre locations public transport is available to use.		
<b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Affordable Housing, Community Facilities, Heritage Assets.	Noted.	None.
<b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b> No. I think that is a bit high, but it would depend on how many years of tenancy they have already contributed to.	This relates to discount market value new-build properties and proposes a discount of 40%. This does not relate to the private purchase of existing social housing by tenants.	None.
<b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> Yes.	Noted.	None.
<b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> No. I think building the new centre is extremely expensive and I am not sure that it is going to meet the needs of the community. Other facilities have been neglected over the years and either, closed down and left to rot, when if the up keep had been maintained the facilities could have lasted a lot longer.	Requesting and securing built sport infrastructure and/or contributions will be done in liaison with the council's Sport and Recreation team, who are best placed to advise where additional provision is required and where existing capacity remains and does not therefore require additional funding.	None.
<b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes. Children need space to play, it also helps early years build relationships so it is important.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes.	Noted.	None.

	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> Yes. As long as the council is going to maintain them in good order.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes. We need to make sure that people can get countryside Summerhill is a great asset.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> No. The new provision at top of West View Road, is awful and has made traffic flow appalling.</p>	Noted. The SPD will seek contributions towards highway infrastructure where required, however the specific requirements/improvements themselves will be determined by the Council's Highways engineers rather than planning officers.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes. Sad to see that the two turntables at Mainsforth Terrace are not going to be preserved.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<b>Resident (14)</b>	<p><b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. So everyone sings from the same hymn sheet.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Education, Community Facilities, Highway Infrastructure</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No, I don't.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b></p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.

Yes.		
<b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
<b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> No. We need schools.	Noted, however requirements for each development will take account of what is needed in terms of built sports, education and other requirements. Built sports would be considered alongside education requirements, not instead of.	None.
<b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> No. We need schools.	Noted, however requirements for each development will take account of what is needed in terms of play, education and other requirements. Play facilities would be considered alongside education requirements, not instead of.	None.
<b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> No. It gets vandalised.	Noted.	None.
<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> No. Schools are a higher priority.	Noted, however requirements for each development will take account of what is needed in terms of outdoor sport, education and other requirements. Outdoor sport would be considered alongside education requirements, not instead of.	None.
<b>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</b> No.	Noted.	None.
<b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> No. we need A&E back and more schools.	Noted.	None.

	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> What assets. Ben Houchen has taken them.</p>	Noted.	None.
<b>Resident (15)</b>	<p><b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b> Yes. Updated guidance is essential to ensure that developer contributions accurately reflect current infrastructure costs (inflation) and the real-world needs of Hartlepool. Without clear, modern guidance, there is a risk that new developments will place an unsustainable strain on existing local services without providing adequate mitigation.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Education, Green Infrastructure, Highway Infrastructure</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> Yes. A 40% discount is a strong starting point to ensure 'affordable' housing is actually within reach of local first-time buyers and key workers, rather than just being a small reduction on an otherwise unattainable market price</p>	Noted, support welcomed. HBC expect a discount of 20-40% to ensure that homes are affordable for those in housing need.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that a maximum of 40% is an appropriate discount for discount market sale housing to be sold to eligible individuals?</b> Yes.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</b> No. This fee essentially acts as a tax on those who are already struggling to afford a home. The administrative costs of managing affordable housing schemes should be borne by the developer as part of their Section 106</p>	The fee relates to covering the delivery of a non-statutory service and is calculated on the level of resource required.	None.

	obligations, rather than being passed on to the lower-income resident.		
	<p><b><i>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</i></b>  Yes. If a development is too small for its own park, it will still increase the number of children using existing local parks. Developers must pay a 'pro-rata' contribution to upgrade those existing spaces to handle the increased wear and tear.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</i></b>  Yes. Large estates must be self-sustaining. Forcing families to drive to other neighbourhoods to find a playground increases traffic and reduces community cohesion. On-site play facilities should be a non-negotiable requirement for 100+ dwellings to ensure a healthy lifestyle for children.</p>	Support welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</i></b>  Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</i></b>  Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree with the calculation proposed for securing education provision?</i></b>  Yes.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<p><b><i>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</i></b>  Yes. Biodiversity Net Gain and access to the countryside are vital for mental health and</p>	Support welcomed.	None.

	environmental resilience. The Council should strictly enforce these requirements and ensure that 'green infrastructure' is meaningful (like wildflower meadows or usable trails) rather than just unusable 'leftover' strips of grass.		
	<b><i>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</i></b> Yes. New developments often lead to 'bottlenecks' at existing junctions. It is vital that highway contributions cover not just the immediate entrance to an estate, but also the wider impact on local traffic flow and safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</i></b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</i></b> I am concerned about 'Viability Clauses.' Developers often argue they cannot afford these contributions after they have already started a project. The Council should require all viability assessments to be made fully public and should ensure that community infrastructure (like schools and parks) is delivered early in the build process, rather than being left until the final phase.	Noted. applicants have to demonstrate if they cannot afford obligations and viability executive summaries are made publicly available. The council do look to work with the applicant to bring forward infrastructure forward as soon as possible, and target dates for infrastructure and/or contributions is set out in legal agreements.	None.
Resident (16)	<b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</i></b> Affordable Housing, Community Facilities, Heritage Assets	Noted.	None.
	<b><i>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</i></b>	Noted.	None.

	No.		
	<b>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes.	Support welcomed.	None
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure the provision of outdoor sport (including tennis courts and bowling greens)?</b> Yes. Required to improve health.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes. Value of the Heritage assets too frequently overlooked - potential economic contribution opportunities worth the investment. Also essential in developing pride of place.	Support welcomed.	None.
<b>Organisation – The Woodland Trust</b>	<b>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</b>	Support welcomed comments set out by The Woodland Trust are embedded within the SPD.	None.

	<p>Yes. The Woodland Trust believes that, whilst new development is of course expected, when it is proposed, it should be accompanied with expectations and commitments around managing and enhancing the natural environment. This can be done through statutory requirements such as Biodiversity Net Gain, but local authorities have the ability to place additional requirements on developers to ensure nature is actually enhanced following development, rather than simply not degraded. We believe prioritising this should include a clear expectation that development improves public access to nature and delivers meaningful green infrastructure.</p> <p>In practice, this means developers should be required not only to protect and enhance existing habitats, but to create new, accessible natural spaces such as woodlands, green corridors, and community green spaces that are integrated into developments from the outset. Green infrastructure should be designed to be functional, connected, and accessible to local communities, supporting both biodiversity and human wellbeing.</p> <p>Hartlepool therefore has the opportunity to set clear, enforceable standards to ensure that green infrastructure provision is of high quality and is well managed and maintained. This will help ensure that new development contributes positively to nature recovery while also providing lasting social and environmental benefits for the local community.</p>		
	<p><b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</i></b> Green Infrastructure, Heritage Assets.</p>	Noted.	None.

	<p><b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.</p>	Noted.	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes, we agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision, including improving access to the countryside and the preservation and enhancement of biodiversity.</p> <p>However, it is important that this approach is supported by clear, enforceable expectations on developers to deliver high-quality, accessible green infrastructure as part of new development. This should include the creation and long-term management of connected natural spaces that are genuinely accessible to local communities.</p> <p>Strengthening green infrastructure provision in this way is crucial to improving wellbeing in Hartlepool and ensuring new communities are positive places to live.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The council does work with developers to ensure that developers deliver high quality accessible green infrastructure.</p>	None.
	<p><b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes, we agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets.</p> <p>We also recommend that the definition of heritage assets is broadened to include natural assets, such as ancient woodlands, veteran trees, and other irreplaceable habitats, recognising their cultural, historical, and environmental importance.</p>	Agreement welcomed.	SPD updated to draw reference to built and natural heritage assets that can include veteran trees.

<b>Organisation – Natural England</b>	Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.	Noted.	None.
<b>Organisation/b business – Anglian Water.</b>	<b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b> Yes. Anglian Water as one of the statutory water service providers in Hartlepool would want to ensure that no additional costs are put onto infrastructure development which supports growth or environmental improvements.	Noted.	None.
	<b><i>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</i></b> Green Infrastructure.	Noted.	None.
	<b><i>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</i></b> No. Anglian Water supports affordable housing provision as part of social and environmental purpose.	Noted.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree with the introduction of a £250 fee for processing applications for discount market value properties?</i></b> Don't know. Anglian Water considers the fees should cover costs.	Noted. The provision of Discount Market Sales Housing units requires a significant amount of work in setting up the process and assessing applications, all of which is after an application has been determined and thus the planning application fee does not cover this ongoing work.	None.
	<b><i>Do you consider the Council's approach to securing built sports provision is appropriate?</i></b> Don't know. Anglian Water supports sports provision as part of social and environmental purpose.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b><i>Do you agree that the Council should aim to secure play facilities on-site for developments of 100 dwellings or more?</i></b>	Support welcomed.	None.

	Yes. Anglian Water supports play provision and equitable funding from larger residential developments as part of social and environmental purpose.		
	<b>Do you consider that money should be secured to improve existing play facilities where on-site provision is not provided?</b> Yes. Existing communities which host new housing should benefit from development.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes. Anglian Water supports green and blue infrastructure provision and we consider that this should be guided by the LNRS and delivered through BNG and where necessary through developer contributions for flood risk betterment, for example.	Noted. The council will have regard to the LNRS once it is published by the TVCA. The council does seek enhancements through a mix of BNG requirements and developer contributions.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that highway infrastructure should be secured as set out in the draft SPD?</b> Yes.	Agreement welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you have any other comments regarding the draft Planning Obligations SPD?</b> Chapter 27 on Green Infrastructure could usefully clarify that Green Infrastructure also includes Blue Infrastructure and that watercourses, canals and other bodies of waters as well as SuDS features in and near new development may require developer contributions to deliver flood mitigation, water quality improvements or biodiversity gain.	Noted, the requirement for SUDS is not within the remit of the SPD, other legislation and policy is better placed to require such infrastructure. SUDS maintenance contributions are discussed within the SPD and the council will require them on a case by case basis.	None.
<b>Organisation/business – Sport England</b>	Sport England welcomes the fact that the SPD has recognised playing pitches, outdoor sport provision and built sport facilities.	Noted, support welcomed. The SPD was written in consultation with the councils Sport and Recreation team and any updates to sporting evidence bases can	None.

	<p>Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states: “Access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate”</p> <p>In seeking planning obligations an up to date sport evidence base will assist the Council. This consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an up to date playing pitch strategy</li> <li>• an up to date built sports facilities strategy</li> </ul> <p>For a playing pitch strategy to be considered “up to date”, it should have been undertaken within the last three years.</p> <p>For a built facilities strategy to be considered “up to date” it should have been carried out within the last five years. The documents also need to be refreshed to ensure they are relevant and up to date and incorporate any changes that may have happened since they were first written.</p> <p>Sport England has produced guidance to assist Local Authorities to ensure their sports based evidence base is up to date, and this can be viewed on this link:  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/planning-">https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/planning-</a></p>	<p>be used as a material consideration in the future.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>sport#assessing-needs-and-playing-pitch-strategy guidance-39961.</p> <p>We would encourage the Council to review its evidence base to ensure that it is up to date and can inform any planning obligation. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.</p> <p>A robust and up to date evidence base can assist Councils in developing policies to ensure that sport facilities are protected and new ones are provided of the right type and in the right location to meet demand. Especially demand created by occupiers of new developments (see comments in next section).</p>		
	<p>Built Sport Facilities – The occupiers of new development, especially residential, will generate demand for sporting provision.</p> <p>The existing provision within an area may not be able to accommodate this increased demand without exacerbating existing and/or predicted future deficiencies. Therefore, Sport England considers that new developments should contribute towards meeting the demand that they generate through the provision of on site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site.</p> <p>Sport England has developed two calculators to assist identifying the demand that a new population will generate from housing development:</p>	<p>Noted and direction towards the calculators is welcomed. This information has been shared with the council’s Sport and Recreation team and can be used as a tool in assessing future planning applications.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p><u>Sport Facility Calculator</u> - The Sport England's Sports Facilities Calculator (SFC) can help to provide an indication of the likely demand that will be generated by a development for certain facility types. The calculator uses population breakdowns from the ONS population projections and from locally derived figures for sports halls, pools, indoor bowls and artificial grass pitches. It then uses information Sport England has gathered from the National Halls and Pools Survey, Benchmarking Service, Indoor Bowls User Survey, and General Household Survey, on who uses facilities and applies this to the actual population profile of the local area. This ensures that the calculation is sensitive to the needs of the people who actually live there.  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport/sports-facility-calculator">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport/sports-facility-calculator</a> Playing Pitch Calculator.</p> <p><u>Playing Pitch Calculator</u> – the Playing Pitch Calculator is designed to assist those developing and implementing a playing pitch strategy by giving a consistent starting point to help estimate the demand from a new population. This can then be refined locally as appropriate. Access to this calculator is currently restricted to local authorities with an up to-date assessment of the need for playing pitches in their area, or those in the process of developing or updating such work. This is primarily because, unlike the Sports Facility Calculator, the Playing Pitch Calculator requires certain data to be entered from their local assessment of need to generate results.  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport/playing-pitch-calculator">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport/playing-pitch-calculator</a></p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>The above, together with a robust and up to date evidence base can identify is new sport provision should be on provided on site as part of any new housing development, or through off site contributions where existing sport facilities can absorb more capacity though appropriate contributions (or a mixture of the two).</p>		
	<p>Thresholds and levels – Sport England welcomes the SPD’s recognition of the importance of sports facilities in creating a healthy and active borough. We note that the threshold of five or more dwellings should contribute towards built sports facilities. Yet occupiers of dwellings of four or less will still create a demand for sport. A number of small housing developments could have a cumulative impact on sporting demand.</p> <p>We consider that any sport contribution should apply to all dwellings, regardless of the number being proposed. A level of contribution of £345 per new dwelling is proposed. However this may not deliver the correct sport facilities to meet an identified demand. Taking into account a local evidence base, this may suggest that there is different demand for different sport facilities.</p> <p>Not all sport facilities cost the same and there is a risk that a fixed contribution may not deliver the correct sport facility that is needed to meet demand. Such a contribution needs to be more bespoke – see the Sport England calculators. Sport England would suggest that the figure starts as a minimum, but should a local evidence base suggest that specific sport facilities are needed, (which may cost more to deliver), then this figure could alter. Sport England has guidance on the cost of sport facilities, and this is regularly updated.</p>	<p>The Council does not have a CIL charging schedule and therefore does not collect developer contributions on each new dwelling proposed. The level of 5 dwellings was tested at local plan examination in public and deemed to strike a balance between the provision of necessary infrastructure and what could realistically be viable. If numerous small sites come forward that are seen as part of a whole development, then the council do seek obligations on a per dwelling basis.</p> <p>The SPD is a guide, if bespoke sports facilities are required as part of a development, then the council will request them on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>The cost guidance can be viewed on this link:  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/facility-cost-guidance">https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/facility-cost-guidance</a></p>		
	<p>Outdoor sport including tennis courts and bowling greens – See our comments for Paragraph 22.11. Thresholds and Levels on the Sport England calculators and thresholds. A quantity standard is propose based on a document that is 11 years old (Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (2015)).</p> <p>Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states: Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. There is a move away from standards as the actual demand for sport facilities can be bespoke and varies from area to area depending on the existing level of sport provision and the capacity to which it is operating at and its ability (or otherwise) to absorb any more demand created locally.</p> <p>Different sport facilities have different sizes, for example, a cricket ground is larger then a tennis court. Sport England would suggest that the Sport England calculators are used instead as this provides a more bespoke provision based on the population and the demographics.</p> <p>Again, the evidence base should underpin what is needed in the area and whether this should be new provision. Sometimes enhancements to existing provision can assist in absorbing new demand, such as</p>	<p>Noted. An updated evidence base is likely to be commissioned as part of the new local plan, it is that evidence that will assist in setting out what is required within the borough.</p> <p>The methodology of applying a standard sum of money is used to provide clarity on the sums of money that may be requested.</p> <p>If a bespoke project is required than the SPD allows that to be secured on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	improving drainage on playing fields, or refurbishing changing rooms.		
	Playing Pitches – See our comments above for ‘Outdoor Sport including Tennis Courts and Bowling Greens’.	Noted.	None
	<p>Green Infrastructure, Countryside and Biodiversity – Every year hundreds, if not thousands, of sports events take place that rely upon the natural environment.</p> <p>Many are the transient, peripatetic sporting events that the organising club sets up, the competition takes place, and afterwards any equipment (e.g. signage, fences, ropes, show jumps) are dismantled and the land reverts to its original use. These events can include equestrian activities, motorsport, cycling, running, canoeing and climbing events. What all these sporting activities tend to have in common is a control point (often the start and finish) where participants will assemble and register for the event, prior to it starting.</p> <p>Because of the transient nature of these type of events, they tend to operate outside the planning system and rely on permitted development rights because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events are mostly low-key and non-profit generating. The peripatetic nature of these sport events results in them using a number of different sites during the year.</li> <li>• There are often no alternative sites with planning permission available at an economic price.</li> <li>• The short-term simplicity of using Permitted Development rights suits the organisers, many of whom are volunteers.</li> <li>• Landowners of these sites show reluctance to become involved in the formal process of seeking planning permission, leading to the loss of sites even where</li> </ul>	<p>It should be noted this document is a Supplementary Planning Document and does not therefore constitute Local Plan Policy, however the comments in that regard can be taken into account during future Local Plan making.</p> <p>The specific projects that green infrastructure contributions are spent on are determined following consultation with relevant departments within the council rather than being determined by the SPD itself. This means that they can be spent in the most appropriate/best value/most needed locations and facilities. The types of project highlighted are noted and should the need for such facilities be put forward in Hartlepool, the Land Use Policy team would not be adverse to obligations being spent in this manner, providing it can be demonstrated there is a need for the facilities and that it would address the impact of a given housing development.</p>	None.

	<p>there is reasonable prospect of planning consent being granted.</p> <p>Occasionally some events do require planning permission and this tends to be where permitted development rights do not apply, or that the events have taken place more than 14 or 28 days per year and therefore exceed their permitted development rights. Local Plan documents generally lack positive policies for formally dealing with such sporting events - because the use is temporary, the forward-looking planning processes is essentially incapable of recognising, acknowledging and safeguarding that temporary use as a valuable recreation asset.</p> <p>Policies should therefore be positively worded to protect and encourage peripatetic sporting events as well as permanent sport facilities. The SPD should recognise that these activities take place and that enhancements can be made to support sport and active recreation. Sometimes the provision of small scale infrastructure can assist in supporting sport and recreation. This could include, for example, mountain bike wash facilities, mounting blocks for equestrians, a hard standing for the siting of a 'control point' where participants enter the competition, the provision of accessible stiles and gates so that people of all abilities can access these networks, etc.</p>		
<p><b>Organisation/business (Taylor Wimpey)</b></p>	<p>Introduction – We note at paragraph 1.1 that the SPD has been produced to support the 2018 Hartlepool Local Plan (HLP) and to provide developers and other interested parties with information regarding the Council's approach to securing planning obligations or conditions.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and the recently updated national regulations are noted, as and when a new Local Plan is to be produced, this will entail wholesale consideration of the future development of the borough.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>It is welcomed that the Council is seeking to provide certainty to developers. However, it is notable that the HLP is approaching eight years old and that the Council will be embarking on the preparation of a new Local Plan. This is coupled with a current national consultation on the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). On this basis, it is considered it should be acknowledged that a wholesale review of Planning Obligations will be undertaken as part of the new Local Plan and in line with any revised NPPF. This is particularly of note as paragraph 1.3 makes clear this is an update to the 2015 SPD, which in itself was consulted on in 2014 and is therefore clearly outdated. It is however welcomed that paragraph 2.2 reflects the current NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in ensuring that the SPD should embed flexibility to prevent sustainable development from being unreasonably restricted. Likewise, paragraph 2.7 is supported whereby it is clarified that planning obligations are negotiated on a site-by-site basis.</p>		
	<p>Types of development, threshold and obligations – Paragraph 6.1 sets out the thresholds for seeking planning obligations. A number of these, for residential development, are for 5 units or more. We would expect the threshold to be 10 units or more to ensure that smaller schemes are not prohibited.</p>	<p>National policy restricts the type of obligations that can be sought on smaller schemes (i.e. affordable housing can only be applied to major applications of 10 or more dwellings or those in designated rural areas), however other obligations set out in the SPD can be imposed where this can make the impact of new development acceptable in planning terms. Applications for 5 to 9 dwellings can have an impact upon infrastructure and it is that impact that should be mitigated. HBC has numerous viability assessments from developers that show developments for 5 to</p>	<p>None.</p>

		9 dwellings can afford to pay planning obligations.	
	In-kind contributions – Paragraph 7.1 sets out that where the Council wishes to provide certain infrastructure, the developer will be required to donate the required land free of charge, together with a financial contribution in lieu of the developer providing these facilities. We consider that this should be revised to reflect that the provision of land free of charge in itself could be sufficient and the requirement of a financial contribution on top of this is excessive and could result in disproportionate contributions being requested.	The council has secured land and financial contributions for schemes across the borough. If a development requires a new primary school then the onus is upon the developer to facilitate and provide for it, one practical approach is that the land is safeguarded and gifted and that money is collected. The land and money are typically then passed to the Department for Education to facilitate the delivery of a school. If land and financial contribution are not required then both will not be sought. But practice to date has dictated that on many occasions, both are required and securing both in legal agreements has been the preferred approach. Without the provision of both, it may be the case that the development is not acceptable in planning terms. The SPD allows sufficient guidance to make a developer aware of what obligations there may be with regard to different types of development.	
	Pooling of contributions – It is supported that paragraph 9.1 sets out that where the level of contribution secured by the development is insufficient to fully fund the required infrastructure, the financial contribution will be held by the Council and pooled with other contributions from other developments and the pool of money will be used to pay for the relevant schemes. However, a time limit should be imposed. A standard time limit of 10 years is often imposed with any unspent sum being returned with interest less reasonable administration	Support welcomed.  Time limits are set on a case by case basis, on larger phased developments, such as High Tunstall, Wynyard and the south west extension, that are expected to build out over 15 years, it is necessary to collect and hold money for a period of more than 10 years. All time limits are discussed with applicants and justification for timeframes are given.	None.

	<p>costs. However, it would be reasonable to agree this on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Education facilities – The worked contribution examples in the Education section of the Draft SPD (page 34) highlight that contributions sought will correspond to the local authority School Places Scorecard evidence on cost per additional pupil.</p> <p>The Draft SPD uses the 2022/23 figures (from the 2023 Scorecard) as the starting point which provides a cost per pupil place of £18,190 for the expansion of primary schools.</p> <p>It should be noted that the costs figures presented within the School Places Scorecards are based on local authority report projects delivered between 2015/16 and 2017/18 and are adjusted to account for inflation and then regional factors.</p> <p>This figure has been sense-checked using the latest National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking<sup>1</sup> (June 2025) study. The study and analysis rely upon a sample of projects delivered over the period 2012 to 2025 and is updated annually with new projects.</p> <p>The total sample size is 1,226 providing coverage across 164 local authorities. The National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking study identifies an average cost per pupil place of £17,941 (in 2024 prices) at the national level for the re-build and extension of existing primary schools.</p> <p>The technical note indicates that costs figures have been normalised to a common UK average using</p>	<p>Anticipated text below – no SPD edits</p> <p>The figures within the SPD have been incorporated in liaison with the council’s education team.</p> <p>The money requested can be used for new build primary schools and/or expansion to existing schools and so if the approach opposite was applied then the sum would likely be too low as it does not factor in new build costs.</p> <p>However the primary reason for not amending the SPD is that the building cost figures can vary on a site-by-site basis, some developer operate at a build cost lower or higher than the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) average. Evidence of the varying levels of build costs has been presented to the council on numerous occasions through viability assessment.</p> <p>Applying the North East BCIS average in circumstances where the NE average varies is considered to be the incorrect approach.</p>	<p>None.</p>
--	--	--	--------------

	<p>regional location factors to accord with the UK Mean (100).</p> <p>To identify the regional cost per pupil place, applying the corresponding BCIS location factors for the North East (0.89) would indicate an average cost £15,967 per pupil place for expansion/extension of existing schools. We consider this should be reflected in the final version of the SPD.</p>		
	<p>Outdoor sport including tennis courts and bowling greens – The review of the assumptions in relation to the contributions sought for the delivery of outdoor sports and play facilities highlights that the average household size may be overstated.</p> <p>At present the Draft SPD applies a rounded average household size of 2.30. The latest (2021) Census data indicates an average household size in Hartlepool of 2.26. This represents a decline from the figure of 2.28 recorded at the 2011 Census. Further analysis of subnational population projections and subnational household projections data indicates that average household sizes in Hartlepool are forecast to decrease further to 2.17 by 2032.</p> <p>Applying the decimalised household size figure translates to a reduction in contribution of £8.99 per dwelling delivered. The below figures should be reflected in the next version of the SPD.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The council considers the 2021 Census data to be robust and the most accurate figure to choose rather than the mid year estimated.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>Highway infrastructure – It is notable that the draft SPD is sets out that the requirement for highways infrastructure will be determined on a site-by-site basis and based on an evidenced need, which is welcomed. It should be made explicit that any highways contributions or mitigation requested by the Council</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>It is not necessary to set this out in the SPD. To seek money for works already planned would not meet the CIL tests. The SPD sets out that obligations must meet the CIL tests. The council does not double count with</p>	<p>None.</p>

	must take account of planned infrastructure works and also ensure that no double counting occurs.	regard to obligations and if an applicant thinks that is the case then they are advised to speak with HBC officers.	
<b>Organisation – The Woodland Trust</b>	<p><b><i>Do you think the Council should produce updated guidance regarding planning obligations?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. The Woodland Trust believes that, whilst new development is of course expected, when it is proposed, it should be accompanied with expectations and commitments around managing and enhancing the natural environment. This can be done through statutory requirements such as Biodiversity Net Gain, but local authorities have the ability to place additional requirements on developers to ensure nature is actually enhanced following development, rather than simply not degraded. We believe prioritising this should include a clear expectation that development improves public access to nature and delivers meaningful green infrastructure.</p> <p>In practice, this means developers should be required not only to protect and enhance existing habitats, but to create new, accessible natural spaces such as woodlands, green corridors, and community green spaces that are integrated into developments from the outset. Green infrastructure should be designed to be functional, connected, and accessible to local communities, supporting both biodiversity and human wellbeing.</p> <p>Hartlepool therefore has the opportunity to set clear, enforceable standards to ensure that green infrastructure provision is of high quality and is well managed and maintained. This will help ensure that new development contributes positively to nature</p>	Support welcomed comments set out by The Woodland Trust are embedded within the SPD.	None.

	recovery while also providing lasting social and environmental benefits for the local community.		
	<b>Which types of infrastructure do you think the Council should prioritise?</b> Green Infrastructure, Heritage Assets.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you have any comments on how the off-site affordable housing sum is calculated?</b> No.	Noted.	None.
	<b>Do you agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision? (including access to the countryside and preservation/enhancement of biodiversity)</b> Yes, we agree with the Council's approach to green infrastructure provision, including improving access to the countryside and the preservation and enhancement of biodiversity.  However, it is important that this approach is supported by clear, enforceable expectations on developers to deliver high-quality, accessible green infrastructure as part of new development. This should include the creation and long-term management of connected natural spaces that are genuinely accessible to local communities.  Strengthening green infrastructure provision in this way is crucial to improving wellbeing in Hartlepool and ensuring new communities are positive places to live.	Support welcomed.	None.
	<b>Do you agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets?</b> Yes, we agree that the Council should secure contributions towards preserving the Borough's heritage assets.	Agreement welcomed.	SPD updated to draw reference to built and natural heritage assets that can

	We also recommend that the definition of heritage assets is broadened to include natural assets, such as ancient woodlands, veteran trees, and other irreplaceable habitats, recognising their cultural, historical, and environmental importance.		include veteran trees.
	Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.	Noted.	None.
<b>Organisation/business (Trees For Cities)</b>	Given the work which has been undertaken to develop a 25-year Urban Forestry Masterplan for Hartlepool, which saw community consultation throughout its development and is set to see council adoption imminently, it would be fantastic to see this nationally leading masterplan reflected in planning obligations. With this in mind, I'd invite you to consider including "supporting delivery of the council's Urban Forest Masterplan" as part of your revised planning obligations. This masterplan speaks to engagement, education, the delivery of targeted planting and many other initiatives which will greatly benefit the town and green infrastructure. As a Tree Equity led strategy, it is particularly concerned with ensuring the benefits of trees are felt and shared by all throughout the town - and it is fantastic to see the council having adopted the vision of Hartlepool being " <i>a place where every neighbourhood grows, enjoys and takes pride in its trees</i> " (page 12 of the strategy). Scott will be able to share and provide full copies of the strategy.	The Planning Obligations SPD aims to set out how, when and why planning obligations will be secured but does not seek to identify specific projects that contributions will be directed to. This will often be site/development specific. Land Use Policy wholeheartedly support the Forestry Masterplan for Hartlepool and would not be against green infrastructure contributions being directed towards this project where appropriate. Specific projects to which contributions will be directed to are determined on a case by case basis with relevant technical consultees.	SPD text updated to set out that obligations can be directed to towards the overall facilitation and delivery of the Urban Forest Masterplan, physical green infrastructure (GI)works and/or maintenance to the existing GI network.
<b>Historic England</b>	Historic England is the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body	Noted.	None.

	<p>established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).</p> <p>We champion and protect England’s historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p>		
	<p>In specific circumstances, planning obligations offer opportunities for funding improvements to, and mitigating adverse impacts upon, the historic environment. These can include, but are not limited to, archaeological investigations; access and interpretation; public realm improvements; and the maintenance of heritage assets.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>'In kind' payments may include land transfers which enable the transfer of an 'at risk' building as part of a comprehensive regeneration scheme. Inclusion of these types of activities within the infrastructure list would ensure that it would be possible to fund appropriate initiatives which deliver necessary infrastructure that also help to conserve and enhance the historic environment. This should be fully informed by an up-to-date and relevant evidence base which could provide a useful insight into any project opportunities.</p>	<p>Support for reference to assets at risk is welcomed. Evidence would be provided at application stage, and it is not within the remit of the SPD to set this out.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>No changes are proposed to the objectives regarding heritage related obligations (section 30 page 46 –47) other than to reflect the adoption of the Local Plan (2018) and Rural Neighbourhood Plan (2018). Hence, we have no specific comments to make on the amended draft.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>Historic England support the LPA's ongoing commitment to secure planning obligations to conserve and enhance the historic environment, when necessary, in line with Local Plan Policy QP1 (Planning Obligations).</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>Section 30 of the draft SPD adequately addresses when planning obligations can be effective in funding improvements to, and mitigating adverse impacts upon, the historic environment.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>None.</p>