

RESPONSES TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

% shown are for those who answered the question, not everyone answered every question.

Question	YES	NO	Survey Comments	Respondent	NP Response
Do you agree with the Vision set out above?	98%	2%	I can't imagine why anyone wouldn't agree with the Vision. It almost sounds like the town as it used to be.	DL5 5LG	The vision was developed using phrases or comments by residents and confirmed via an on-line poll
			This hopefully lets everyone know that the town and it's residents are important.	DL5 4TS	
			It's good all round vision for our town.	Katie Flanagan	
			Pleasant – healthier	DL5 4UY	
			It's a pity this didn't happen years ago	David Peacock	Viability has been considered at all stages and where possible/applicable an additional policy or clarification has been included
			Persimmon Homes are generally supportive of the proposed vision statement of the Great Aycliffe Neighbourhood Plan. We approve of the encouragement of high quality housing provision which will help the Local Planning Authority boost significantly the supply of housing which is a Central Government policy goal (NPPF para 47). However in order to support the continued provision of new housing within Great Aycliffe policies contained within the GANP must be careful not to	Persimmon Homes	

			<p>7undermine the deliverability of future development through the adoption of obligations and policies which threaten sites ability to be developed viably.</p> <p>A green and attractive..town with only 1 possible high street that seems to be governed by a London based company</p> <p>I agree with some of it but not all.</p>	<p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p>	
Do you agree with the objectives for Environment or have any comments?	96%	4%	<p>Whilst green areas are important, in a growing society where homes have many vehicles this should be overlooked to improve congestion and risky parking</p> <p>Newton Aycliffe must keep keep it's green spaces. All new build houses must cater for cars. Bigger garages are needed, cars have become bigger, but in many cases the garages are too small</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> as long as dcc don't over rule the plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I think it is extremely important to prioritise alleviating parking problems especially in the old part of town by reducing slightly green spaces to make overall area more pleasant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>-</p> <p>Ian Gray</p> <p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p>	<p>This has been clearly shown as important to residents through consultation. The Heritage and Character Assessment has supported this further.</p>

		<p>Partnership working with all the relevant agencies is essential to ensure we have an environment that is well looked after and protected for the benefit of the public.</p> <p>I do think it is very important to find the balance between green spaces and parking. I have suggested in the past that using smaller green spaces for the greatly needed parking and keep the larger green spaces.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is essentially the same as the Vision statement ... and Objective 1 is EXACTLY the same as Objective 3</p> <p>It's a long time coming</p> <p>I live in middle of Greathead Crescent and been trying to get more parking spaces for years and never nothing gets done. I am disabled and sometimes I can't even park outside my house. Livin wouldn't gl've me a drive as there is a tiny piece of grass outside my house that belongs to DCC. Other tenants around newton Aycliffe have the drives and some don't even have a car. I am disabled and need my car to go even round the corner but I still have the stress of parking near so I can get to my house. I just have 1 car</p>	<p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>-</p> <p>David Peacock</p> <p>Allison White</p>	<p>Policies GNAP H3, H4 and H5 deal with parking issues and provisions are set out for larger developments to ensure the same problems to not occur in the future.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>the other 3 houses next to me have 7 cars in total.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes generally agree with the environmental objectives of the GANP however as will be discussed we have concerns that in some instances policies conflict to some degree to the stated objectives</p> <p>Otherwise it becomes boring concrete and brick</p> <p>Stop infill housing to protect the open spaces.</p> <p>Parking is a must within the town areas..we have by far too much green areas beside streets that can be utilised for car parking, shafto way especialy, it is fancy to say, green spaces be kept, but not and I state..not..at the cost of possible accidents due to cars parked on a main road</p> <p>It is not only Aycliffe Village that needs protecting many parts of Aycliffe do to..</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes</p> <p>DL5 5RA</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p>	
Policy GANP CH1 Landscape Character and Townscape	99%	1%	<p>as above</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Maintaining the unique character of the</p>	DL5 4QJ	

		<p>town is crucial.</p> <p>See above ... redundant</p> <p>Only on the bigger green areas not little bits of grass outside my house</p> <p>Persimmon Homes generally support the proposed CH1 Policy. However, flexibility should be incorporated into the policy by adding “In particular, new development should where it is possible and appropriate.” Currently the draft policy reads that all existing hedgerows and trees should be retained. Often it is not possible or safe to retain all hedgerows and trees within a development site as there tends to be a some removal required to either facilitate the development or because the tree is dead, diseased or unsafe. Policy E4 of the GANP reflects this understanding that tree removal is occasionally required however currently as drafted there is a conflict between policy CH1 and E4. It is suggested the Policy CH1 is revised to align with policy E4. Additionally with regards to the provision of onsite green space on smaller sites it may not be appropriate to provide onsite green space as the level of development may result in</p>	<p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>-</p> <p>Allison White</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>Careful consideration has been given to all of these comments and some minor wording changes have been made where possible and appropriate – without allowing too much space for ‘interpretation’ by developers.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>a requirement to provide an area of green space insufficient to be usable and which adds no great benefit in enhancing the aesthetics. In these instances often a S106 contribution is more appropriate to improve existing off site green space in the vicinity.</p> <p>Protect the green heart of the town</p> <p>This is a very important factor.</p> <p>This policy is of key importance to protect the appearance and 'feel' of the town.</p> <p>Although his policy refers to 'townscape' in its title, it is predominantly referring to landscape. Subsequent policies, however, refer to the 'settlement and landscape character' (Policy GANP H4) and 'maintaining the unique character of the area' (Policy GANP DB1). It would be helpful to provide greater clarity on settlement or townscape character, and what would be expected from new development. The Heritage and Character Assessment might be helpful in providing this, in particular its identification and assessment of difference character areas.</p>	<p>DL5 4EE</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>DL5 5PS</p> <p>Historic England</p>	<p>Section 106 will also be used if a developer has given clear reasons for no inclusion of green space.</p> <p>The wording of the title was suggested by the Planning Authority</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>The approach set out within Policy GANP CH1 is generally supported as it seeks to ensure development proposals provide a robust landscape design that incorporates the ‘vision’ of Lord Beveridge. Indeed, the draft SPD prepared by DCC fully reflects this objective. However, it is noted that all proposals are inherently different and the approach taken to landscape design will vary from site to site. Therefore, to provide additional flexibility within the policy, we would recommend a minor amendment to the wording.</p> <p>As currently drafted, Policy GANP CH1 explains that “In, particular, new development should:”, however it is considered appropriate for this to be amended to “<u>Wherever possible</u>, new development should:” This amendment would ensure that the landscape character and townscape is maintained through development proposals, whilst providing sufficient flexibility to take into consideration the context of specific sites.</p> <p>Criteria 2 ‘Tree-lined avenues’: This implies that ALL roads should be tree-lines. This should be clarified, eg does this mean main routes within a scheme rather than all roads?</p>	<p>Barton Willmore</p>	<p>‘Wherever possible’ allows too much scope for interpretation for developers to state – it is not possible.</p> <p>The aim is to start with a ‘tight’ policy</p>
			<p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>This has been clarified and main thoroughfares added.</p>

			Also, there is an issue in respect of who will maintain the trees once development is complete given that they will be located within the adopted highway outside of domestic curtilages.		Added to the policy that this will be through the use of a Legal agreement and/or through adoption process.
Policy GANP CH2 Protection of Accessible Local Green Space Designations	97%	4%	<p>People need green spaces</p> <p>as above</p> <p>I agree except for slight reduction to alleviate parking. This will be one off change only as all new developments have to include parking</p> <p>Over development of the town must be avoided whilst still retaining the lovely green feel of the town.</p> <p>Whilst I agree on the whole, the field adjacent to Woodham School is also used for recreational purposes but this is never mentioned.</p> <p>what are the special circumstances? Certain areas – Simpasture Park?!</p> <p>it would be an error to agree or not until 'special circumstances' and 'certain criteria' are clearly and specifically</p>	<p>Ian Gray</p> <p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>Peter Davies</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Information regarding the full policies and details about the special circumstances was explained on a number of occasions and at various meetings. It was clarified that</p>

		defined.			the detailed planning policies should be open so they could be referred to when completing the questionnaire as the special circumstances were detailed in the full policy.
		Should be left green		Christopher Peacock	
		Special circumstances!		Barbara Clare	
		What are special circumstance and who decides		DL5 4UY	
		Need to know what 'special circumstances'		Mike Dixon	
		What determins exceptional circumstances		DL5 7HR	
		(1) GATC and DCC land is *NOT* automatically safe and should be identified also as development or protected open space amenity land. (2) the land at the south end of Site N, Burnhill Way, is designated for DCC development and cannot be protected – however, there is a small triangle of raised ground at the north end, immediately adjacent to the SUDS nature reserve, which should be so designated. (3) is there a process to add plots as time goes on – are there set reviews?		John Clare	Land shown at south end of Site N – WV4 priority code changed to 5 – potential for development
		They should help us genuine disabled		Allison White	

		<p>people to be able to park close to our houses. Sometimes I've had to stay in the car until a car has moved as I'm too far away from house</p> <p>Paragraph 76 of the NPPF sets out Local Communities through neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. Paragraph 77 adds however that local designations should only be used; o Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; o Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and o Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. The Local Green Open Spaces table at appendix 3 appears to consider all green spaces against the criteria set out within paragraph 77 of the framework. However as the Local Green Spaces Map in Appendix 4 does not indicate the mapping code to which each space relates its is difficult to ascertain if the assessment criteria has been met in that</p>	Persimmon Homes	These points are already shown in the justification
--	--	--	-----------------	---

		<p>sites which do not meet all of the above criteria are not proposed to be afforded local green space designation. Any site which fails to meet any one of the above criteria should not be designated as local green space. Additionally the safeguarding of non appropriate green spaces for specifically public off street parking only in addition to the designation of spaces which do need meet the assessment criteria in full could potentially discount a number of potential infill development sites from coming forward which would in other instances be appropriate for development under policy H1 of the GANP. It is therefore suggested the mapping codes be added to the green space map and that only sites which meet the paragraph 77 assessment criteria in full be considered for local green space designation.</p> <p>The criteria needs to be clearly specified and agreed by general public.</p> <p>What are the special circumstances</p> <p>The guidance set out within draft Policy GANP CH2 is generally supported as it identifies local green spaces within Newton Aycliffe which are of importance</p>	<p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>Owen Dickinson</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p>	<p>The green spaces marked for safeguarding have all been considered appropriate. There is a priority code allocated to each space. It is acknowledged that there may be discussions needed in the future regarding requests for in-fill development, these will be discussed in detail at the pre-application advice stage.</p> <p>Noted - a legend will be included</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>to local residents and which help maintain the Beveridge “Vision” within the existing settlement. We have not objection to the areas of local green space identified within Appendix C, whoever consider that Appendix D would benefit from the inclusion of a legend. There are two shading of green on the map therefore it would be beneficial to clarify the areas of land which are being referenced.</p> <p>The proposed sites should be more clearly identified on the Map on page 75. In relation to two specific sites we would make the following comments (also shown on the accompanying Plan):</p> <p>The site knows as ‘Agnew 5’ forms a part of the development site for Chapel Homes that now has planning approval for the whole site and is underway, including the area in the south-west corner of the site shown as Local Green Space in Appendix D. As such the Local Green Space designation should be removed as it cannot override the planning consent already in place.</p> <p>Site ‘N’ Cobbler’s Hall – the southern half of this site is shown as Local Green Space. It is DCC owned and may have</p>	<p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Noted and removed.</p> <p>Noted and priority code changed from 1 – high priority for development to 5 – may</p>
--	--	---	------------------------------	--

			potential for development in the future so DCC object to the inclusion of about half of the site as Local Green Space, Should any development be brought forward on the site in the future it would have to conform to the requirements of Policy GANP CH1, so there would be a requirement for appropriate green open space to maintain the Beveridge vision		have potential for development
Policy GANP CH3 Existing Amenity Open Spaces & Recreational Areas	96%	4%	<p>Need to know exceptions</p> <p>dcc will anyway money talks</p> <p>Certain Parks</p> <p>Alternative sites for development must be identified to protect the open space feel that exists in the town currently.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>See 4</p> <p>what would be an exceptional circumstance?</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances?</p> <p>This policy is worded incorrectly and should read"...should not be built on except in very special circumstances</p>	<p>DL5 7YF</p> <p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Peter Davies</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>-</p> <p>DL5 5AZ</p> <p>Barbara Clare</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>Information regarding the full policies and details about the exceptions was explained on a number of occasions and at various meetings. It was clarified that the detailed planning policies should be open so they could be referred to when completing the questionnaire as the exceptions were set out within the full policy.</p> <p>Statistics for Great Aycliffe show a higher than average aging population. Some</p>

		<p>such as;" As policy CH3 correctly identifies within its justification the latest Open Space Needs Assessment of Newton Aycliffe does identify that there is an undersupply of parks and gardens; outdoor sports and play space; semi natural green space and allotments. Therefore it is correct to protect existing provisions of these forms of open space. However the same assessment identified that the area has significantly more amenity open space than is required by the Council's standards with 115.81Ha of amenity open space provided against a requirement of 26.16Ha. This is not to say that there should be a race to the bottom to develop upon all of the surplus amenity open space in with Newton Aycliffe, however provisions should be made to allow infill development of existing amenity open space which can be evidenced to be of poor quality or surplus to requirements and through the development of which would provide significant public benefits which outweighs its loss as amenity green space.</p> <p>Who will determine the exceptions?</p>	DL5 5RA	<p>wording changes have been made – 'the following' has been inserted before 'very special circumstances' Policy GANP CH3.</p> <p>Point 2 now says and/or quality in a suitable location</p> <p>Set out in the policy. The Planning Authority would have the final say.</p>
--	--	---	---------	---

			<p>I would suspect this should be the case, but then I am also aware, council have ways to do as they prefer and can change a directive to suit</p> <p>To be clearly specified and agreed by general public</p> <p>Further to our comments for Policy GANP CH2, it would be considered beneficial to identify existing Amenity Open Spaces and Recreational Areas as part of a legend within Appendix D. This would ensure that there is no confusion as to which areas of land are being referenced as part of the draft Policy.</p> <p>Criteria 5: remove the '5' and change this into a paragraph at the end of the policy, rather than a criteria.</p>	<p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>This has been considered but it was felt that it would make the map too confusing. A legend will be added.</p> <p>Moved to justification.</p>
Policy GANP E1 Green Corridors	99%	1%	<p>as above</p> <p>cycleways linking workplaces crucial</p> <p>And green corridors which join with (and join up) green spaces should be built into planning applications</p> <p>It would be helpful if the "Green Corridors" to be protected under policy E1</p>	<p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Peter Davies</p> <p>John Clare</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>The green corridors have been mapped and will be</p>

			<p>were mapped wither on the Green Space Designations Map or on their own map. This will clearly define to which areas the protection is afforded.</p> <p>The Commissioners' support the guidance contained within Policy GANP E1 which seeks to maintain and enhance green corridors as part of new development proposals.</p> <p>First sentence replace 'favoured' with 'encouraged'</p> <p>Second sentence remove 'etc'</p>	<p>Barton Willmore</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>included.</p> <p>Favoured changed to preferred</p> <p>removed</p>
Policy GANP E2 Aycliffe Village Green Wedges	93%	7%	<p>Whilst I understand the concerns of the village residents, there is a greater need for housing and I feel that all areas should be considered equally for housing.</p> <p>Is this also subject to 'exceptional circumstances' hinted at above?</p> <p>Essential</p> <p>It will also protect the arceological remains in the area hopefully</p> <p>Don't know enough about this to comment either way.</p>	<p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>-</p> <p>John Clare</p> <p>Wendy Hillary</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p>	

		<p>There is no point in having a village if it is allowed to merge with modern development from the town</p> <p>On review of draft Policy GANP E2 and the supporting evidence base, the Commissioners' object to the inclusion of a proposed Green Wedge to the north and south of Aycliffe Village.</p> <p>In the first instance, it is considered that the proximity of Aycliffe Village to the wide range of employment opportunities contained within Aycliffe Business Park make it a sustainable location to accommodate some level of growth over the emerging Plan period. However, the inclusion of a Green Wedge on the edge of Aycliffe Village will limit the opportunity for development to come forward. Given that the overall housing requirement to be allocated towards Newton Aycliffe has yet to be determined as part of the emerging CDP, the Parish Council is not considered to be justified in its approach for limiting where development can come forward.</p> <p>Indeed, whilst it is appreciated that Policy GANP E2 seeks to ensure that Aycliffe Village maintains its own identity, the Policy is not supported by any evidence</p>	<p>DL5 5PS</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p>	<p>The designation of a green wedge is more appropriately a neighbourhood function</p> <p>Changes to the policy wording are not required</p>
--	--	---	---------------------------------------	--

		<p>to justify the necessity or size of the designation. Moreover, given that land to the north of Aycliffe Village falls largely within the ownership of the Commissioners', they are in a unique position to deliver an area of separation as part of any future development proposals. In particular, future development provides the opportunity for landscape-led development which can better define the two settlement boundaries.</p> <p>As such, a more appropriate approach would be to remove the Green Wedge designations from the draft GANP so that they can be examined in greater detail as part of the emerging CDP. This will allow DCC to take a holistic approach towards strategic growth and ensure that development comes forward in the most sustainable locations. This would also provide a more suitable opportunity to identify areas of Green Wedge to protect against development in less sustainable areas.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is considered that the wording to Policy GANP E2 could be amended to achieve the same objective, as follows:</p> <p>"The separation distance between</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Aycliffe Village and Newton Aycliffe will be maintained through the protection and enhancement of the open areas and undeveloped land around Aycliffe Village”</p> <p>The proposed amendment would ensure that any future development proposals are required to respect the separation distance between Aycliffe Village and Newton Aycliffe. The need for inclusion of green wedges could then be taken into greater consideration as part of the emerging CDP.</p> <p>Add ‘s’ to the title ‘Aycliffe Village Green Wedges’.</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of this policy as follows: ‘The separation between Aycliffe Village and Newton Aycliffe will be maintained through the protection and enhancement of the open areas and with amenity value; and green, undeveloped land around Aycliffe Village that are defined as green wedges on the Proposals Map E2. Shown below, Aycliffe Village Green Wedge’.</p>	Durham County Council	<p>‘s’ added</p> <p>These have been noted and policy wording amended.</p>
Policy GANP E3 Conservation Area of Aycliffe Village	96%	4%	<p>Same answer as before</p> <p>may be</p>	<p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>DL5 4QJ</p>	

		<p>No comment here as I can see both sides and there is a need to protect certain areas but not the whole village.</p> <p>How will it do that? Specifically.</p> <p>While we welcome a specific policy dedicated to the Conservation Area, it would be helpful to expand the detail within this policy to provide far greater clarity to future developers, and in particular how new development should enhance its character and appearance. In addition, there is enormous potential for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify positive actions which might be taken by the community to benefit the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Heritage and Character Assessment provides an excellent basis for expanding this policy, identifying issues to be addressed, as well as management principles. For example, the Assessment document recognises that the Conservation Area does not currently have a Conservation Area Appraisal, and suggests supporting the local authority in preparing both the appraisal and Management Plan to aid understanding of the special character and appearance of</p>	<p>Katie Flangan</p> <p>-</p> <p>Historic England</p>	<p>Sedgefield Borough Council undertook a Conservation Area Appraisal in the past.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			<p>the conservation area and to inform future decisions and development.</p> <p>Change title to 'Conservation Area of Great Aycliffe'.</p> <p>Amend policy wording to align with NPPF as follows: Any development in, or affecting the setting of the Conservation Area of Aycliffe Village must demonstrate how the proposal sustains and protects, enhances reinforces and retains the character and appearance significance of the conservation area in a design statement accompanying any planning applications.</p> <p>Also, 'The design statement must at a minimum address the following topics:'</p>	Durham County Council	<p>The conservation area refers to Aycliffe Village added to policy title</p> <p>Noted and amended</p> <p>'at a minimum' included</p> <p>An additional paragraph added in the justification to take into account other comments</p>
Policy GANP E4 Existing Tree Retention and Removal	97%	3%	<p>Yes. We presently suffer from over-enthusiastic people hacking down bushes and trees on land that is not theirs eg Bridleway behind Zetland Hunt.</p> <p>It appears that trees are sometimes cut down, without due cause or notification.</p> <p>Great Aycliffe is noted for its variety of</p>	DL5 7LH DL5 5LG	A Tree Policy is in place. The Town Council always notifies tree removal in the media unless the work is work is of an urgent nature to deal with a dangerous tree.

		<p>trees and this must be maintained and where possible enhanced.</p> <p>Any trees that are cut down for disease anywhere in the town should be replaced.</p> <p>If trees are taken down from an area they should be replaced in that area to retain the atmosphere and appearance of the site</p> <p>This is an intrinsic conflict within Policy E4 as it states that where the removal of a tree is proposed the developer is required to replace at least two of similar amenity value on site (i.e. 2 for 1 replacement) whilst adding that where a group of trees are removed a similar number (i.e. 1 for 1) must be replaced in a nearby suitable location. Persimmon Homes would propose that the policy be amended to suggest that as a minimum there should be no net loss of trees as a result of development.</p> <p>There are too many large trees situated near houses – if any further trees are to be planted make sure that they are far enough away from dwellings and are trimmed regularly</p>	<p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>DL5 5RA</p> <p>Wendy Hillary</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p> <p>Ann Masson</p>	<p>Noted - The number differences exist as in a group of trees many may be of little amenity value and only a limited number of trees would have been worth saving.</p> <p>Policy amended to state ‘... that propose a nett loss of trees will only be supported...’</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Aycliffe is well known for this therefore it must be kept.</p> <p>Must be policed to prevent trees shrubs etc being accidentally removed by contractors working on agnew5</p> <p>Change title to 'Existing Tree – Retention and Removal'</p> <p>Move the last sentence/para 'New developments that propose the loss of existing trees will only be supported if there is a compensatory mitigation proposal which forms part of the submission' to the beginning of the policy.</p> <p>Sentence/para 'New development proposals will be expected to have regard to the local distinctive landscape character of great Aycliffe and in particular to retain tree lines avenues where they exist. As with Criteria 2 of Policy CH1, there is an issue in respect of who will maintain the trees (in avenues) once development is complete, given that they will be located within the adopted highway outside of domestic curtilages.</p> <p>Delete 'The planting of additional trees</p>	<p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>Susan Peacock</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>This should help mitigate this happening in the future</p> <p>Noted and added to policy title for clarification</p> <p>Noted and moved</p> <p>Noted and clarification added that this would be through a legal agreement or through the adoption process</p> <p>Noted and deleted as the</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>and provision of tree lines avenue on main thoroughfares should be included in new developments, particularly species that are in keeping with the character of the area.' as this is covered in the 1st criteria of Policy CH1.</p> <p>Justification – this section needs to be beefed up more in respect of maintenance issues</p>		policy deals with existing trees
<p>Policy GANP E5 Tree Protection Protection of existing trees within new development</p>	97%	3%	<p>See above</p> <p>The woods outside our back has huge trees and some are far to tall they haven't been cut for years. We live in fear some days when we have storms as if the tree ever up rooted and the tree falls inwards we will be killed</p> <p>This could extend beyond development to woodland management in places such as Woodham Woods and Byerley Park. There seems to be a lot of trees being cut down with nothing planted to replace them.</p> <p>Housing builders. Should NOT plant trees too close to new developments, this may and can cause hardship on grounds near housing</p>	<p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Allison White</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p>	

			<p>Change title to 'Protection of existing trees within new development'</p> <p>Justification – After the first sentence insert 'Therefore the trees identified are to be protected during development and in the long term, after construction'.</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Noted and amended</p> <p>Noted and wording added to the policy for clarification.</p>
Do you agree with the objectives for Housing?	96%	4%	<p>Particularly relevant is the need for 2 bedroomed bungalows - not sheltered housing or care homes. Installing solar panels in ALL new houses is achievable and cost-efficient.</p> <p>Future developments must also ensure it meets the needs of people with special needs not just older persons, and the policy needs to ensure that housing developments for people with special needs and older people are integrated into the whole development and not segregated into "ghettos"</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I do feel that residents local to each site should be able to have some input into suggested buildings.</p> <p>I have always said that new</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>Vince Crosby</p>	<p>Installing solar panels in ALL new builds would not be viable. Technology is advancing very quickly and is a relatively new area which would make pre-installed panels obsolete very quickly.</p> <p>The housing policies try to achieve this.</p>

			<p>developments should have renewable energy built in as standard</p> <p>But there is a need one bed one bedroom accommodation</p> <p>1 bedroom houses should be pursued for single people 5% of all new builds. Bungalows for disabled and elderly should be built regardless of location at least 10% off al builds</p> <p>More AFFORDABLE bungalows should be approved to allow mobility of the housing stock to enable those who no longer require family size homes to move in to more suitable accommodation so freeing up larger homes for families in the area</p> <p>I need help with getting parked outside house so either the council and Livin get together and give me a drive like everyone else or u give me a disabled bay outside my home. I also have a mobility scooter but unfortunately I sometimes can't use it as I can't get access to my boot due to not having a parking spot</p> <p>I would like to see all older people's</p>	<p>DL5 4UY</p> <p>J. Hannah</p> <p>Wendy Hillary</p> <p>Allison White</p> <p>DL5 5LY</p>	<p>New legislation for Building Regulations is in place</p> <p>Policy H7 tries to deal with the need for 1 bed accommodation in a flexible manner by having a multifunctional room.</p> <p>Viability and the cost of providing bungalows will always be an issue for developers</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>homes have a shower room and wheelchair access to many properties in Aycliffe don't have access for disabled</p> <p>With regards to objective 5 – Housing, Persimmon Homes object to the specific objectives a) b) and c) which support the provision of 2 bed and older person's accommodation whilst discouraging one bed accommodation. There is no evidence to suggest there is currently an undersupply of older person's accommodation or 2 bed properties or an oversupply of one bed properties to justify the objectives. Contrary the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies that in South Durham supply matches demand for all types and sizes of dwelling from bungalows to detached dwellings ranging from one to five bed. It is therefore suggested that it would be more appropriate for the objective to be to ensure that future developments provide a range and mix of housing to widen housing choice and to meet the identified needs of the area. Subsequently the Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out by, and update regularly by Durham County Council, will inform the size and type of housing which should be supported within the area.</p>	Persimmon Homes	<p>These are the guidance criteria set out in the NPPF</p> <p>County Durham SHMA 2016 provides the evidence for this policy.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------	--

			<p>More bungalows are required as Newton Aycliffe has a lot of older residents but younger people are also interested</p> <p>Don't think solar panels are a must</p> <p>More Elderly persons housing needed less non affordable new housing. Let's develop what we have and help sell houses in the less desirable areas of Newton Aycliffe</p> <p>One bedroom properties are important and should not be avoided as they serve an important mix of housing.</p> <p>We need one bedroom housing for young people</p>	<p>Ann Masson</p> <p>DL5 5AY</p> <p>DL5 5EE</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>Owen Dickinson</p>	
<p>Policy GANP H1 In-Fill Developments and Small Sites</p>	87%	13%	<p>Should only be on existing brownfield sites.</p> <p>Yes subject to comments from residents in immediate vicinity</p> <p>There should be no infill developments</p> <p>Slight contrdction to with question 11</p> <p>Carefully – priority to brownfield</p>	<p>DL5 7YF</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>DL5 5RA</p> <p>DL5 4UY</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p>	

		<p>Local feelings should be thought about. What does proportionate mean. Avoid.</p> <p>This contradicts Policy GANP3 and makes a nonsense of your whole Plan. This ***MUST*** be deleted.</p> <p>We have been very lucky and in many cases enjoyed an open aspect across and the leisure benefits if vast areas that were always designated for development. The original plan, a garden city, will protect the neighbourhoods features when development arises.</p> <p>Very sad to see the packed housing now on the Cobbler's Hall field and the 'protected' newts have probably moved as far away as possible. Shame that another large development is in progress alongside Woodham playground. Both of these spaces were well used by local people including doggy walkers but especially children to play games.</p> <p>We already put up with the smells from the Trading Estate.</p> <p>Not tacking up valuable public amenity space</p>	<p>Peter Davies</p> <p>John Clare</p> <p>Rebecca Barnett</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p>	<p>This area had been earmarked for development for a number of years and is only now coming to fruition</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Brown field priority</p> <p>The approach set out in Policy GANP H1 is generally supported however it is considered that additional clarification is required to establish how the approach to in-fill development will work alongside draft Policies GANP CH1, CH2 and CH3. In particular, for draft Policy H1 to be effective, it would be considered beneficial to reference within the Policy the areas of land which are to be protected as accessible local green space through Policy GANP CH2.</p> <p>Is the policy about ‘Infill Developments and Small Sites’? If yes add to title, if not delete reference to small sites in policy.</p> <p>Need to define what a site is (if included in policy) EG Would it be up to and include 29 with ref to policy DB1 which is 30+ to give coverage across all site sizes</p> <p>Policy should be broken down into criteria as follows:</p> <p>Permission will be granted for suitable in-fill developments and small sites. These must be: *proportionate to the scale of the</p>	<p>Owen Dickinson</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Additional clarification added in the justification and amendments made to the policy</p> <p>Small Sites added to the title but reference to small sites left in the policy as it clarifies housing numbers.</p> <p>Reference to small sites left other wording amended</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>settlement and within built up areas, *respect the character and form of the settlement settlement and landscape character of the locality and *not physically extend the settlement be well contained.</p> <p>It must clearly relate to part of an established settlement and not isolated dwellings</p> <p>Justification – Action there is a need to state in the justification that the issue of isolated dwellings is addressed at para 55 of the NPPF.</p>		<p>Clarification added in justification Para 55 of NPPF</p> <p>This has been added.</p>
Policy GANP H2 Dwellings Appropriate to the Needs of Residents	96%	4%	<p>As I mentioned earlier, there is a huge need for bungalows, particularly for the 'baby boomers'.</p> <p>Developing co-operative models: self built</p> <p>Why not 100%</p> <p>Should we suggest more than 25%</p> <p>Would prefer 100%, but understand the constraints.</p> <p>A minimum is a good starting point, perhaps a preferred target should be given?</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p> <p>K Crosby</p> <p>Peter Davies</p> <p>John Clare</p>	

			<p>Persimmon Homes have serious concerns surrounding the economic viability implications of the proposed policy to require a minimum of 25% of any 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings to be delivered to the Lifetime Homes Standard. A similar policy was proposed within the County Durham Plan prior to its withdrawal which proposed that as an alternative to providing 10% of private or intermediate housing in the form of housing to meet older persons needs defined as; level access flats; bungalows; sheltered housing or extra care scheme; or housing products that can be shown to meet the specific needs of a multigenerational family, 10% of the total units on site could be delivered to a Lifetime Homes Standard. The GANP goes significantly further than what was previously proposed in the CDP by proposing to require 10% of all housing provision to be specifically bungalows under policy H7 in addition to 25% of all 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings to be provided to Lifetime Homes Standard. Policy H2 justification sets out that the 2013 SHMA report supplies the evidence base for housing need however it is unclear as to where this justification stems from and</p>	Persimmon Homes	<p>Noted</p> <p>Reference added to Building for Life 12 and Code for Sustainable Homes as legislation has changed since the plan commenced.</p> <p>A neighbourhood plan can ask for more but it cannot say no to development.</p>
--	--	--	---	-----------------	---

			<p>therefore what the evidence base for imposing the requirement is. Whilst the SHMA shows that older people would like to move to other types of housing, it is unclear as to why the requirement is set at 25%. The Lifetime Homes website sets out that the cost of providing a dwelling to Lifetime Homes Standards can add between £545 to £1,615 to the construction cost of a dwelling. Therefore the proposed policy will create a significant economic impact on the viability of development sites, particularly those on the margins on economic viability, and therefore will delay or stop development coming forward constraining the delivery of all forms of housing required to meet the future needs of residents within Aycliffe. Persimmon Homes do not believe that the financial implications, and subsequently the delivery implications, of the implementation of policy H2 have been fully considered. The NPPF is clear and sets out in paragraph 173 that pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viability is threaded. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal costs of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. Persimmon Homes object to, and request the deletion of policy H2 on the basis that the SHMA provides no justification for the requirement of 25% of properties to be Lifetime Homes Standards and because the introduction of such a policy would have economic implications which have not been fully considered and which would render many schemes, particularly those on the margins of viability, unviable which would delay or stop altogether much needed housing delivery required to boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with Central Government policy.</p>		noted
--	--	--	--	--	-------

		<p>Are these to be rented or purchased as more 1-2 bedroom rental properties required.</p> <p>A lot more bungalows should be available for the elderly, and not in block of flats 2 storeys high, main doors should not have power closers, a high majority of older people struggle to open doors because of this. Maybe more elder people should be on board planning committees, to aid younger people's perception of what is suitable for elders.</p> <p>Given that DCC's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will not be updated on a regular basis, and certainly not at the pace that the market can fluctuate, it is requested that the wording of Policy GANP H2 is amended.</p> <p>Indeed, the justification to draft Policy GANP H2 explains that the requirement towards Lifetime Homes Standards is based on the evidence contained within the County Durham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2013 Update. However, whilst the SHMA 2013 Update outlines the likely demographic shift towards an aging population, it sets no prescriptive target to deliver new dwellings at Lifetime Homes Standards.</p>	<p>Ann Masson</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p>	<p>Noted policy now refers to Building for Life 12 and Code for Sustainable Homes to mirror the emerging County Durham Plan</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>As such, it is considered more appropriate to allow a degree of flexibility and allow individual developments to take account of the context of the site, local character and market dynamics at the time of development. It is noted that DCC proposed a similar approach to meeting the needs of residents as part of draft Policy 31 of the CDP. Whilst the draft policy forms part of the now revoked Plan, it is considered to provide an appropriate approach as part of the emerging GANP – indeed the Inspector’s interim report raised no objection to the inclusion of the Policy as part of the CDP.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is proposed that draft Policy GANP H2 is replaced with the following text:</p> <p>“To contribute towards meeting the needs of Great Aycliffe’s ageing population we will require 10% of private or intermediate housing on sites of 0.5ha or 10 units or more which, in relation to design and house type, increase the housing options of older people. Appropriate house types considered to meet this requirement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level access flats; • Bungalows; 		
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheltered Housing or Extra Care Scheme; or • Housing products that can be shown to meet the specific needs of a multi-generational family. <p>All of these properties must be built to Lifetime Homes Standard.</p> <p>Where it can be demonstrated that this requirement would undermine the viability of the scheme, either in terms of financial viability or lack of market demand for these products, then as an alternative we will require at least 10% of the total units on the site to be of Lifetime Homes Standard.”</p> <p>The proposed approach would ensure that major residential developments make provision for properties to the Lifetime Homes Standards whilst ensuring sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of residents at the time an application is submitted. It is noted that the amended Policy includes provision for bungalows to come forward as part of a development proposal. Our comments for draft Policy GANP H2 should therefore be read alongside our comments to draft Policy GANP H7, below.</p> <p>25% of 5 no. or more dwellings or should</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>this be 20% of 5 no. or more dwellings or 25% of 4 no. or more dwellings to avoid ‘rounding off’ confusion when percentages are applied.</p> <p>In the policy itself you need to add a line about viability: ‘Unless it can be demonstrated by means of a viability study submitted by the developer that this requirement would undermine the viability of the scheme , either in terms of financial viability or lack of market demand for these products’.</p> <p>Justification – add the following in relation to viability Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision taking. Therefore, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’.</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Noted and clarified policy now states “ 25% of 4 or more ...”.</p> <p>Noted and added</p> <p>Noted and added</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------	---

Policy GANP H3 Parking Standards for New Residential Development	97%	3%	Developers should also have to have a minimum road width onto new estates. See the road into the Chestnuts as an eg of how NOT to do it. (I know the Chestnuts is DBC)	DL5 5LG	
			Yes I agree with this and do feel it is an issue in all areas of the town.	Katie Flanagan	
			2 parking spaces per house	DL5 5RA	
			K	Christopher Peacock	
			How does this apply in comparison to the national standard?	Mike Dixon	
			Essential	Peter Davies	
			Desperately needed. I would also up the minimum road width on new housing estates so they are wide enough for people to park on without blocking the traffic.	John Clare	
			It's not new development's it's the housing that is already built that obviously built all them years ago for 1 car each. Disabled people should get some help and support to park outside there home I've had no help or support even though	Allison White	

		<p>I've explained how difficult it is around my area. The other 2 sides of greathead have off road parking I'm opposite Dykes Walk where they have no parking at all and there is a huge green there that never gets used a car park section could be put there. I need someone to fight for me to get a drive.</p> <p>This is the biggest planning item that the original plans seem to be short on, because they were made without the expectation if a huge boom in car ownership. Parking space should never replace green space.</p> <p>Paragraph 39 of the Framework sets out that if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account: o The accessibility of the development; o The type, mix and use of development; o The availability of and opportunities for public transport; o Local car ownership levels; and o An overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles With consideration of the above Durham County Council have adopted parking standards which they apply across the county. The adopted parking</p>	<p>Rebecca Barnett</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>Noted and discussed with Durham County Council</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>requirements provide greater detail with regards to what type of parking spaces are required for a variety of different dwelling types including identifying proportions of parking spaces to be provided for visitor parking. Additionally they set out that on residential developments within 400m of Newton Aycliffe Town Centre a maximum of 1 car parking space per dwelling applies. This approach ensures that sufficient private and visitor car parking is provided within a development whilst car parking is provided within a development whilst also promoting alternative forms of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport particularly in sustainable town centre locations. Persimmon Homes are concerned that the proposed blanket car parking standards set out within Policy H3 are significantly higher than Durham County Council's current parking standards and do not appear to have been formulated with consideration of paragraph 39 in mind. The proposed standards appear to account only for private car parking spaces with no provision for public visitor parking. Additionally Policy H4 proposes to require that where a garage is provided it must be built to a minimum internal</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Public visitor parking is set out in Policy GANP DB1</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>dimensions of 6m x 3m for a single garage and 6m x 5.5m for a double garage to ensure a medium sized car can adequately fit in. Clarification within Policy H3 is therefore needed setting out that garages will be counted as a parking space provision. We believe that although the proposed parking standards are higher than those currently in use by DCC the proposed policy will not mitigate the issues noted as the justification for the policy namely to mitigate parking problems which exist elsewhere in the parish and to contribute towards a pleasant, uncluttered environment. The overprovision of private car parking spaces within a residential scheme will not alleviate existing car parking problems elsewhere in the Parish as they exist elsewhere road users will not , and cannot, use new residents' private car parking spaces and the existing problems experienced elsewhere in the town will persist. Additionally the provision of car parking standards to the level currently proposed in the GANP will not contribute towards a pleasant and uncluttered environment as in order to meet these standards significant levels of hard standing will be required to the front and side of new dwellings which reduce new</p>		<p>Noted and clarified within the policy - garages are counted as a parking space</p> <p>Wording clarified</p>
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>developments ability to provide attractive green frontages which would be in direct conflict with the GANP environmental objectives 2 and 3 which aim to allow grass to be retained as the dominant finish and to retain and protect the green and leafy character of the area. What the proposed standards will in fact achieve is residential developments which include less than average green spaces with more land dedicated to the provision of car parking spaces and drives resulting in areas which are dominated by the car and which in now way alleviate existing parking issues elsewhere in the town. Mitigation of any existing car parking issues will only be alleviated through the provision of more car parking spaces in those areas where the problem exists or by the reduction of private car usage through the promotion of alternative means of transport. The proposed parking standards will achieve neither. Therefore Persimmon Homes suggest that the proposed parking standards are either deleted from the GANP and DCC's parking standards be relied upon or that the proposed standards be reduced following their reconsideration in line with paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Further clarification is also needed within</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Policy H3 with regards to visitor parking provision, counting of garages as a parking space and the reduction of parking requirements in sustainable, town centre locations.</p> <p>As long as the parking is near the relevant house as people wont park their vehicles away from them.</p> <p>Old parts of the town suffer from lack of parking and garages.</p> <p>Pull-ins should be an essential inclusion when new builds are planned.</p> <p>Anything to relieve parking congestion is welcome.</p> <p>Durham County Council parking standards relate to a minimum number of parking spaces within the curtilage</p> <p>As your proposed standards are higher than those of the County Council, there should be an additional line in the policy and justification in regards to the issue of viability</p>	<p>Anne Masson</p> <p>DL5 5RA</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>DL5 5PS</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Noted – evidence from public consultation included in justification to support higher standards than DCC currently use.</p> <p>Viability added through Design and Access Statement for Development.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Policy GANP H4 Parking Mitigation	97%	3%2	Ideally yes. However, most families now have a minimum of 2 cars. Also, people (including me!!) don't use their garage, but park on their drive or on the roadside.	DL5 5LG	
			Yes I do agree - however, in reality, however many of these garages will be used for a car and not general storage (as new homes are known for their lack of built in storage space).	Katie Flanagan	
			But most families have 2 cars	DL5 5RA	
			But they must be used for cars not storage or running business from	J. Hannah	
			Average size car is not big enough. It should be large saloon	DL5 7DT	
			Modern garages built with houses are really not big enough...cars are larger than they were 40 years ago...most garages built on are not large enough for 4 wheel drives and become storage lockers instead. This is not appropriate. Build garages with usable dimensions fit for purpose.	Wendy Hillary	
			If policy H4 is pursued in requiring the proposed garage dimension Persimmon Homes would have to suggest that it is	Persimmon Homes	Noted and clarified Consultation evidence added

		<p>made clear that the garages are to be considered as a parking space. If it is not proposed to count garages as parking spaces then Persimmon Homes would strongly object to the policy H4 as sufficient parking spaces will already be provided in the form of parking spaces and drives such that there would be no need for additional garage spaces to be provided to enable a car to be stored within them.</p> <p>A necessity to modern living</p> <p>How many garages are used for car parking now even if the garage is of reasonable size?</p> <p>Installing driveways instead of widening possible roads to alleviate parking should be looked into more, instead of just going ahead and ignore parking issues directly before roads are built</p> <p>about time someone thought of this</p> <p>What is classed as a family sized car?</p> <p>Specific covenants and restrictions should be added to housing deeds when prevent change of use of garages</p>	<p>DL5 4EE</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>Susan Peacock</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p>	to justification
--	--	---	--	------------------

			<p>DCC adopted design guide says 2.6m x 5.5m for a single garage and 4.6m wide for a double. These are based on a standard vehicle dimensions. It is likely that larger 6m x 3m would be objected to by house-builders on the basis it affects their unit density, cost viability etc. It is appreciated that many garages are used for storage not parking, this is why we changed our parking standards to minimum in curtilage and largely ignore a garage as a parking area. Increasing the size of the garage will make no difference to their use.</p> <p>Justification – it is hard to see the link between a larger garage and traffic flow.</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Noted and discussed</p> <p>Comments and statistics from consultation have been included. Evidence to support residents will use larger garages or pay a small premium for one.</p> <p>Wording amended for clarification.</p>
Policy GANP H5 Provision of In-curtilage Parking and Storage	96%	4%	<p>The problem here lies with two car families and people being granted planning permission to convert garages into livin space</p> <p>Not possible – communal parking</p> <p>How close?</p> <p>Yes but never happens</p> <p>Persimmon Homes object to the proposed requirement to provide suitable</p>	<p>Vince Crosby</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p> <p>Peter Davies</p> <p>Allison White</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>bicycle parking and/or storage for all dwellings where no garage is proposed. We feel it is unjust to require bicycle storage / parking for all dwellings without a garage as this would add additional development costs to provide infrastructure which may not be used or wanted by future residents. If future residents want or need bicycle storage / parking infrastructure this can be purchased on an individual basis without putting further pressure on the deliverability of developments by requiring all garage free dwellings to provide potentially unwanted sheds / bicycle racks etc. Persimmon Homes suggest that rather than being required bicycle infrastructure provision should be encouraged within the cartilage of dwellings without garages.</p> <p>With 3 bins and a recycling box per property it would be good to see bin storage. Numerous places in the town look dreadful with these bins out front. Perhaps bring back the rear access footpath that was a feature of so many roads in the early days of the town?</p> <p>Anything to relieve parking congestion will be welcome</p>	<p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>DL5 5PS</p>	
--	--	---	----------------------------------	--

			The provision of secure storage such as cycle lockers may be resisted by developers	Durham County Council	Noted. This is instead of a garage to help with viability issues
Policy GANP H6 Energy Standards Securing Energy Efficient Homes	99%	1%	<p>Solar panels, as mentioned earlier really DO work. Even with our dull weather, water can be heated very cheaply/free.</p> <p>But at least 50% of all new builds should be solar to keep carbon footprint down</p> <p>Persimmon Homes object to Policy H6 as it is unnecessary as Code for Sustainable Homes has now been scrapped by the Government with the key energy efficiency measure now incorporated into Building regulations</p> <p>What is meant by highest, this should be to meet current or relevant standards at that time</p> <p>It is noted that the Government, through a written ministerial statement dated 25th March 2015, has revoked Code for Sustainable Homes and requires new developments to be considered against Building Regulations. As such, it is requested that draft Policy GANP H6 is updated with reference to Building</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>J. Hannah</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p>	<p>Solar panels still work even when it's not sunny just not at a higher capacity.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

		<p>Regulations to ensure that it accords with national policy on energy standards.</p> <p>Change title to 'Securing Energy Efficient Homes' (that is if the policy relates to housing development)</p> <p>Capitalise 'Code for Sustainable Homes'</p> <p>In the 2nd sentence replace 'will' with 'must'.</p> <p>Add a line about viability eg 'Unless it can be demonstrated by means of a viability study submitted by the developer that this requirement would undermine the viability of the scheme, either in terms of financial viability or lack of market demand for these products'.</p> <p>Remove the sentence starting with 'Conversely, development proposals that make little effort...'</p> <p>Justification – Add the following in relation to viability: 'Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Therefore,</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Policy wording amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Changed</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Removed</p> <p>added</p>
--	--	---	-----------------------	--

			development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’.		
Policy GANP H7 Bungalow Provision	97%	3%	<p>Yes, yes yes!!! This should be incorporated into every new development, nationwide!! We're always being told that the population is living longer. People want to remain independence, and not have to rely on their children.</p> <p>Not just for older people but for people with special needs also.</p> <p>My two sets of Grandparents live in bungalows on the town and their gardens are huge. Far too big for them to manage so I do think we need more bungalows with much smaller gardens.</p> <p>How does this fit with 13</p> <p>Though I think 10 percent is a small percentage given the aging population...if 20 percent were bungalows an equal proportion of family sized homes would be freed up for families to move into</p> <p>Persimmon Homes object to the requirement to deliver 10% dwellings on housing sites to be delivered as</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p> <p>Wendy Hillary</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	Noted additional information added in justification

			<p>bungalows as it is unclear where the justification stems from and therefore the evidence base for imposing the 10% requirement. The policy justification states that the 2013 SHMA provides the evidence base however although this document indicates that the county does have an aging population there is no clear indication that the older residents would seek to move specifically into a bungalow. Additionally Persimmon Homes do not believe that the cost implications of the proposed requirement of 10% bungalow provision has been fully and robustly tested with regards to its impact on the deliverability of the plan. We are concerned that the 10% bungalow provision could render new housing schemes unviable undermining their delivery and subsequently the deliverability of the plan as a whole. The implications of this is that potentially all types and forms of housing provision becomes constrained further narrowing the choice of high quality homes and opportunity for home ownership in the area contrary to paragraph 49 of the NPPF and paragraph 47 which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Persimmon Homes therefore object to, and request the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>deletion of policy H7 on the basis that the SHMA provides no justification for the requirement because the introduction of such a policy would have economic implications which have not been fully considered and which could render many schemes contrary to paragraph 173 of the NPPF which states that pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threaded. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal costs of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.</p> <p>The problem is getting the developers to do this</p>	Anne Masson	
--	--	--	-------------	--

		<p>Two bedrooms are better to cater for a carer to sleep if need be.</p> <p>Bungalows should be built on sustainable infill brownfield locations</p> <p>Very very important</p> <p>Whilst the objective of meeting the needs for older residents is supported, we have concern with the need to provide 10% bungalow provision on all new housing sites of 10 or more dwellings. Indeed, the SHMA 2013 Update provides no specific figure on the number of bungalows which will be required over the emerging Plan period. It is appreciated that the SHMA 2013 Update outlines that there is a shortfall of bungalows across County Durham however, without an understanding of the overall number of dwellings coming forward within the Neighbourhood Area, the inclusion of a 10% threshold is considered to be wholly arbitrary.</p> <p>Moreover, when the requirements set out in draft Policy GANP H2 are also taken into consideration, the draft GANP places significant limitations on the housing mix which can come forward as part of a major residential development.</p>	<p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>Brian Hall</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p>	Noted
--	--	---	--	-------

			<p>As such, and as highlighted above, it is considered appropriate to delete draft Policy GANP H7 as the requirements will be met through the proposed amendments to draft Policy GANP H2.</p> <p>Move the last sentence into the JUSTIFICATION 'Bungalows should normally be two bedrooms, or one bedroomed with a multi-functional room to provide for adaptable uses.'</p> <p>Add 'In applying these requirements we will consider the cost of developing the site and the impact of this on the viability of any proposed scheme. In circumstances where the viability of the scheme is in question, the developer will be required to demonstrate, to the Council's satisfaction that this is the case'</p> <p>Justification - Add the following in relation to viability: 'Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Therefore, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.'</p>	<p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Some wording amendments made. This is a key criteria for the policy.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p>
--	--	--	--	------------------------------	---

			Also add a sentence referring to feedback e.g. ‘feedback from consultation suggests that’		noted
Policy GANP H8 Affordable Housing	97%	3%	<p>Is it possible to define affordable?</p> <p>what about housing to rent ?</p> <p>don't know –‘affordable’ = what</p> <p>do not know</p> <p>There should be a caveat to prevent homes being sold to buy to let developers</p> <p>Policy H8 is somewhat confusing. It is unclear what this policy is seeking to achieve or support. The current requirements for affordable housing provision are set out in the Council's evidence base and in particular the SHMA (2013) and the CIL Viability Study (2014). In south Durham which</p>	<p>Kathleen Woodhams</p> <p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p> <p>K Crosby</p> <p>DL5 7DT</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>An affordable house is a house that you rent or buy, below the current market value. This is usually for approximately 80% of the amount you would pay on similar properties.</p> <p>You can get an affordable home in one of two ways: Rent a home (from registered housing providers, this includes former council housing) Buy a home (through Help to Buy schemes or low cost home ownership)</p> <p>Noted and some wording amendments to the policy made for additional clarification.</p>

		<p>includes Netwon Aycliffe the affordable housing requirement stands currently at 10%. Policy GANP H8 should support applications which meet the affordable housing requirement identified at the time subject to the criteria of bullet points 1, 2, 4 and 5. However Persimmon Homes object to the inclusion of bullet points 3 and 4 which state that applications will be supported if it is on a suitable, previously-developed site or, if no previously developed sites are available, it can be clearly demonstrated that there are no other suitable sites within the existing built up or developed parts of the Parish. This is a brownfield first policy which since the introduction of the NPPF is no longer aligned with National Policy. Although the 8th Core Planning Principle set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF “encourages the effective use of land that has been previously developed, it makes no reference prioritising previously developed land. Given the prioritisation of previously developed land does not coincide with National Policy Persimmon Homes suggest that bullet points 3 and 4 are deleted from Policy H8</p> <p>A lot of homes are expensive for what they are</p>	-	<p>Bullet points 3 and 4 deleted to help clarify the policy</p> <p>Deleted</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			Is it possible to define affordable?	Kathleen Woodhams	See above
			The inclusion of Policy GANP H8 is generally supported, however it is recommended that the wording of the policy is reviewed as it appears confusing in its current format. In particular, the criteria explains that priority will be given to previously developed sites when looking to bring forward affordable housing. However, as part of the justification, it explains that provision will also need to be made for affordable housing on large or strategic development sites – which will undoubtedly come forward on undeveloped land.	Barton Willmore	Wording amended and bullet points removed for clarity
			2 nd bullet point remove ‘... of people with local connection’ as this is more restrictive than national guidance allows.	Durham County Council	Acknowledged and removed
			PDL could this restrict development of affordable homes given that Newton Aycliffe by its nature has little in the way of brownfield land		
			Last sentence in policy replace ‘will be		Amended

			<p>too costly with 'making the scheme unviable'</p> <p>Justification – Need to clarify in the justification what the “defined local need” is? Was it or will it be defined through a local housing needs survey? Add the following in relation to viability: 'Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Therefore, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.'</p>		added
Policy GANP H9 Provision of Facilities and Services	100%		<p>Local type shops would be useful in some areas</p> <p>But what does appropriate new facilities on site mean.</p> <p>Particularly improved drainage. Newton Aycliffe is built on swamp land.</p> <p>When the Lanes were built I viewed the plan and there was no provision for play areas despite family homes being built</p>	<p>Kathleen Woodhams</p> <p>DL5 7YF</p> <p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>Ann Masson</p>	

		<p>Persimmon Homes suggest that the proposed H9 policy be reworded to read as follows “New development proposals must contribute towards sustainable development. All proposals for new housing should demonstrate provision of necessary new facilities on-site and / or provision of, or contribution to, necessary off-site facilities such as improved drainage, parks, play areas or footpaths as required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.” This Policy appears to seek to ensure that new developments either make sufficient on or off-site provision of necessary infrastructure and open space or that a contribution is secured via a planning obligation to improve off site facilities. Persimmon Homes suggest that further detail is added to the policy in accordance with paragraphs 203-206 of the NPPF to ensure that on-site / off-site provision or obligations are only required as and when the appropriate tests in paras 204 and 206 are met.</p>	Persimmon Homes	<p>Wording changed accordingly</p>
		<p>replace last sentence in the policy ‘Conversely, development proposals which limit the potential to enhance local facilities will not be permitted’ with the first sentence in the policy beginning with</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Added in justification</p> <p>Policy wording changed as per Persimmon comments</p>

			<p>'New development proposals ...' So policy starts with "All proposals..." and ends with current first sentence.</p> <p>Justification – Elaborate to explain why these specific off-site facilities have been listed.</p>		Not required
<p>Policy GANP AV1 Enhanced Bungalow Provision (Woodham Community College site), Land adjacent Woodham Community College</p>	97%	3%	<p>Absolutely agree. Older or disabled people need to be part of a community, not segregated. 20% would equate to 6 bungalows on a site of 30 dwellings, which sounds good to me.</p> <p>Any development here could impact on local housing and 100% bungalows might be preferable</p> <p>This area is of particular concern to us as we back on to this site. I am pleased that a larger percentage of bungalows has been agreed for this site. I would like to see more bungalows as I expect they will have less cars per household and traffic is a concern for any new development on this site.</p> <p>Bungalows</p> <p>Accessible bungalows</p> <p>Due to its proximity to town, and because</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>Christine Belwey</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>Peter Davies</p> <p>DL5 5LY</p> <p>Rebecca Barnett</p>	<p>More bungalows has been a constant request from residents.</p> <p>Unable to request 100%</p>

		<p>of the open enjoyed hitherto, this site would be ideal for 100% bungalow provision. Such a development would address the immediate and pressing need for such accommodation with minimum need for additional facilities and services</p> <p>Again for the reasons set out in Persimmon Homes' response to policy H7 Persimmon Homes objects to any requirement to deliver a proportion of new dwellings as bungalows</p> <p>In the title of the policies include 'Land adjacent to Woodham Community College'</p> <p>Will need more detailed justification for the 20% bungalow figure, e.g. via evidence from consultation</p> <p>Also as in previous policies you will need to add something about viability 'In applying these requirements we will consider the cost of developing the site and the impact of this on the viability of any proposed scheme. In circumstances where the viability of the scheme is in question, the developer will be required to</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>bungalows it would make the site unviable</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Title amended</p> <p>Additional information added in justification</p> <p>Added</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			demonstrate, to the Council's satisfaction that this is the case'		
Policy GANP AV2 Garden Provision (Woodham Community College site) Land Adjacent Woodham Community College	89%	11%	<p>Great idea, provided there is some way of ensuring the community space is accessible only by the residents on that site. Perhaps by use of a gated area, accessed only by using an electronic key/pass.</p> <p>The size of gardens must be a mixture so that people who like a nice decent size garden can have that choice.</p> <p>Mentioned in a previous comments.</p> <p>Residents should be responsible for some or all of the upkeep in their deeds</p> <p>Brilliant. Also stops that situation where older people cannot tend their gardens.</p> <p>If a greater percentage of bungalows is targeted, this would be an excellent opportunity for shared community space, perhaps along the lines of a distinct retirement village.</p> <p>This proposed policy further strengthens Persimmon Homes' concerns with regards to any requirement to deliver a proportion of all dwellings as bungalows.</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>DL5 5RA</p> <p>John Clare</p> <p>Rebecca Barnett</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>This policy should make the higher percentage of bungalows more viable.</p>

		<p>This policy recognises the financial impacts that providing bungalows has on the viability of future development. It recognises that the requirement of providing bungalows could undermine the deliverability of the site and as such makes provisions to lessen the financial impact though allowing smaller back gardens / community gardens.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the long term care of community gardens – you can't rely on community long term.</p> <p>As long as residents have a dedicated personal area to sit out in should they wish to do so.</p> <p>depends if housing associations, (as normal) reduce clean up/tidying of garden areas</p> <p>This development should contain a high provision of footpaths, drop kerbs. Also it needs to bright with an open feel with minimum large trees as the block light and cascade large quantity of leaves in winter requiring cleaning from gardens.</p> <p>Children need larger gardens</p>	<p>DL5 4EE</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 7EE</p> <p>Owen Dickinson</p>	<p>Concerns noted</p> <p>This is a detail of a planning application when submitted</p> <p>Noted and would be an element of the planning application when submitted</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Smaller gardens or community garden space will be acceptable on this site to allow for a larger number of bungalows to be provided and to accommodate older or less physically able residents who may not want to maintain large gardens. A flood risk assessment would need to be undertaken and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems incorporated as appropriate due previously identified surface water flood risk on site. Advice should be sought on an appropriate development buffer from Woodham Burn to prevent any significant adverse effects on the local nature reserve.</p>	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report - Durham County Council</p>	<p>Noted, already included in the policy and specific reference to Flood Risk Assessments and Sustainable Urban Drainage in Policy GANP DB1</p>
<p>Policy GANP DB1 Large Scale Development Requirements</p>	<p>99%</p>	<p>1%</p>	<p>but dcc planners will ignor the factors anyway</p> <p>The appearance of a large development needs to be of mixed design, not just uniform looking. The character of the town is based on different styles of property.</p> <p>Can you add a requirement for the developers to out in drop-kerbs at every junction and crossing-point *when they build the estate* (which will cost them not a penny more) – so that the County</p>	<p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>John Clare</p>	<p>This requirement would form part of the pre-application advice and may be included in a planning application.</p>

		<p>Councillors do not have to come along and install them later at £800 a time.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes suggest that the wording of paragraph 8 of Policy DB1 be amended to read “Large scale developments should make adequate provision for local services where it is deemed necessary such as a small shop to ensure sustainability of the area and contribute to the neighbourhood”</p> <p>We have space around the town for larger developments with these characteristics. Please preserve green space around the town by not infilling</p> <p>The contents of draft Policy GANP DB1 are noted and generally supported as suitable requirement for large scale development proposals.</p> <p>Need to cross ref with H1 in that DB1 refers to large sites (30 or more dwellings) while H1 Deals with small sites (would this be 1 to 29 dwellings)</p> <p>New Domestic Garages - DCC adopted design guide says 2.6m x 5.5m for a single garage and 4.6m wide for a double. These are based on a standard</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p> <p>Barton Willmore</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Noted and ‘where deemed necessary’ added to policy wording.</p> <p>Wording added for clarification and cross reference to Policy GANP H1 added in the justification.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>vehicle dimensions. It is likely that larger 6m x 3m would be objected to by house-builders on the basis it affects their unit density, cost viability etc. It is appreciated that many garages are used for storage not parking, this is why we changed our parking standards to minimum in curtilage and largely ignore a garage as a parking area. Increasing the size of the garage will make no difference to their use.</p> <p>The provision of secure storage such as cycle lockers may be resisted by developers</p> <p>Parking Standards see comments at H3</p> <p>As stated in regards to previous policies there is an issue in respect of who will maintain the trees once development is complete given that they may be located within the adopted highway outside of domestic curtilages.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and wording added for clarification</p>
Do you agree with the retail objectives?	100%		<p>It is a shame that no large retailers are interested in coming to Aycliffe.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing with the above objective, I would add that the retail trade/the way we shop, has changed immeasurably in</p>	<p>Kathleen Woodhams</p> <p>DL5 5LG</p>	<p>Soft Retail Needs Assessment undertaken.</p> <p>Changing shopping habits have changed the look / need of town centres and indeed</p>

		<p>the past 5 years. So many of us, of all ages, now shop online. Large retail chains are struggling even in out of town shopping centres. Meanwhile, the mega stores (Tesco Extra as an example) have a monopoly, selling everything that used to be sold by smaller, locally run businesses. I suggest encouraging much smaller, 'specialist' retailers, with the promise of much cheaper rents, to take smaller shops. A problem, I know, due to the town centre being owned by a London landlord. (Lesson to be learned - don't 'sell off' shopping centres!!)</p> <p>town centre landlords wont change anything</p> <p>I think a priority should be to look into purchasing town centre if at all possible</p> <p>This is crucial to the success of the town.</p> <p>We must have a retail park on trading estate</p> <p>Lower the rents to attract more small businesses</p>	<p>DL5 4QJ</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>J. Hannah</p> <p>DL5 7DT</p>	<p>out of town shopping areas. Only time will tell what the future of shopping will be.</p> <p>Newton Aycliffe Town Centre is privately owned and as suggested have their own agenda.</p> <p>This has been investigated on 2 occasions in the past. Financial requirements/ restraints would likely make this impossible.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>Town centre has nothing appealing when it comes to shops everything is closing apart from charity shops which have all become expensive. We have people living in poverty who can't afford to pay those prices</p> <p>Its getting the right shops to put their trust in this town but with the landlords we have at the moment doesn't look likely</p> <p>We must encourage New businesses and the only way is to build a new shopping. Area</p> <p>I recognise that retail provision is an economic decision made by businesses and there is little you can do to influence this.</p> <p>Work on the town centre should continue and shops need to be there first</p>	<p>Allison White</p> <p>Ann Masson</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p> <p>DL5 5PS</p> <p>Brian Hall</p>	
Policy GANP R1 Economic Retail Viability for Betting Offices and Pay Day Loan Shops	65	1	<p>Shouldn't takeaways be limited too as well too many is not profitable for everyone.</p> <p>Not only betting shops, but those dreadful 'amusement arcades', which spring up everywhere, and target the vulnerable,</p>	<p>DL5 7YF</p> <p>DL5 5LG</p>	Take aways will be dealt with at a strategic level

		<p>encouraging them to gamble money they can't afford, on slot machines. Badly run, and have in the past, knowingly allowed under 18s. (I had direct experience of this, some years ago, which was only resolved when I 'threatened' to go to the media)</p> <p>We also need to limit the number of charity shops in the town.</p> <p>What about charity shops, estate agents, and banks/building societies. There should be a limit on these too.</p> <p>'balance' not prohibition – anything better than vacant</p> <p>Same should apply to charity shops</p> <p>Needs a good balance of shops asp</p> <p>I agree but if there is going to be an unused site being filled then go ahead</p> <p>We have enough betting offices within the central of aycliffe..no need for more</p> <p>We don't want to end up all Charity shops and betting shops ☹</p>	<p>Katie Flanagan</p> <p>DL5 5RA</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p> <p>DL5 7DT</p> <p>Allison White</p> <p>Ann Masson</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 5EE</p>	<p>Need to balance shop use against empty shops. Betting shops and pay day loan shops were targeted as these often move in as a town goes into decline.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			It is suggested that these two policies are merged into one with separate criteria for Betting Offices and Pay Day Loan shops.	Durham County Council	Noted and amended
Policy GANP R2 Economic Retail Viability for Pay Day Loan Shops	95%	5%	<p>I don't believe any of these should be allowed, they encourage people with low incomes to borrow money they can't afford to pay back, only compounding their problems</p> <p>Don't 'limit' them. Ban them completely. Parasitic companies, totally unscrupulous, and charging vulnerable people extortionate amounts of APR. Instead, the Council need to encourage more Credit Unions, and landlords could help by allowing them free use of premises. NB I have no personal experience of the PDLs, however, in my job, I dealt with many people who had fallen prey to them. Dreadfully sad in some cases. People on very low incomes/benefits, should have access locally to managing money, making nutritious meals out of next to nothing. People of my parents' generation had to do this. Me too, to a certain extent, when my children were little.</p> <p>Takeaways?</p>	<p>DL5 4AD</p> <p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>Peter Davies</p>	Now amalgamated with Policy GANP R1 (Betting Offices)

			<p>Pay day loan companies should not be allowed in the town at all</p> <p>At the moment I don't think we have any but as previous comment if it fills up a vacant shop then why not</p> <p>Pay day loan shops only bring more long term misery.</p> <p>Does this need to include take-aways, these are unsightly during the day.</p> <p>Shouldn't this be included in the previous policy?</p>	<p>DL5 7DT</p> <p>Ann Masson</p> <p>Taylor</p> <p>Brian Hall</p> <p>John Snowball</p>	
<p>Policy GANP R3 2 Restrictions on Change of Use Safeguarding the Retail Function & Character of the Local Centres'</p>	98%	2%	<p>Allowing late night food takeaways without consultation to local residents is not a good move. As well as increased traffic which causes problems, the stench caused, and additional litter, which blows into gardens, is a nuisance.</p> <p>This policy needs to be flexible.</p> <p>Parking is always a problem and access to upper floor car park is now limited which was found when the lifts were out of order in January</p> <p>I have said Yes but the Town is privately</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Ann Masson</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p>	

		<p>owned so the alternative is to build a new one</p> <p>Suggest a more positive title : ‘Safeguarding the Retail Function & Character of the Local Centre’</p> <p>Criteria 1 - after retail insert ‘function and’</p> <p>Move the last sentence ‘The local retail centres are important ...’ from the justification section and insert into the policy after the last criteria and replace ‘uses’ with ‘function’.</p> <p>Justification -Move the last sentence ‘The local retail centres are important ...’ from the justification section and insert into the policy after the last criteria.</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Policy title amended</p> <p>Wording amended</p> <p>Moved</p>
<p>Policy GANP R4 3 Local Jobs Supporting Local Job Opportunities</p>	100%	<p>Much more could be done to help unemployed people. A 'joined up' approach, with all the various agencies working together. Also, utilise the skills of volunteers, possibly recently retired people (like me!!) who could advise unemployed people.</p> <p>This is one of the important policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p>	

			<p>Also focus on giving the youth of Aycliffe work experience within these shops and businesses. As currently we are not given any opportunities</p> <p>Suggest a more positive title : ‘Supporting Local Job Opportunities’</p> <p>Add the following to the Justification: “...further employment, which will be achieved through Targeted Recruitment and Training (TRT). To deliver TRT, developers may be required to enter into a planning obligation.</p> <p>As written the policy could apply to any location in the Plan area. If that is the intention the policy would need to include a criteria setting guidelines for when an employment use would be acceptable in a residential area, e.g. in relation to any possible amenity and highway issues etc.</p>	<p>DL5 5QU</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Policy title changed</p> <p>Added to justification</p> <p>Sentence added for clarification in justification</p>
Do you agree with the inclusion of a specific CIL policy?	97%	3%	<p>Apologies, this is outside of my knowledge.</p> <p>a meeting to be available for residents before monies is distributed is a must</p> <p>But it all depends what it is</p>	<p>DL5 5LG</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p>	

			Should this not be objective 8?	John Snowball	Previously discussed at Steering Group meetings and document amended to show Objective 8
Policy GANP CIL1 Community Infrastructure Levy Developer Contributions	100%		<p>Some grassed verges could be used for lay-bye's</p> <p>SUDS provision?</p> <p>We would recommend that environmental infrastructure, including habitat enhancements, water storage areas, and green space, is taken into account when looking to fund local infrastructure</p> <p>It is worth noting that both the Planning Act 2008 and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations are clear that the CIL can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure and facilities. This flexibility means that many projects may be associated with the repair and maintenance of heritage assets, and it might be worth considering including the historic environment within this policy.</p> <p>As the policy covers planning conditions, CIL and Obligations, the title would be better as: Policy GANP C1</p>	<p>J. Hannah</p> <p>John Clare</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Historic England</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>The policy is aimed at priorities for the residents of Great Aycliffe. These items would be dealt with at the strategic level.</p> <p>The policy is aimed at priorities for the residents of Great Aycliffe. These items would be dealt with at the strategic level.</p> <p>An additional policy (Policy GANP CH4, Heritage Assets) has been included in the Plan.</p> <p>Policy title changed</p>

		<p>Contributions.</p> <p>The use of Planning Obligations has to be in accord with para 204 of the NPPF so it is suggested the wording of the first paragraph be amended as follows:</p> <p>All new development must provide necessary and appropriate new facilities, relevant and related to the development, on site, or contribute to off-site facilities, as required either by means of planning conditions, a Section 106 agreement or use of Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate. Any necessary facilities and/or infrastructure will be secured by negotiation on a case by case basis taking viability into account.</p> <p>In the case of para 2, what is meant by “appropriate uses” should be clarified, as it is not clear why there would be a need to maintain or improve access to the countryside for certain uses, e.g. employment or retail uses.</p> <p>As shown in the Sudbury NP policy above, NPs can include a priority list for contributions so the Justification needs to clarify that the five points listed have been developed from community support.</p>		<p>Noted and wording amended</p> <p>‘appropriate uses’ deleted</p> <p>Sentence added to start of the numbered list.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Comments above regarding the uncertainty surround the level of CIL and the time before its implementation should also be noted however, so as not to raise expectations too high in relation to what may be delivered.</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION: The justification should be expanded to explain the uncertain situation regarding CIL as described above with the following para inserted at the beginning of the justification...</p> <p>At this time there is uncertainty regarding when the CIL will be introduced as it is dependent upon the completion of the emerging County Durham Plan. As such, the level of any future CIL in the Neighbourhood Plan area is not known. If and when a CIL is introduced the 5 priorities listed in the policy will apply. There is an overwhelming....etc</p> <p>To accord with national guidance the 2nd para should be amended to read:</p> <p>CIL or Section 106 contributions for all new housing will be required to demonstrate provision of appropriate new facilities on-site and provision of, or contributions to, off-site facilities (in</p>		<p>Paragraph added</p> <p>Final sentence of this amendment not included in justification</p> <p>Some wording amendments made</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>accord with advice in NPPF para 204) as per pre-development consultation meeting with Great Aycliffe Town Council meeting the obligation requirements set out within the policies of this Plan and the priorities set out in this policy in the first instance to ensure local needs are met or Durham County Council agreements are met.</p>		Policy moved to the end of the policies list in the GANP.
Policy GANP T1 Parking Impacts on Existing Infrastructure	94%	6%	<p>The provision of more layby parking where space is available should be introduced</p> <p>They could be accepted if part of agreement was to improve parking on existing streets for all by contributing to costs</p> <p>We must not refuse development proposals based on this criteria alone, but work will need to be done with each proposal to ensure all issues are dealt with fairly.</p> <p>There should be no exceptions..we have outstretched parking facilities within aycliffe already, and a major factor that should be included is the need for easier access for emergency services..</p>	<p>DL5 4AD</p> <p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p>	

		<p>People will need to use street parking as well as on site parking</p> <p>Suggest change policy wording from:-</p> <p>'Development proposals that include a reliance on existing streets shall not be permitted where:</p> <p>1 the streets are narrow</p> <p>2 local roads are already heavily trafficked</p> <p>3 there are identified parking issues</p> <p>4 where on-street parking would impact on the safety of road users or adversely impact the character of the area</p> <p>5 adequate provision has not been made for parking and access for deliveries, service vehicles, tradesmen working on-site, workers, social visitors and residents.'</p> <p>To -</p> <p>'Development proposals that include a reliance on existing streets shall not be permitted where on-street parking would impact on the safety of road</p>	<p>Owen Dickinson</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Policy re-worded</p> <p>Added</p>
--	--	---	--	--------------------------------------

			<p>users or adversely impact the character of the area and adequate provision has not been made on-site for parking and access for deliveries, service vehicles, tradesmen working on-site, workers, social visitors and residents.'</p> <p>Justification – Suggest change from:- 'Restrictions on proposals will favour developments which have a limited impact on nearby residents, improving their quality of life.'</p> <p>To – 'The policy is needed given evidence, and feedback from consultation, that narrow, heavily trafficked, local roads are the characteristics that lead to congestion and road safety issues'</p>		Noted and reason changed in justification
Policy GANP T2 Design Finish for Off-Street Parking in Visually Sensitive Areas	91%	9%	<p>Not if cost outweighs possibility of improvements</p> <p>Providing it does not cause problems in areas where there is wheelchair access is required, as this type of surface is not suitable for people in wheelchairs.</p> <p>Don't know – not an expert</p>	<p>Christine Bewley</p> <p>DL5 4TS</p> <p>Mike Dixon</p>	

			<p>Don't know</p> <p>As long as provision is also made for the maintenance (eg grass cutting) of said areas and removal of vehicles and other items which may from time to time prevent it; effective restrictions in us.</p> <p>not all the cost of parking needs in an already heavy parking within aycliffe</p> <p>This will preserve the appearance of the area but still alleviate parking problems</p> <p>Suggest change title to: 'Design, Finish for Off-Street Parking in Visually Sensitive Areas'</p> <p>Suggest change policy wording from:- Where an area has been identified with a significant parking problem and where there is only limited scope to provide off-street parking a geo-grid, or similar permeable design material, type approach must be used to allow grass to be the dominant final finish</p> <p>To 'Where development will result in loss of important local space in visually significant areas that have been</p>	<p>Joan Gray</p> <p>Rebecca Barnett</p> <p>Ralph Gauntlett</p> <p>DL5 5PS</p> <p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Policy title amended</p> <p>The policy aims to deal with existing problems where there is limited space to provide off-street parking and aims to maintain a green feel rather than allowing tarmac off-street parking which may have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area</p> <p>Some working amendments made for clarification</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

		<p>identified with significant parking problems with only limited scope to provide off-street parking then mitigate with a geo-grid , or similar permeable design material, type approach must be used to allow grass to be the dominant final finish'</p> <p>Where an area has been identified with a significant parking problem and where there is only limited scope to provide off-street parking a geo-grid, or similar design material, type approach must be used to allow grass to be the dominant final finish. Due consideration should be given to changes to flood risk as a result of increased parking provision and a flood risk assessment should be undertaken and SUDs incorporated as appropriate.</p>	Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report – Durham County Council	<p>Noted. Wording added to the justification for clarity.</p> <p>Geo-grid or other suitable permeable design is specified specifically to deal with flood risk.</p>
Policy GANP T3 Cycling Provision and Walking Routes	100%	<p>NB Well lit! We have problems with lighting already</p> <p>Sites do not always have to be well lit. Look at the number of defunked street lights through Greathead creasent woods.</p> <p>This is not just for developments. Existing cycle routes and footpaths such as The Great Aycliffe Way, particularly the paths through Woodham Woods and round the back of The Chase and Byerley</p>	<p>DL5 7LH</p> <p>DL5 4EE</p> <p>Pam Taylor</p>	Policy already states 'well lit'

			<p>Park, are a disgrace. There are numerous large and small potholes that are a danger to life and limb but which also fill with water after rainfall. Many places are ankle deep in mud for most of the year with some parts of the pathway (near 'The Spider' for instance) impassable for water and mud at times.</p> <p>Suggest add 'Major' at the start of the policy as there has to be some form of cut-off / threshold, e.g. a development producing a single dwelling should not have to provide a cycle path (there are also viability issues to be addressed). Also, there may be sites where there are adequate paths and cycle routes in place, in these situations the policy should look at links to existing networks.</p> <p>Justification Suggest add '... for both existing and future residents and employees. Cycling is an important...'</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Significant added</p> <p>Noted and included</p>
Policy GANP EE1 Promoting Domestic Scale Renewables	97%	3%	<p>But not at expense of higher energy costs.</p> <p>As long as anything that helps towards this doesn't have an unsightly aspect ie building of wind farms locally.</p> <p>See comments 17</p>	<p>DL5 7YF</p> <p>DL5 5LP</p> <p>J. Hannah</p>	

			<p>Suggest add to the title: 'Promoting Domestic Scale Renewables'</p> <p>Justification – Add the following para: Small scale renewables are those renewable energy developments where the primary use of the energy generated is on site. They are defined by their purpose rather than by energy output (by kilowatt) so the focus is on providing energy for the property rather than the energy generation. For example, a wind turbine up to 50 kilowatt is likely to be domestic but anything over 100 kilowatts is likely to be exported to the grid. Another example is a solar array (turbine) for a specific business, farm or dwelling.</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Policy title changed</p> <p>Bullet points numbered.</p> <p>Wording added to justification.</p>
Policy GANP EE2 Promoting Community-Led Efficiency Projects	97%	3%	<p>Suggest add to the title: 'Promoting Community-led Energy Efficiency Projects'</p> <p>Comment: Does this policy come across as too positive and too open ended leaving you open to an inappropriate scheme?</p>	Durham County Council	<p>Policy title changed</p> <p>Bullet points changed to numbers</p> <p>Pre-application advice would deal with this</p>
Policy GANP EE3 Promoting Business Energy Efficiency	98%	2%	<p>All new builds should be encouraged to use solar panels</p> <p>The questions for this topic is Very</p>	<p>J. Hannah</p> <p>DL5 7AY</p>	

		<p>Sneaky and I do not want any Wind Farms or Fracking in Newton Aycliffe</p> <p>Suggest add to the title: 'Promoting Business Energy Efficiency'</p> <p>Suggest changes to policy as follows:</p> <p>'Initiatives which would enable local businesses to develop renewable and low carbon energy will be accepted where : The primary function is to support their operations; T they are subordinate to the primary business, and T they are in accordance with the Character and Heritage Assessment and Green Spaces policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Also need to consider scale, character and amenity</p>	<p>Durham County Council</p>	<p>Policy title changed</p> <p>Bullet points changed to numbers</p> <p>Noted and wording amended</p> <p>Included at point 2</p>
--	--	---	------------------------------	---

Do you have any further comments?

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| DL5 5LG | - Excellent survey, though one or two questions were outside of my knowledge, and a bit 'jargonised'. |
| Christine Bewley | - Would it be feasible to set up group to look into possibility of purchasing town centre |
| no personal details | - no |
| Mike Dixon | – some rather vague – are they achievable |
| J. Hannah | – something needs to be done about cars driving on grass and footpaths this need to be done with D.C.C. HELP |
| Ralph Gauntlett | – not yet |
| DL5 7AY | – Please take note of my last comment |
| DL5 5PS | – A very comprehensive range of policies which should ensure a better living environment for future generations |
| Barton Willmore | - In addition to the comments outlined above, there is considered to be an opportunity to provide a more positive approach to strategic housing development within the neighbourhood area. Whilst it is appreciated that the draft GANP does not propose the allocation of strategic residential sites, it can still outline the potential opportunities for strategic growth to come forward. Indeed, Low Copelaw has previously been identified as a suitable and sustainable location to accommodate residential development. |

However, despite the significant work that has been undertaken in respect of the Site, it is noted that there is no specific reference within the draft GANP. Given that the GANP does not propose the allocation of strategic sites, it is not considered that a specific policy would be appropriate in this instance. However, it would be considered appropriate to include reference to the Site within the introductory chapter to provide greater context to the planning policy background as well as the potential opportunities for growth over the emerging Plan

	<p>period. In particular, it is recommended that further details of the draft SPD are included - which is already referenced at Appendix A of the draft GANP.</p>
GANP RESPONSE	<p>The Low Copelaw Site is referenced in the Plan and Consultation Statement where support for the site is shown. There are limited opportunities for large scale housing within the built up area of Great Aycliffe and this is considered a suitable site for development.</p>
Historic England	<p>- As we have noted above, the Heritage and Character Assessment provides an excellent evidence base for the Plan, and identifies a range of heritage assets within the Plan area. In addition, it makes a series of recommendations for future action, many of which could be delivered through the Neighbourhood Plan. However, there are no policies within the Plan, apart from Policy GANP E3, which seek to protect and enhance the historic environment., We would therefore recommend either expanding Policy GANP E3 to include all heritage assets (not just those covered by the Conservation Area), or to include an additional policy which would encompass the wider historic environment, including both designated and undesignated assets.</p> <p>In addition to referencing the designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area, there should be a clear understanding of their <u>significance</u>, including any contribution made by their setting. This is an extremely important concept, particularly in planning terms, and the NPPF refers to significance a number of times in Section 12 on Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. Historic England has produced a good practice advice note on Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment, and also on the Setting of Heritage Assets, which give further details.</p>
GANP RESPONSE	<p>Additional wording has been added within the Plan and an additional Heritage Asset Policy has been added.</p>
Northumbrian Water	<p>- We note that within the pre submission plan, there is an omission of any policy relating to sustainable drainage & water conservation for new developments which will play a part in tackling any flooding and the increased possibility of flooding that is associated with new development.</p> <p>We recommend a meaningful environmental policy, as we consider this is an important topic which is currently omitted from the pre- submission plan. Our recommended wording for a comprehensive flooding and sustainable drainage policy is:</p> <p>Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Policy</p>

Development proposals need to demonstrate the minimisation of flood risk to people, property and infrastructure from all potential sources and demonstrate consideration of the separation, minimisation and control of surface water runoff with sustainable drainage systems being the preferred approach, giving preference to the hierarchy of a). soakaways, or if that is not feasible due to underlying ground conditions; b). a watercourse, unless there is no alternative or suitable receiving watercourse available; c). a surface water sewer; and lastly d). a combined sewer.

GANP RESPONSE – *A specific SUDS Policy would be covered at a strategic level. Reference made to the need for Sustainable Drainage and SUDS schemes if applicable.*

Natural England - Does not have any specific comment to make on this draft neighbourhood plan.

Ministry of Defence - The proposed designated neighbourhood area falls outside of statutory safeguarding area, the therefore have no safeguarding concerns.

Durham County Council - p28 Add text in bold 'Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106 (**Legal Agreement with Developer**)

GANP RESPONSE – *Noted and amended*

- Insert new paragraph after CIL heading – wording on the lines of '**At this stage there is a degree of uncertainty as to when (or if at all) CIL will be introduced.**

GANP RESPONSE – *Came into force April 2010*

- P33 Key Issues, 2nd bullet point – Replace '~~does not lose out on~~' with 'To ensure that Great Aycliffe **maximises opportunities in relation to any** CIL or Section 106 Monies'.

GANP RESPONSE – some wording changes made

- P34 Section 6 Planning Policies – Replace '~~..as the County Durham Local Plan has been delayed.~~ With '**...as following withdrawal of the County Durham Plan work on a new plan is about to commence so that it is not yet material**'.

GANP RESPONSE – wording amended

- P34 Environment – Add extra wording to paragraph starting ‘Lord Beveridge’s vision for the new town of Newton Aycliffe was of a ‘Welfare State...aims to reflect the Beveridge ethos **updated to modern day lifestyle.**’

GANP RESPONSE – wording amended. This is exactly what the Plan is trying to achieve

- Housing - First sentence replace ‘...should make sure...’ with ‘...**seeks to ensure...**’

GANP RESPONSE – wording amended.

- P45 Is this section in the wrong place? *Durham County Council’s guidance for adopting Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which details how schemes should demonstrate their compliance with National Standards and local policy by setting out a number of requirements which designs should meet will be applied wherever applicable. The guidance is aimed at Developers of Major Development sites which meet any of the following criteria:*

- *For residential development, developments that contain 10 or more dwelling houses or where the site is 0.5 hectares or greater*
- *For non-residential development, developments of 1,000 square metres or greater of floor space or where the site is 1 hectare or more.*

In addition to the previous housing policies and in order to protect the Beveridge Vision of houses grouped around greens, any planning application for housing developments of 10 or more houses must meet the following housing planning policies and must provide a design and access statement.

P52 – We suggest putting this section at the end of the policies

GANP RESPONSE – This has been moved as suggested.

In terms of CIL for the Durham County Council area, DCC cannot adopt a Charging Schedule until there is an adopted Local Plan in place. Given that the County Durham Plan has been withdrawn it is expected to be some 24 months before a CIL is likely to be in place. Similarly, in terms of income or coverage of CIL, this cannot be predicted at present due to the uncertainty of how the Local Plan strategy will develop so the level achieved in the NP area could be low. This could be further impacted upon by Government moves towards Starter Homes, which may diminish viability for other developer contributions significantly. It is appreciated that

this does not aid in the clarity of delivering the Policy but is an unavoidable situation following withdrawal of the Local Plan pending a new one coming forward. For information, the following Developer Contribution Policy has been adopted in the Sudbury NP, including a priority list:

GANP RESPONSE – The fact that a Charging Schedule cannot be adopted until the Local Plan is in place which may be a further 24 months is of some concern.

SUDBURY NP POLICY DC1: Developer Contributions

Funds collected under the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be targeted at the following schemes, which are listed in order of priority:

- 1. Contributions to an expanded public realm scheme.*
- 2. Contributions towards new community facilities, such as new library space.*
- 3. Contributions towards road improvements, including new cycle routes and facilities, as well as safe pedestrian crossings and the potential remodelling of the Bridgewater Road roundabout.*
- 4. Contributions towards a shopfront improvement scheme and associated guide.*

GANP RESPONSE – Sentence added for clarity.

Age Profiles for Respondents of those who chose to complete this question.

Under 11	12 - 17	18 - 29	30 - 44	45 - 59	60 - 70	Over 70
0	0	2	13	17	24	5