



Civic Centre,
Crook,
County Durham.
DL15 9ES

Tel: 01388 765555 Fax: 01388 766660

Minicom: 01388 761515 e-mail: i.phillips@wearvalley.gov.uk

Iain Phillips Chief Executive

5th September 2006

Dear Councillor,

I hereby give you Notice that a Meeting of the **REGENERATION COMMITTEE** will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC CENTRE, CROOK** on **WEDNESDAY, 13th SEPTEMBER 2006** at **6.00 P.M.**

AGENDA

	Page No.
1. Apologies for absence.	
2. To consider the Minutes of the last Meeting of the Committee held on 12 th July 2006 as a true record – copies previously circulated.	Copies previously circulated
3. To consider recommendations of the Government appointed Panel following the Examination in Public into the submission draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East.	1 – 12
4. To consider proposed revisions to the allocation criteria in respect of the Planning Delivery Grant for 2007/08.	13 – 16
5. To consider progress made in energy conservation.	17 – 34
6. To receive an update on the risk register for the Regeneration Department.	35 – 38
7. To consider the proposed Design and Access Statement Guidance.	39 – 45
8. To consider proposals relating to Stage II of the Wear Valley Economic Futures Study. *	46 – 47
9. To consider such other items of business which, by reason of special circumstances so specified, the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency	

* It is likely that item 8 will be taken in the closed part of the meeting in accordance with paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. H. Jones', with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Chief Executive

Members of this Committee: Councillors Bailey, Mrs. Brown, Dobinson, Ferguson, Grogan, Hayton, Mrs Jones*, Laurie, Mews, Mowbray, Murphy*, Nevins, Perkins, Mrs Seabury, Stonehouse, Townsend and Zair.

*ex-officio, non-voting capacity

Chair: Councillor Townsend

Deputy Chair: Councillor Mowbray

TO: All other Members of the Council for information
Management Team

REGENERATION COMMITTEE

13 SEPTEMBER 2006

Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Regeneration

REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE NORTH EAST: EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC PANEL REPORT

purpose of the report

1. This report presents the recommendations of the Government-appointed Panel which conducted an Examination in Public (EiP) into the Submission Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the North East.
2. The EiP was held over 5 weeks in March/April this year.

background

3. As members will be aware the draft RSS was prepared by the North of England Assembly, as the Regional Planning Body. This was submitted to Government in June 2005 and subject to statutory consultation and subsequent public inquiry in front of an independent panel of experts in March/April this year. The Panel Report has been submitted to the Secretary of State who will make the final decisions on RSS, and was published by Government Office North East on 4 August **for information only**. The Panel Report is not subject to public consultation. The Secretary of State will consider the Report together with the representations made on the RSS, with the aim of producing Proposed Changes to RSS in winter 2006. There will then be public consultation on the Changes. Following consideration of the responses to this consultation, the Secretary of State is expecting to publish the final RSS in Spring 2007.

key issues for county durham and wear valley district

4. This report focuses on those matters where the conclusions of the Panel raise serious concerns for Wear Valley District and the County Durham as a whole. Annexes 1 and 2 briefly summarises key issues and major recommendations.

strategic approach

5. The Report agrees with the trajectory for growth included in RSS (2.8% increase in GVA pa from 1.8% at present) as recent evidence supports such assumptions. County Durham has obviously contributed to such recent growth. The report also appears to reject the concept of 'urban flight' suggesting that sub-urban drift (i.e. movements within the conurbations) is more significant.

6. To achieve such growth the Submission Draft RSS sees the main focus of future development as the conurbations, but does recognise the role of other towns in the Tyne & Wear and Tees Valley City Regions and of the rural areas in contributing to a turn-around in the region's fortunes and reducing disparities with other parts of the country. The Panel report, however, further reinforces the concentration of development on the conurbations and core areas of the City Regions. The changes they recommend would result in a spatial strategy for the conurbations rather than a strategy for the region. The Panel requires greater alignment of RSS allocations with City Region geography. Wear Valley and Teesdale are, however, suggested to be firmly in Tees Valley City Region. Only Berwick is not included within a city region. The implication of this approach needs to be clarified particularly in relation to Policy 6 where Crook is still placed in Tyne and Wear City Region and in Policy 8 on rural areas which may now only applies to Berwick. If this is the case Policy 7 on the Tees Valley City Region should be amended to reflect rural needs of West Durham.

city regions and county durham

7. The Panel quite rightly emphasise the link between the components of employment, housing and transport, stating "if any of these are allowed to develop on their own without regard to the other two, then it is unlikely that sustainability will be achieved". However, their narrow locational interpretation of "sustainable development" is of particular concern in relation to the constraints placed on employment opportunities and housing provision. For example, by concentrating major employment sites in the conurbations without establishing the net effect on travel by car, the Panel are encouraging long distance commuting and increased congestion, which is hardly a sustainable outcome.
8. If changes are made in accordance with the Panel's recommendations, the contribution County Durham can make to the Region will be constrained and ignored. The realism of expecting the Region's renaissance to rely so heavily on the success of the core areas should therefore be questioned. The Panel's approach will not only severely prejudice the County's ability to secure new investment and achieve its own economic regeneration but will damage the prospects of the North East as a whole and undermine the Region's ability to achieve the ambitious growth rate which the Panel has accepted.

housing provision

9. At the Examination in Public the County Durham Authorities presented a united case, accepting the Submission Draft 20,000 housing allocation to the sub-region as a minimum, but seeking an early review to the distribution of sites post 2011. The Panel has adopted a new set of figures from a rerun of the NEA's demographic model. This shows an increase in the regional allocation from 107,000 to 112,000 new dwellings. This, however, reduces County Durham's share of the regional allocation from 19% to 17%, whereas Tees Valley's share of an increased regional figure rises by 3% at the expense of both County Durham and Tyne & Wear. Of even greater concern is that a new District distribution was not discussed at the EiP and was contained in an NEA information note, produced at the Panel's request at the

end of the inquiry and, which clearly states “this model run has not been endorsed by the Assembly and no discussions have taken place with stakeholders”. The Panel themselves acknowledge “that there are some anomalies which are difficult to explain” but “as some of this data only became available during the EiP we have not been able to seek verification”.

10. These figures now show a County Durham total of 19040 not 19975 as in draft and a district redistribution as follows:-
 - Chester le Street from 1785 to 1530 (-255)
 - Derwentside from 4250 to 3230 (-1020)
 - Durham City from 2975 to 3230 (+255)
 - Easington from 2975 to 2720 (-255)
 - Sedgefield from 3995 to 4930 (+935)
 - Teesdale from 1190 to 1360 (+170)
 - Wear Valley from 2805 to 2040 (-765).
11. There is no justification or evidence presented in the Panel report for this change.
12. The suggested change clearly further suppresses housing in the county with further concentration in conurbations.
13. The panel report still predicts population stability for County Durham (+0.3% over plan period) but compared to other regions this is debatable as Tyne and Wear (+15.5%), Northumberland (+4.5%) and Tees Valley (+17%) all positively benefit from a regional increase of 37.3%.
14. It is difficult to see why County Durham is so constrained and where there is justification for this.
15. The potential implications of the new figures for the District are very severe. The District already builds about 250/300 dwellings per annum. A new total of 2000 dwellings provides only a potential 7/8 year supply and whilst existing planning permissions already exceed the new allocation the ability of the District to increase population (Council objective) and achieve settlement regeneration will be severely curtailed.
16. There is extreme concern that the whole process of producing these new figures has been flawed and there has been no opportunity for debate. The Panel has placed undue emphasis on housing allocations produced by a demographic model which do not reflect the RSS policies and which need further amendment.

regeneration areas

17. The Panel are critical of the “blanket approach” to Regeneration Areas in the Submission Draft and recommend identification of more specific regeneration priorities. They are concerned to ensure that development in the regeneration towns identified as all of County Durham's major towns should meet local needs only (not aspirations) and do not adversely impact on regeneration initiatives in the conurbations. In particular, they do not consider all of the 12 towns identified as regeneration centres for their hinterlands in County

Durham, require the same combination of action. However, these named towns are retained in the relevant policies for the time being, as places outside the conurbations where regeneration should be supported. The Panel say they do not have the information to put forward an alternative proposal. If Government Office North East is proposing to make changes in response to the Panel's recommendation they should be asked to enter into dialogue with the local authorities in County Durham as the basis for defining more specific priorities.

employment sites

18. The Panel highlight an inconsistency in the Submission Draft between the need for the scale and type of industrial land proposed and assumptions about the expected sources of new employment in small and medium sized enterprises which could be provided for in high density accommodation in core areas and at transport hubs. The perceived changing needs of inward investment has lead them to radically revise the approach to prestige sites of regional importance and to reserve sites, particularly where they involve greenfield land outside the conurbations. The main changes to affect the County are:-
- The strategic reserve sites at Heighington Lane West and South of Seaham are recommended for deletion;
 - The deletion of Tursdale; and
 - The reduction of the Netpark site to 13 ha. (Phase 1).
19. The Panel also rejected the introduction of any other new brownfield mixed use sites, including Eastgate, as they state the circumstances of the site can be dealt with through other policies of the plan. This position needs to be clarified.

conclusion

20. The implications of the potential changes to the RSS are quite severe for the District in relation to a further suppression of housing development. The implications for County Durham as a whole are equally severe and would hinder both the development of the County and the region.
21. It is important to attempt to achieve Countywide consensus to this report and to make strong representation to GONE based on the above comments.

RECOMMENDED

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | that Members note this report for information, pending consideration of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes when they are published for consultation. |
| 2 | agree that a copy of this report is sent to Government Office North East to inform them of the District Council's concerns, and to continue to work with other Durham authorities to further the case for the County as a whole. |

Officer responsible for the report

Robert Hope
Strategic Director for Environment and
Regeneration
Ext 264

Author of the report

Robert Hope

REGENERATION COMMITTEE

13 SEPTEMBER 2006

Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Regeneration **PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT 2007/08**

purpose of the report

1. To inform Members about the proposed allocations criteria in respect of Planning Delivery Grant 2007/08. Also, the report informs Members about a proposed new housing and planning delivery grant.
2. The Government has issued two consultation documents on these matters namely, Planning Delivery Grant 2007/08 Proposed Allocations Criteria and Housing and Planning Delivery Grant, and requested views.

background

3. For 2007/08, Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) is provisionally £120m. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) proposes that a significantly higher proportion of the grant will reward housing delivery, and that housing will play a key part in future local authority incentives. Also DCLG wishes to continue to incentivise performance towards the planning targets for handling applications, and Local Development Frameworks.

handling planning applications

4. We had been informed previously that PDG would be awarded for meeting Best Value targets in the period 1 July 2005-30 June 2006. However, it is now proposed to extend the assessment period. The Government target is for 100% of authorities to meet the Best Value targets for development control by 31 March 2007. To maintain the incentive to meet the targets, DCLG proposes to split the 2007/08 allocations for handling planning applications into 2 separate awards. The first allocation would be based on performance from 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2006. A second allocation would reward performance from 1 July 2006 to 31 March 2007, and would be announced in June 2007.
5. For the first award the DCLG intends to allocate only 25% of the proposed total allocation for meeting planning application targets between 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2006. The amount of award should be announced in November 2006.
6. The second award would allocate 40% of the total allocation to reward local planning authorities' performance from 1 July 2006 to 31 March 2007. Also DCLG have suggested a bonus of a minimum of £50,000 per authority for meeting all 3 targets by this date.

7. There is a weighting system which favours planning authorities with high workloads, in particular high numbers of “major” applications, and who perform above the targets.
8. The delay in announcing the second award will cause the Council uncertainty about future budget provision, particularly where PDG is to be used to fund additional staff. We will not know what our total allocation will be for next year until well into the financial year.

plan making

9. Planning authorities will be awarded PDG for progress in delivering sustainable development outcomes such as housing and employment and in plan making (according to a self-assessment based on their Annual Monitoring Reports for the period from April 2005 to March 2006). DCLG is to provide guidance on how this self-assessment should be completed.
10. 50% of the award will be based on meeting production timescales. The other 50% of the award will be based on “sustainable outcomes”. Six outcomes have been selected:-
 - proportion of residential development on previously developed land
 - volume of affordable housing completed
 - proportion of non-residential development complying with parking standards
 - proportion of energy used in new development which comes from on site renewables
 - proportion of nationally important wildlife sites which are in favourable condition
 - proportion of open space managed to the Green Flag standard.
11. It is not clear how we would be able to influence these outcomes.

housing

12. DCLG proposes allocations for housing delivery in high demand and growth areas, and a flat rate would be awarded to low demand areas.

e-planning

13. For 2007/08 DCLG proposes more challenging criteria for assessment based on PARSOL standards. These include a quality assessment of the on-line systems and information provided to applicants and the public, the take-up of services, and the provision of monitoring and tracking information for public use.

the future

14. A further consultation paper has been issued by DCLG that sets out proposals for a new housing and planning delivery grant. The paper states that the Government accepts the case for an incentive scheme to encourage local authorities to deliver housing growth. It is proposed to reform PDG to ensure it better supports areas that are delivering high numbers of new houses. The purpose of a new housing and planning delivery grant is to provide an incentive to local authorities and other bodies to respond more effectively to local housing pressures, become actively involved in the delivery of additional housing to meet local demands and to incentivise improvements in the planning system.
15. This new grant would benefit authorities in the south-east (where there is a high housing demand) and authorities in growth areas. It would reward authorities that receive lots of housing applications and consequently benefit from high fee income.
16. As well as supporting local authorities that take a positive step to meet the demands for housing created by their community, DCLG proposes that the new grant should continue to support new plan making and provide funding for national and regional advisory organisations.

financial implications and human resource implications

17. The salaries of 19 staff in the Regeneration Department are either fully or partly paid using funding received for PDG. Changes to the way the Government awards delivery grant and uncertainty about the availability of other funding for posts causes great concern.

conclusion

18. The Government has allocated PDG to incentivise improvements to the planning service. The Council has used this reward to increase capacity and as a consequence performance has improved. The grant has, however, increased the dependency of the service on external grant reward to continue to meet performance standards requires a sustained resource.
19. It is not considered either desirable or just that future PDF be concentrated on areas of high growth or housing growth. The need to meet performance standards applies to all local authorities. High growth also means higher potential fee income from planning applications. The Government need to be made aware of these concerns.

RECOMMENDED	1	That the Council express their concerns about changes to PDG arrangements outlines above to the DCLG.
--------------------	---	---

Background documents

Planning Delivery Grant 2007/08 Proposed Allocations Criteria and Housing and Planning Delivery Grant

Officer responsible for the report	Author of the report
Robert Hope	Dave Townsend
Strategic Director for Environment and	Head of Development & Building
Regeneration	Control
Ext 264	Ext 270

REGENERATION COMMITTEE

13 SEPTEMBER 2006

—

Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Regeneration **PROGRESS MADE BY ENERGY CONSERVATION**

purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the latest report from the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs on progress made by Energy Conservation authorities in England relative to the Home Energy Conservation Act 1995, and confirm the action taken.

introduction

2. The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 places a duty upon each local authority to provide an annual progress report on its reductions in energy usage and carbon dioxide emissions and requires authorities to achieve a 30% improvement within 15 years.
3. The previous years report showed an overall improvement in energy efficiency of 27.45% which indicated progress ahead of the Government target and resulted in DEFRA congratulating the authority on its achievements.
4. The improvements reported to DEFRA were of the top 3 highest figures reported by local authorities in the North East region.

current progress

5. The Ninth Home Energy Conservation Progress report published by DEFRA shows the improvements made in domestic energy efficiency, in Energy Conservation authorities in England, up to 31st March 2005 (report appended Annex 3).
6. The domestic energy efficiency figures reported by Wear Valley District Council in this period, showed an improvement of 30.1% which achieves the initial Government target of 30% ahead of target and is the top figure reported by local authorities in the North East region and in the top six amongst all England authorities.
7. In a feedback report from DEFRA they stated that it was, “...*impressive to see that, despite reaching your target, you are still implementing a number of activities, and have more planned for the future to improve your domestic energy efficiency*”. To this end, DEFRA asked that an extended goal target of a 40% reduction by 2011 should be considered.

comments

8. It is pleasing to report the progress made in achieving Government targets by this authority, and that it has been noted by DEFRA, however, recent strategic changes within the authority have altered the manner in which progress is achieved and energy efficiency is delivered.
9. The energy efficiency team at Wear Valley District Council currently operates in a 'cross-departmental' arrangement between Housing and Regeneration, where operating costs are recharged between administration sections.
10. The success of domestic energy conservation within Wear Valley District, its promotion, awareness raising, grant provision and education, resides with an Energy Assistant estranged within the Housing Department, and upon whom rests the responsibility of 'front-line' delivery.
11. More detailed consideration will be given to the request. The impending organisational re-structure, will establish this function within Regeneration and provide a more cohesive approach will enable greater progress to be made and provide the opportunity to achieve the 'extended goal' requested by DEFRA.

RECOMMENDED

- 1 Members note the progress made by the authority in achieving the goals set by the Government under the Home Energy Conservation Act.
- 2 Endorse action undertaken and welcome the proposed organisational re-structure as recognising the importance of a definitive role for the delivery of energy efficiency, and provides the appropriate staffing structure to maintain our excellent progress.

Officer responsible for the report
Robert Hope
Strategic Director for Environment and
Regeneration
Ext 264

Author of the report
Ian Bloomfield
Environment/LA21 Officer
Ext 423

REGENERATION COMMITTEE

13 SEPTEMBER 2006

Report of the Strategic Director of Resource Management
RISK REGISTER UPDATE

purpose of the report

1. To inform Members of the progress in managing the risks of the Regeneration Department.

background

2. Members will see that the Service Plan for the Department includes an analysis of the main risks facing the department. This report seeks to give assurance to Members of the management of those risks.
3. A key line of enquiry within the Use of Resources assessment, relates to the extent to which risks are managed and Members are kept informed of their management. The table in Annex 4 shows the risks as agreed within the Service Plan and progress in managing them. This report will be presented to Members at every other committee cycle to demonstrate ongoing improvement in the area of risk management.

conclusion

4. From the above table it can be seen that risks are currently being managed. No real problems exist at present but continued monitoring of service demands will enable the department to respond to any change in circumstances

RECOMMENDED

1. That Members note the report.

Officer responsible for the report

Gary Ridley
Strategic Director of Resource
Management
Ext 227

Author of the report

Gary Ridley/R Hope
Strategic Director of Resource
Management/Strategic Director for
Environment and Regeneration
Ext 227/264

REGENERATION COMMITTEE

13 SEPTEMBER 2006

Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Regeneration **DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT GUIDANCE**

purpose of the report

- 1 To seek Members support for the Design and Access Statement Guidance produced by the Department.

introduction

- 2 Since 10 August 2006 it has been necessary for an applicant or agent to submit a design and access statement with an application for outline or full planning permission, except for applications for:-
 - A material change of use of land or building(s), unless it also involves operational development;
 - Engineering or mining operations;
 - Development of an existing house, or development within the curtilage of a dwelling house, where no part of that dwelling house or curtilage is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a conservation area, or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
 - Advertisements, tree preservation orders or storage of hazardous material.
- 3 Also a design and access statement must be submitted with an application for listed building consent. Where there is a planning application submitted in parallel with an application for listed building consent the applicant or agent should submit a single, combined statement, which addresses the requirements of both.

the purpose of design and access statements

- 4 A statement accompanying an outline application must explain how the applicant has considered the proposal, and understands what is appropriate and feasible for the site in its context. It should clearly explain and justify the design and access principles used to develop the scheme that can then be used in working up the proposal in more detail.
- 5 Such information will help with community involvement and informed decision making. The design and access statement will form a link between the outline permission and the consideration of reserved matters.

- 6 In respect of a detailed application, a design and access statement is a short report accompanying and supporting the application to illustrate the process that has led to the development proposal, and to explain and justify the proposal in a structured way.

pre-application discussions

- 7 The Department encourages pre-application discussions before a formal application is submitted in order to guide applicants/agents through the process. This can minimise delays later in processing the application. Although it is not a formal requirement, it is considered good practice to use design and access statements as an aid in pre-application discussions.

presenting the information

- 8 The level of detail required in a design and access statement will depend on the scale and complexity of the application. For most straightforward planning applications, the statement may be only short, for some only one page may be needed. For more complicated planning applications, a more detailed format and, perhaps, a longer document are likely to be necessary. For larger or more challenging sites, the statement may include, as appropriate, plans and elevations, photographs of the site and its surroundings, and any other relevant illustrations that the scheme has responded to. For large and complex schemes, a model of the proposed development in the context of its surroundings may also accompany the statement.
- 9 The document should be concise, and effectively cover all of the design and access issues for the proposed development.
- 10 Design and access statements are not intended to be a substitute for drawings and other material required to be submitted for determination as part of the planning application itself. They provide an opportunity for developers and designers to demonstrate their commitment to achieving good design and ensuring accessibility in the work they undertake, and allow them to show how they are meeting, or will meet, the various obligations placed on them by legislation and policy.

guidance notes for applicants and agents

- 11 Staff have prepared guidance notes for applicants and agents which will be available at the Civic Centre and on the Council's web site. On request, the guidance notes will be sent to applicants and agents.
- 12 A copy of the proposed guidance notes are appended at Annex 5.

application forms

- 13 The application forms have been amended to refer to the above guidance notes and a checklist has been added which includes a design and access statement box to be ticked when appropriate. Failure to submit a design and access statement when one is required will result in an application being made invalid.

conclusion

- 14 The requirement to submit a design and access statement is seen as a positive step towards achieving an improvement in the standard of the applications submitted to the Council.

RECOMMENDED 1 That Members welcome the introduction of the requirement for design and access statements to be submitted with planning and listed consent applications, and endorse the guidance notes that have been prepared.

Background document: DCLG Circular 01/2006.

Officer responsible for the report		Author of the report	
Bob Hope		David Townsend	
Strategic Director for Environment and Regeneration		Head of Development & Building Control	
Ext 264		Ext 270	

EiP PANEL REPORT KEY ISSUES

GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS BY NEA

The Panel report is broadly welcomed and offers support for the overall strategy for development in the North East up to 2021. The Panel recognise the SEA and SA process as being sound and not in need of revision in line with changes in legislation. The assumptions that the growth rates proposed in the Submission Draft

However there are areas that the Panel have highlighted as being in need of amendment in order to better reflect the evolution of Government policy in the time that has elapsed since the publication of the Submission Draft RSS. Some of the key areas highlighted by the Panel which are as follows:

- The inclusion of a specific climate change policy
- Increased provision of housing over the plan period and distribution based on updated model run
- Review of housing allocations for Blyth Valley, Durham City, Easington and Sedgefield districts to better reflect the overall locational strategy
- The revision of the minerals and opencast mining strategy to reflect the concerns of the coal producers
- The disaggregation of Tyne and Wear waste figures
- Review of the regional transport priorities in order to better reflect the overall strategy and increase the prominence of demand management as a policy mechanism to control congestion

Settlement	RSS provides adequate guidance for LTP to factoring a hierarchy.
Hierarchy	
Second Homes	Agree RSS should not include an allowance for second homes.

ECONOMY

Land Assessment	<p>Need to do on a city region bases and test against a reasonable supply e.g. 25 years</p> <p>Upgrade options prioritise before greenfield options</p> <p>Tyne & Wear has further brownfield sites so don't have to rely on Northumberland or County Durham.</p> <p>De-allocate sites in more peripheral areas of city regions</p>
Airport Land	<p>Delete flexibility and restrict development and the airports to airport related uses only. A new list is included as part of the recommendations that reduces the range of uses permitted to those dependent on an airport location</p> <p>No longer scope for exceptions on the grounds of a 'robust business case'</p>
Brownfield mixed use sites	<p>There could be others so delete 'major' in title.</p> <p>Extend the definition to support brownfield mixed-use sites in sustainable locations and not limit the development prospects to of other suitable sites</p> <p>Widen the extent of the opportunities in Darlington in the light of the availability of major sites suitable for accommodating mixed use development</p>
Eastgate and Boulmer	<p>No specific policy needed in RSS, as can be dealt with by existing policies.</p>
Prestige Employment Sites	<p>These cannot be treated as a consistent group: Baltic Business park and Newburn Riverside vastly different to the large-scale Greenfield proposals for Wynyard and Tyne and Wear Park</p> <p>Scale of ambitions for B1 (office) development on these sites is a major concern. The original rationale for allocating sites of such a scale was to accommodate the needs of inward investors with large-scale operations</p>
Office Development Policy	<p>New Policy nominally 'Policy 18A' should be added in order to more effectively regulate office development outside defined City and Town Centres</p>
Tyne & Wear Park PES	<p>Delete</p>
NetPark	<p>No further expansion beyond existing 13ha permission:</p> <p>Development model aspired to deemed unsuitable given the nature of the location</p>
West Hartford	<p>Should be retained for large users and manufacturing in order to prevent subdivision for general employment uses</p> <p>Nature of the location means it is unsuitable for general employment/B1</p>

Wynyard	Existing planning consents should be restructured to limit development on the site to large scale employment providers and prevent subdivision
---------	--

Reserve Sites	Delete policy as large-scale inward investment these are reserved for is unlikely to occur in the current climate
---------------	---

URBAN AND RURAL CENTRES AND THE METROCENTRE

Retail Centres	RSS Review should adopt a City Regional approach
----------------	--

Urban and Rural Centres	Next review, further research on a more extensive hierarchy of centres
Metro Centre	No further major expansion

HOUSING

Housing Provision	<p>Uncertainty as to the way to net additional housing component had been arrived at:</p> <p>Recommend 112,000 net figure – satisfied Assembly process model is robust</p>
-------------------	--

	<p>Amend gross figures policy</p> <p>Unclear as to what local demand or indigenous growth needs are</p>
--	---

Housing Distribution	Concern that the Panel have adopted the figures arrived at through the demographic model which does not take into account the RSS Strategy
----------------------	--

Amended figures (incorporating overall regional figure of 112,000) do not necessarily reflect RSS Policies and need further amendment

Amendments to Policy 30 requiring the amendments to the allocations for Blyth Valley, Easington and Sedgfield in order to reflect the locational strategy and achieve a greater degree of concentration in the conurbations

Housing Markets	Next review should reflect housing markets and take into account that HMAs do not necessarily correspond with LA areas
-----------------	--

Housing Markets/City Regions	Berwick not part of the Tyne and Wear City Region and is a separate housing market
------------------------------	--

Policy 29 final Para	Panel state that the inclusion of this could inhibit sustainable development
----------------------	--

HMR	Some could be reinforcing an outdated settlement pattern, e.g. in County Durham (12 towns not match)
-----	--

Density	Accept regional exceptions policy
---------	-----------------------------------

Urban Capacity	<p>Need a consistent regional approach.</p> <p>Allocations should not be used to restrict the development of</p>
----------------	--

	brownfield sites that have not been identified in urban capacity studies.
PDL%	Increase to 70% by 2008 and raise for 2016 to 75%
PMM	<p>Approach supported and AMR needs to be used to justify a full or partial review of RSS</p> <p>AMR needs to go beyond what is happening on the ground</p> <p>Triggers won't work</p>

THE ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Wind Policy	Submission Draft RSS provides an adequate and proactive policy approach to wind energy development: Panel support RSS approach
Flood Risk	General support for RSS policy approach
Flood Risk	Greater emphasis on SFRAs for Local Planning Authorities in order to better reflect PPS25 and latest predictions for Sea Level rise
Sustainable Energy Use	<p>Rename Policy 39 as Sustainable Construction and include a more structured guide to inform LDFs</p> <p>Incorporate elements of Policy 40 into Policy 39 in order to encourage wider acceptance of the policy</p>
Renewable Energy	<p>Rewrite Policy 41 in order to better reflect the main emphasis of PPS22</p> <p>Removal of requirement for small-scale wind energy developments to have significant community benefits.</p>
Opencast Coal	<p>No justification for and/or deviation problem is Northumberland already has policy so saying to weaken it in their area.</p> <p>Tests are alternative tests not cumulative – but we say should be cumulative</p>
Waste Policies	RSS done as much as could in timescale and further planned research will fill the PPSP compliance gaps
Tyne & Wear Waste figures	<p>Recommended part in the ERM figures as interim figures.</p> <p>Figures should be disaggregated</p>
Waste capacity gap	<p>Need to provide further details about how the 'capacity gap' will be identified</p> <p>Panel not satisfied that the EiP info note sufficiently explained this</p>

TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Transport	Need to tackle first and last 5 miles of journeys: panel are of the opinion that congestion associated with growth will be found in these areas
Priorities (Table3)	<p>Not convinced represent purpose balance.</p> <p>Too heavily focussed on roads and heavy rail.</p> <p>Need more on demand management</p> <p>GO NE alternative is more spatially specific and addresses specific transport problems</p> <p>GO NE table is a useful starting point and gives greater prominence to demand management, bus and light rail</p> <p>But Policies are the priorities and Table 3 is just what fills out of policies.</p>
RFA	<p>Panel have Criticised the RFA process</p> <p>The inclusion of Wheatley Hill, Bowburn and Morpeth Northern Bypass are surprise inclusions</p> <p>Panel state that Tees Tyne Express should not have been given a higher priority than the Tyne and Wear Metro: seems logical that getting around a conurbation should be a higher priority than moving between conurbations</p>
Transport Corridors	Identify transport corridors where improvements are needed and will contribute to socio-economic objectives
High Speed Line	<p>Why preference for Newcastle City Centre?</p> <p>What about Tees Valley?</p>
Park & Ride	Include reference, to include, but don't say where.
Hubs, Core and Feeder networks	<p>Need action at city region or regional level</p> <p>But don't reflect two levels of hubs – settlement and facilities levels</p>
Parking Standards	Need standards at a city region level
Tursdale	Delete
Tweedmouth	Change purpose for safeguarding to ECML loop
Port of Tyne	Give some consideration to as Teesport – but Teesport is much larger
Monitoring and Implementation	<p>RSS Implementation Plan good and process working well some minor changes proposed.</p> <p>AMR needs more analysis on forecasts etc and need for a review of RSS</p> <p>AMR should also give more recognition in terms of the City Regions</p>

ANNEX 4

Score risk likelihood and impact as high=3; medium=2; low=1. Overall score likelihood x impact.

KEY

Probability of happening	Impact on Service
1 – low	1 – low
2 – medium	2 – medium
3 - high	3 - high

Type of risk	Risks to the Department	Actions to minimise	Progress to Date	Likelihood	Impact	Overall Score	Responsible Officer
Political	Reduction/change in priority accorded to tasks	Have contingency work programme available	No change in priority proposed.	1	2	3	R Hope
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in resources available to service. Availability of external funding. Reduction in economic performance of District leading to reduction in demand on service (building rates). 	Scale back programme, seek partners. Pro-active approach to external funding regimes.	Current resources meet demand for service. Demand (initiated by building industry) remains high but performance has been maintained.	1	3	4	R Hope S Dawson
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ageing population 	Need to ensure flexibility of response in relevant service areas. Impact on DFG's etc to be monitored.	Resources currently meet demand. New ways of working with HIA under consideration.	1	1	2	R Roddam
Technological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computer failure 	Have adequate back-up in place	No current problems (paper system remains relevant)	1	2	3	All Heads of Service

Type of risk	Risks to the Department	Actions to minimise	Progress to Date	Likelihood	Impact	Overall Score	Responsible Officer
Managerial/ Professional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of staff/no replacement. Middle management capacity. 	Use PD Grant constructively. Restructuring of service.	Staffing levels being maintained. One vacancy to be advertised but currently covered by agency staff.	1	2	3	D Townsend
Financial	Reduction in resources Revenues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure of revenue bids to fund additional staff. Environmental resources limited. Reliance on external funds to support mainstream service activity. 	See "Economic" above. Use of Planning Delivery Grant. Seek external assistance.	See Managerial/ Professional above.	1	2	3	D Townsend
	Capital <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale of projects reduced. 		Capital Programme still subject to funding bids at present.	1	2	3	S Dawson
Legal Partnership/ Contractual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role of potential partnerships of Eastgate/Coalfield Housing SPUs. 	Ensure proposals are soundly/legally based.	Partnership arrangements still in process of development.	1	1	2	S Dawson
Physical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of office accommodation/cram ped working conditions. 	Negotiate space elsewhere	Currently being addressed as part of Council restructuring.	1	2	3	R Hope

Type of risk	Risks to the Department	Actions to minimise	Progress to Date	Likelihood	Impact	Overall Score	Responsible Officer
Legislative/ Regulatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in demand on strategy planning/building control facilities leads to more complaints. 	Extra resources required to ensure effective service delivery.	Resources currently available are keeping pace with demand. Proposed staff additional capacity.	1	2	3	D Townsend
Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk assessment more onerous 	Follow set procedures (with Environment Agency)	Joint approach with neighbouring districts being considered.	1	2	3	C Dillon
Competitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External Building Control providers 	Building Control runs at surplus (on fee paying service). Cut back in non-fee activities if service demands decrease.	Building fee rate still competitive and demand for service remains high. Joint working being explored.	1	2	3	J Smith
Customer/ citizen	<p>On-going support for partnerships including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic based partnerships Town Centre Forum Increasing public involvement in planning/development issues. 	Build on existing capacity of community network to continue partnership arrangements. Increased focus on customer care.	Current resources are adequate to meet demands.	1	1	2	R Hope

Wear Valley District Council

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENTS

Guidance Notes for Applicants and Agents

When are Design and Access Statements Required?

From the 10th August 2006 design and access statements must accompany planning applications for both outline and full planning permissions. Design and access statements are required for all applications except:

- A material change in the use of land or buildings, unless it also involves operational development.
- Engineering or mining operations.
- Development of an existing dwelling house, or development within the curtilage of a dwelling house, where no part of that dwelling house or curtilage is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a conservation area, or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Advertisements, tree preservation orders or storage of hazardous material.

Design and access statements will also be required with applications for listed building consent. Where there is a planning application submitted in parallel with an application for listed building consent, a single, combined statement should address the requirements of both.

The elements to be described in the design and access statements will be the same regardless of whether the application is for outline or full planning permission, but their scope will differ.

What is the Purpose of Design and Access Statements?

The role design and access statements play is in linking general development principles to final detailed designs.

A statement accompanying an outline application must explain how the applicant has considered the proposal, and understands what is appropriate and feasible for the site in its context. It should clearly explain and justify the design and access principles used to develop the scheme which can then be used in working up the proposal in more detail.

Such information will help with community involvement and informed decision making. The design and access statement will form a link between the outline permission and the consideration of reserved matters.

In respect of a detailed application, a design and access statement is a short report accompanying and supporting the application to illustrate the process that has led to the development proposal, and to explain and justify the proposal in a structured way.

Pre-application Discussions

The local planning authority encourages pre-application discussions before a formal application is submitted in order to guide applicants/agents through the process. This can minimise delays later in processing the application. Although it is not a formal requirement, it is considered good practice to use design and access statements as an aid in pre-application discussions.

Statements can be a useful and cost effective way to discuss a proposal throughout the design process. Pre-application discussions can also help you and the local planning authority identify areas of concern about your proposed development so that you can give consideration to amending your proposal before the application is submitted.

The advice and guidance given to you at the pre-application advice stage is given in good faith. However no definitive undertaking is given as to whether or not your proposal will be granted consent.

If you have any queries or to arrange an appointment please contact:

Development Control Team

Environment & Regeneration Department
Civic Centre, CROOK, County Durham. DL15 9ES

Tel : (01388) 765555, Fax : (01388) 766660

Email: development.control@wearvalley.gov.uk

www.wearvalley.gov.uk

The opening hours are:

8.30am - 5.00pm Monday to Thursday, and
8.30am - 4.30pm Friday

Presenting the Information

The level of detail required in a design and access statement will depend on the scale and complexity of the application. For most straightforward planning applications, the statement may be only short, for some only a page may be needed. For more complicated planning applications, a more detailed format and, perhaps, longer document is likely to be necessary. For larger or more challenging sites, the statement may include, as appropriate, plans and elevations, photographs of the site and its

surroundings, and any other relevant illustrations which the scheme has responded to. For large and complex schemes, a model of the proposed development in the context of its surroundings may also accompany the statement.

However, whilst its length and complexity may vary, what is important is that the document is concise, and effectively covers all of the design and access issues for the proposed development.

Design and access statements must not be used as a substitute for drawings and other material required to be submitted for determination as part of the planning application itself. They provide an opportunity for developers and designers to demonstrate their commitment to achieving good design and ensuring accessibility in the work they undertake, and allow them to show how they are meeting, or will meet the various obligations placed on them by legislation and policy.

What is Required in a Design and Access Statement?

There are three main elements that are required in a design and access statement, they are:

- The Design Component
- Appraising the Context
- The Access Component

The Design Component

The statement should explain the design principles and concepts that have been applied to particular aspects of the proposal – these are the **amount**, **layout**, **scale**, **landscaping** and **appearance** of the development.

The **amount** of development is how much development is proposed. For residential development, this means the number of proposed units for residential use, and for all other development this means the proposed floor space for each proposed use.

The design and access statement for both outline and detailed applications should explain and justify the amount of development proposed for each use, how this will be distributed across the site, how the proposal relates to the site's surroundings and what consideration is being given to ensure the accessibility for users to and between parts of the development is maximised. Where the application specifies a range of floor space for a particular use, the reasons for this should be clearly explained in the design and access statement.

The **layout** is the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces (both private and public) are provided, placed and orientated in relation to each other and buildings and spaces surrounding the development.

If layout is reserved at outline stage, the outline planning application should provide information on the approximate location of buildings, routes and open spaces proposed. The design and access statement accompanying the outline application should explain and justify the principles behind the choice of development zones and blocks or building plots proposed and explain how these principles, including the need for appropriate access, will inform the layout. The use of illustrative diagrams is encouraged to assist the explaining of this.

For detailed applications, and outline applications where layout is not reserved, the design and access statement should explain and justify the proposed layout in terms of the relationship between buildings and public and private spaces within and around the site and how these relationships will help to create safe, vibrant and successful places. An indication should also be given of factors important to accessibility of the site for users, such as travel distances and gradients, and the orientation of block and units in relation to any site topography to afford optimum accessibility.

A key objective for new developments should be that they create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. Design and access statements for outline and detailed applications should therefore demonstrate how crime prevention measures have been considered in the design of the proposal and how the design reflects the attributes of safe, sustainable places set out in *Safer Places – the Planning System and Crime Prevention* (ODPM/Home Office, 2003).

Scale is the height, width and length of a building or buildings in relation to its surroundings.

If scale has been reserved at outline stage, the application should still indicate parameters for upper and lower limits of the height, width and length of each building proposed, to establish a 3-dimensional building envelope within which the detailed design of the buildings will be constructed. In such cases the design component of the statement should explain and justify the principles behind these parameters and explain how these will inform the final scale of the buildings.

For detailed applications, and outline applications that do not reserve scale, the design and access statement should explain and justify the scale of buildings proposed, including why particular heights have been settled upon, and how these relate to the site's surroundings and relevant skyline. The statement should also explain and justify the size of building parts, particularly entrances and facades with regard to how they will relate to human scale.

Landscaping is the treatment of private and public spaces to enhance or protect the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated through hard and

soft landscaping measures. Statements should also explain how landscaping will be maintained.

If landscaping is reserved at the outline stage, the outline application does not need to provide any specific landscaping information. However, the design and access statement should still explain and justify principles that will inform any future landscaping scheme for the site.

For detailed applications, and outline applications that do not reserve landscaping, the design and access statement should explain and justify the proposed landscaping scheme, explaining the purpose of landscaping private and public spaces and its relationship to the surrounding area. Where possible, a schedule of planting and proposed hard landscaping materials to be used is recommended.

Appearance is the aspect of a place or building that determines the visual impression it makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture.

If appearance is reserved at the outline stage, the outline application does not need to provide any specific information on the issue. In such cases the design and access statement should explain and justify the principles behind the intended appearance and explain how these will inform the final design of the development.

For detailed applications, and outline applications that do not reserve appearance, the design and access statement should explain and justify the appearance of the place or buildings proposed including how this will relate to the appearance and character of the development's surroundings. It should explain how the decisions taken about the appearance have considered accessibility.

The choice of particular materials and textures will have significant impact upon a development's accessibility. Judicious use of materials that contrast the tone and colour to define important features such as entrances, circulation routes, and seating for example will greatly enhance access for everyone. Similarly early consideration of the location and levels of lighting will be critical to the standard of accessibility ultimately achieved.

Appraising the Context

The statement must demonstrate the steps taken to appraise the context of the proposed development. It is important that an applicant should understand the context in which their proposal will sit, and use this understanding to draw up the application. To gain a good understanding of context and to use it appropriately applicants should follow a design process which includes:-

- **Assessment** of the site's immediate and wider context in terms of physical, social and economic

characteristics and relevant planning policies. This may include both a desk survey and on-site observations and access audit. The extent of the area to be surveyed will depend on the nature, scale and sensitivity of the development.

- **Involvement** of both community members and professionals undertaken or planned. This might include, for example, consultation with local community and access groups and planning, building control, conservation, design and access officers. The statement should indicate how the findings of any consultation have been taken into account for the proposed development and how this has affected the proposals.
- **Evaluation** of the information collected on the site's immediate and wider context, identifying opportunities and constraints and formulating design and access principles for the development. Evaluation may involve balancing any potentially conflicting issues that have been identified.
- **Design** of the scheme using the assessment, involvement, and evaluation information collected. Understanding a development's context is vital to producing good design and inclusive access and applicants should avoid working retrospectively, trying to justify a pre-determined design through subsequent site assessment and evaluation.

In the light of understanding of context, a design and access statement should explain how this has been considered in relation to its proposed **use**. The use is the use, or mix of uses, proposed for land and buildings. Use cannot be reserved within an outline application. Design and access statements for both outline and detailed applications should explain the use or uses proposed, their distribution across the site, the appropriateness of the accessibility to and between them, and their inter-relationship to uses surrounding the site.

In addition, the statement should explain how this context has been considered in relation to the physical characteristics of the proposal, that is, the amount, layout, scale, landscaping and appearance of the development.

The Access Component

It is important to note that the requirement for the access component of the statement relates only to "access to the development" and therefore does not extend to internal aspects of individual buildings. Statements should explain how access arrangements will ensure that all users will have equal and convenient access to buildings and spaces and the public transport network. The statement should address the need for flexibility of the development and how it may adapt to changing needs.

The design and access statement should explain the policy adopted in relation to access and how relevant policies in local development documents have been

taken into account. The statement should also provide information on any consultation undertaken in relation to issues of access and how the outcome of this consultation has informed the development proposals. This should include, for example, a brief explanation of the applicant's policy and approach to access, with particular reference to the inclusion of disabled people, and a description of how the sources of advice on design and accessibility and technical issues will be, or have been followed.

Access for the emergency services should also be explained where relevant. Such information may include circulation routes around the site and egress from buildings in the event of emergency evacuation.

For outline applications, where access is reserved, the application should still indicate the location of points of access to the site. Statements accompanying such applications should, however, clearly explain the principles which will be used to inform the access arrangements for the final development at all scales from neighbourhood movement patterns where appropriate to the treatment of individual access points to buildings.

Statements Accompanying Applications for Listed Building Consent

Design and access statements will also be required for Listed Building Consent. They will be similar to design and access statements for planning applications, although there will be some differences because of the differing nature of the application.

Where there is a planning application submitted in parallel with an application for Listed Building Consent, a single combined statement should address the requirements of both. The combined statement should address the elements required in relation to a planning application in the normal way and the additional requirements in relation to Listed Building Consent.

The design and access statement should explain the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the scale, layout and appearance characteristics of a proposal.

Information on use, amount and landscaping is not required for Listed Building Consent design and access statements that do not accompany a planning permission. Otherwise, scale, layout and appearance

are broadly the same as outlined in previous paragraphs.

In addition to following the broad approach in drawing up the design and access statements in relation to planning applications for planning permission, a design and access statement relating to Listed Building Consent should include a brief explanation of how the design has taken account of paragraph 3.5 of PPG15 (Planning and the Historic Environment), and in particular:-

- The historic and special architectural importance of the building.
- The particular physical features of the building that justifies its designation as a listed building.
- The building's setting.

The statement will need to explain and justify the approach to ensuring that the listed building preserves or enhances its special historic and architectural importance and what measures within the approach to design and access have been taken to minimise any impact and fulfil duties imposed by the Disability Discrimination Act and what options have been considered.

The statement should make clear how the approach to access has balanced the duties imposed by the Disability Discrimination Act where the proposal is subject to those and the particular historical and architectural significance of the building (as judged by 3.5 of PPG15). The statement should detail any specific issues that arise particularly with regard to the fact that the building is listed, the range of options considered and, where inclusive design has not been provided, an explanation as to why should be given. In alterations to existing buildings where the fabric of the structure restricts the ability to meet minimum levels of accessibility details should be provided of the solutions that will be put in place to minimise the impact upon disabled people and ensure that any services provided within the building are made available in other ways.

Further Information

For further information on design and access statements you can contact the Development Control Team (details on page 1 of this guidance note) or you can visit the CABI website at www.cabi.org.uk

Suggested Format for Design and Access Statements

Proposed Development

- Applicant name, description of development and address.

Location

- Description of the site and surroundings.
 - Size and shape;
 - Geographical location;
 - Relationship with neighbouring properties;
 - Boundary treatment

The Context of Development

This section may include the following:

- Describe the proposal;
- What is the character of the area;
- Include photographs of the site and surroundings (make sure all photos are clearly labelled);
- Are there any similar developments in the area?
- Any constraints i.e. Conservation Area, Tree Preservation Order's, Listed Buildings etc

Consultation

- Has the proposal been discussed with Neighbours, Ward Members or Parish Council's?
- If so what was the outcome of these discussions and how have they influenced the design?
- Has a community consultation exercise been undertaken? (This would be expected for larger/more contentious schemes only)
- Have any pre-application discussions been held? (what was the outcome?)
- Prior to submitting an application you may wish to discuss the proposals with the following:
 - Planners or Support Staff from the Development Control Team;
 - Planning Policy;
 - Highways Engineers (Durham County Council);
 - Environment Agency (if possibility of Flood Risk or Contamination);
 - English Nature (if protect species or habitat may be involved);
 - Conservation Officer;
 - English Heritage (for major schemes involving listed buildings or conservation areas);

Good pre-application consultation and research will undoubtedly make the application more straight forward once submitted. If the applicant fails to make any enquires and problems are identified during the course of the application which cannot be resolved within the specified 8 or 13 week time period for determination the applicant will be asked to withdraw the application, if the issues can be resolved, or the application will be refused.

Planning Policy

This section may include the following:

- Which policies are relevant to the proposal? (this may be established through pre-application discussions)
- Reference all the policies considered and how the proposed development would comply with them.
- For larger schemes reference will need to be made to policies contained in the emerging Durham County Structure Plan, the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), and any relevant national planning guidance.

The Design Component

The following questions may be answered in this section:

- How has this design been arrived at?
- What pallet of materials are being proposed, why are these considered acceptable?
- Have any existing architectural features/characteristics been used to influence the design of the proposal?
- Describe the height and layout of the proposal and explain why it is suitable within its surroundings?
- How have any identified constraints been addressed in the design?

This section should include diagrams, sketches, photographs, photomontages and any other visual tools to demonstrate the design concept.

The Access Component

This section may include reference to the following:

- Is the site well served by public transport facilities? (Include maps and timetables);
- Are there any special requirements for disabled users?
- Describe pedestrian and cycle access to and from the site;

The applicant will need to comply, where appropriate, with the guidance outlined in The Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document M (Access to and the use of buildings) or British Standard 8300 (Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people).

Useful references

- Wear Valley District Local Plan, www.wearvalley.gov.uk
- Durham Structure Plan, www.durham.gov.uk
- Regional Spatial Strategy, <http://www.viewnortheast.co.uk/documents/index.aspx>
- National Planning Guidance, <http://www.communities.gov.uk/>
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (Cabe), www.cabe.org.uk

NB: There is no right or wrong way of preparing a Design & Access Statement. The aim of the statement is to explain to the reader what you are trying to achieve and how the design solutions have been arrived at. The use of photographs, plans, sketches and even notes will greatly improve the quality of the submission. Each statement must be site specific rather than following a generic format which could be applied to any site. The level of information required will depend on the nature of the proposal and the location of the application site. If the quality of the submission is not appropriate then your planning application may be made invalid and eventually returned. For further information please contact the Development Control Team.



Development Control Team

Environment & Regeneration Department,
Wear Valley District Council,
Civic Centre, CROOK, County Durham. DL15 9ES,
Tel : (01388) 765555, Fax : (01388) 766660,
Email: development.control@wearvalley.gov.uk

The opening hours are: 8.30am - 5.00pm Monday to Thursday, and 8.30am - 4.30pm Friday