

# COMMITTEE REPORT

---

### APPLICATION DETAILS

---

<b>APPLICATION No:</b>	DM/19/00197/FPA
<b>FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:</b>	Erection of 1 detached, 3-storey house with integral garages
<b>NAME OF APPLICANT:</b>	Mr & Mrs Michael Leatherland
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	Crawley Edge Crawleyside Bank Crawleyside Bishop Auckland DL13 2DX
<b>ELECTORAL DIVISION:</b>	Weardale
<b>CASE OFFICER:</b>	Tim Burnham Senior Planning Officer 03000 263963 <a href="mailto:tim.burnham@durham.gov.uk">tim.burnham@durham.gov.uk</a>

---

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

---

1. Crawley Edge is located in countryside on the hillside at Crawleyside Bank, in a prominent position, high above Stanhope. It is within the area of High Landscape Value (AHLV) and close to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
2. The application proposes the erection of a three storey detached dwelling on the land immediately to the SW of the existing property. The land appears to be a former railway cutting, but more recently has been laid to grass. The proposed dwelling would be built to 'Passivhaus' standards and in a distinctly modern design utilising a mixture of stone, render and cedar boarding with roofing materials detailed as single ply membrane and grey concrete tiles. Access would be taken from the B6278 (Crawleyside Bank) at the existing access serving Crawley Edge.
3. This application is a resubmission of the same proposal (DM/16/01460/FPA) that was dismissed at appeal by The Planning Inspectorate in January 2017 following delegated refusal. This time it has been referred to the planning committee at request of Cllr Shuttleworth.

---

### PLANNING HISTORY

---

DM/16/01460/FPA: Erection of 1no. detached dwelling: Refused 20.09.2016 – APPEAL DISMISSED 21.02.2017

---

---

---

# PLANNING POLICY

---

## NATIONAL POLICY

4. The Government has consolidated all planning policy statements, guidance notes and many circulars into a single policy statement, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However, the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
5. *NPPF Part 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes.* To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.
6. *NPPF Part 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities.* The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Developments should be safe and accessible; Local Planning Authorities should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space and community facilities. An integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and services should be adopted.
7. *NPPF Part 9 - Promoting sustainable transport.* Developments that generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised. In assessing applications for development it should be ensured that, among other things, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
8. *NPPF Part 12 - Achieving well-designed places.* The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
9. *NPPF Part 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.* The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.
10. *NPPF Part 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.* The Planning System should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests, recognising the wider benefits of ecosystems, minimising the impacts on biodiversity, preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from pollution and land stability and remediating contaminated or other degraded land where appropriate.

## **LOCAL PLAN POLICY:**

11. The following policies of the Wear Valley Local Plan are relevant to the application; however, in accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the weight to be attached to relevant saved local plan policies will depend upon the degree of consistency with the NPPF. The greater the consistency, the greater the weight.
12. *Policy GD1: General Development Criteria:* All new development and redevelopment within the District should be designed and built to a high standard and should contribute to the quality and built environment of the surrounding area.
13. *Policy ENV1: Protection of the Countryside:* The District Council will seek to protect and enhance the countryside of Wear Valley. Development will be allowed only for the purposes of agriculture, farm diversification, forestry or outdoor recreation or if it is related to existing compatible uses within the countryside as defined in other Local Plan policies.
14. *Policy ENV2: The North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:* Priority will be given to the protection and enhancement of the landscape qualities of the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as identified on the Proposals Map, when considering proposals for development. Development which adversely affects the special scenic quality and the nature conservation interest of the AONB will not be permitted.
15. *Policy ENV3: Areas of Landscape Value:* Development will not be allowed which adversely affects the special landscape character, nature conservation interests and appearance of the Area of Landscape Value identified on the Proposals Map.

*The above represents a summary of those policies considered most relevant in the Development Plan the full text, criteria, and justifications of each may be accessed at <http://www.durham.gov.uk/article/3271/Teesdale-Local-Plan>*

## **RELEVANT EMERGING POLICY:**

### **The County Durham Plan -**

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF says that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of the emerging plan; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and, the degree of consistency of the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF. An 'Issues & Options' consultation was completed in 2016 on the emerging the County Durham Plan (CDP) and the 'Preferred Options' was approved for consultation at Cabinet in June 2018. However, the CDP is not sufficiently advanced to be afforded any weight in the decision-making process at the present time.

---

## CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

---

### STATUTORY RESPONSES:

16. *Highway Authority:* Crawleyside is a very small settlement in Weardale. It has no school or convenience shop, or indeed any retail offer. It is just under 1km steeply uphill from the western end of Stanhope, via Crawleyside Bank, which has a gradient in places of 17%, or 1 in 6. The nearest bus stop with scheduled service is in Stanhope, 870m downhill to the A689 from the application site. DCC and IHT Guidance is that maximum walking distance to a bus stop should not exceed 400m.

Sustainability is the cited 'golden thread' within the NPPF. New build dwellings should be in close proximity to community, education, and shopping facilities where realistic opportunities exist for sustainable travel modes rather than place reliance on the private motor car. The combination of lack/dearth of such facilities, distance and topography of the intervening land to the nearest settlement, and no scheduled bus service, strongly suggests the application site is not sustainable.

The 85th percentile B6278 traffic speeds through Crawleyside settlement are just under 40mph. Sight visibility of and for B6278 traffic, from the proposed access to be utilised, are impaired by the boundary treatment, particularly the high wall to the north east. When measured from the 2.4m guidance setback from the B6278 carriageway edge this latter high boundary wall restricts sight visibility of south west bound B6278 traffic to that commensurate with 10mph traffic speeds only, i.e. substantially less than actual vehicle speeds. It is suggested this too should weigh against the application.

### INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

17. *Design and Conservation:* As part of the planning process the former railway cutting and associated structures which cross the site have previously been identified as a non-designated heritage asset. But, for seeking to use their presence to support the application and designate the land as brownfield no further narrative is offered on the impact of this proposal on the non-designated asset or its setting. Further commentary and appraisal of such matters should be required in accordance with Section 16 of the NPPF.

The intention of the design element of these comments is not to critique the design of the building in full but rather to comment on appropriateness in context. The resultant design draws heavily on the emphasis placed on sustainability, I believe to the detriment of designing in context for the site. The result in relation to the site and its surroundings is a solution which is uncomfortable, jarring and of insufficient quality to overcome these shortcomings. Materials appear to have been driven by local availability and design in general draws little from the positives of the local vernacular. Whilst it would not be appropriate to stifle good design, such design needs to be appropriate. This rural location on the boundary of an area of outstanding natural beauty does not lend itself to the approach taken. Whilst design is subjective I note that the design and access statement is almost silent on the relevance of the design to the site and its surroundings.

As the site adjoins the boundary of the North Pennines AONB which benefits from a building design guide which actively encourages the development of high-quality sustainable architecture it is difficult to see why such advice has not been used to influence the development of this proposal.

Overall it has been proven that appropriate modern architecture can work in the context of this site, thus I would not seek to impose a pastiche solution, however, I believe the current proposal fails to respect the site constraints and so would be harmful to the local environment.

18. *Landscape*: The site is within an Area of High Landscape Value. Visibility into the site is possible from the B6278 road that passes the site to the north, and also at distance of over 1000 metres from the other side of the valley. From the latter viewpoint the site would be seen in the context of the built forms of Crawleyside above it on the valley side and the proposals are unlikely to have a significant effect on the landscape.

In views from the road immediately to the north west of the site there are glimpsed views down Weardale across the site that would be lost. However these views are seen in the context of Crawleyside, above, and the highway escape lane at the roadside, and cannot be regarded as particularly precious.

I do not, therefore, have a problem in visual terms with the principle of a dwelling on this site. While several of the boundary treatments appear to be in place, and are appropriate in terms of materials and design, I would like clarification of the boundary treatments for the whole site, should the application be approved.

19. *Ecology*: I have viewed the eDNA report for GCN (E3 Ecology, July 2016) and am satisfied with the results. I have no objections to the proposals subject to the conditioning of the Method Statement which is appended to the GCN report.

#### **PUBLIC RESPONSES:**

20. The application was publicised by site notice and press notice. No public responses have been received.

*The above is not intended to repeat every point made and represents a summary of the comments received on this application. The full written text is available for inspection on the application file which can be viewed at <https://publicaccess.durham.gov.uk/online-applications/>*

#### **APPLICANTS STATEMENT:**

21. The dwelling we have proposed for this site has the highest possible sustainability credentials with both the owners and the Designer being former winners of national awards for eco-homes. This exemplary new dwelling would be only the second Band A passive house in County Durham and very close to a zero-carbon home. The design and the sustainability credentials are exceptional by both local and national standards and the applicants' current home would be released to the market where there is a recognised demand for high quality, detached homes.
22. Since our application to develop this residential site was refused in September 2016, there have been some significant changes in attitudes to rural housing developments and to sustainable transport arrangements, both public and private. Subtle changes in the wording of Para 78 in the NPPF 2018 give more emphasis to the encouragement of developments in one village which may support services in a nearby village. There is an inevitable and regrettable decline in public transport services in rural areas, due to subsidy cuts, and the scheduled bus services in Weardale do not currently provide

a comprehensive and viable alternative to private car use. We acknowledge that, in rural areas, there is a greater reliance on the private motor car but within ten years most vehicles will be electric and there may be no bus service at all in Upper Weardale. This new dwelling will be exceptionally energy-efficient as well as being equipped to embrace sustainably sourced vehicle charging technology.

23. The location of the site on the edge of the hamlet of Crawleyside, an established residential area which lies within half a mile of Stanhope, was described as “isolated” in the previous planning refusal, solely because it is more than 400m from the nearest stop on a scheduled bus service. This definition of the applicants’ site’s location has been refuted in writing by the Leader of Durham County Council, Cllr Simon Henig. In the Braintree DC Appeal Court judgement in March 2018, the meaning of the term “isolated” in relation to its use in NPPF has been clarified and its previous interpretation declared as being incorrect. This decision also acknowledged that “sustainable transport options are likely to be more limited in rural areas”. We therefore consider that our proposals are sustainable, in the broadest sense of the word and provide the applicants with an opportunity to provide, for themselves, an exceptional, energy-efficient, accessible, new home.

---

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT**

---

24. Having regard to the requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the relevant Development Plan policies, relevant guidance and all other material planning considerations, including representations received, it is considered that the main planning issues in this instance are whether the proposal would be a suitable location for housing having regard to the accessibility of services and facilities by sustainable transport modes and in conjunction with national planning policy; the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and highway safety.

### Policy Context

25. The site is located outside of the settlement boundary for Stanhope as defined in the Wear Valley Local Plan (LP). However, given the age of the local plan its housing policies cannot be considered up to date.

26. This engages Paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which requires that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means either:

approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in the Framework (NPPF) that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework (NPPF) taken as a whole.

## Housing Land Supply

27. On the 13th June 2018, the 'Preferred Options' of the County Durham Plan (CDP) was presented to the Council's Cabinet and endorsed for consultation. The CDP is aligned with the Government's standardised methodology for calculating OAN, which is now reflected in paragraph 60 of the NPPF, and formally endorses the use of 1,368 dwellings per annum (dpa) as the OAN. The Council is now able to demonstrate in excess of 6 years supply of deliverable housing land against this figure.
28. Although the supply has not yet been established in a recently adopted plan, the weight to be afforded to the boost to housing supply as a benefit of the development is clearly less than in instances where such a healthy land supply position could not be demonstrated.
29. Although in a recent written representations appeal involving land to the south of Castlefields, Esh Winning, the Inspector took the view that supply had not been demonstrated by the Council in the terms of paragraph 74 of the Framework, the Council's view is that the Inspector applied paragraph 74 prematurely in this appeal because paragraph 74 does not allow for submission of an Annual position statement on 5 YHLS until April 2019 at the earliest. It was, therefore, impossible for the Council to have such an annual position statement in place at the time of the appeal. In addition, in three further, more recent, written representation appeals (3213596, 3215357 & 3215186), the Inspector outlined that there are also the requirements of Paragraph 73 under which councils are required to identify annually a supply of housing sites to provide a minimum of 5YHLS, set against local housing needs where strategic policies are more than 5 years old. The Council's approach to demonstrating a 5YHLS is, therefore, considered to be appropriate in the circumstances, and in line with the requirements of the NPPF.

## Principle of Development

30. Crawleyside is a very small hamlet, which is identified as a tier 6 settlement within the County Durham settlement study because of its lack of any basic services and facilities. As noted previously by the Inspector, it is located approximately 1km from the services in the centre of the market town of Stanhope, but the steep incline of Crawleyside Bank would be such a deterrent for pedestrian and cycle movements, that neither would be a realistic option for residents of the proposed dwelling who may wish to use these modes of transport. He also noted that the "dial a ride" local bus service would not provide a reasonable alternative to a reliance on the private car due to it not being available in the evenings and weekends and the relative inconvenience of these "first come first serve" modes of transport compared to private car travel. These conclusions have again been shared by the Highway Authority on this resubmission.
31. Regard has been given to the applicant's arguments that the environmental benefits of a Passivhaus in minimising energy consumption and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions would exceed the occupant's CO<sup>2</sup> emissions from car travel, or that low emission vehicles could be used, but this was also raised and considered during the previous appeal, albeit in less detail. It is acknowledged that Passivhaus standard can create buildings that use significantly less energy than standard buildings in the UK. However, the Inspector made it clear in the previous appeal that whilst there may be very few energy efficient

buildings of this nature in County Durham, the Passivhaus standard is not a new, innovative or truly outstanding concept. Other Inspectors have come to the same conclusion on appeals in other parts of the country, noting that the NPPF already supports the move to low carbon and expects new development to take account of things like landform, layout and orientation to minimise energy consumption and therefore such approaches are not uncommon requirements.

32. Moreover, Passivhaus has been around since before the NPPF and is not one of the special circumstances listed to overcome development in unsustainable locations. Nor are low and zero emission vehicles. If this would have been the case it would open the door to housing in any remote location contrary to the aims of the NPPF. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposed dwelling would likely give rise to multiple car ownership with garaging included for three cars and a motorhome. Even if all the occupiers' vehicles were low emission, there is no way to ensure this would remain the case in perpetuity and therefore it is not a factor which can be given any weight. A dwelling would also generate other vehicle trips from deliveries and visits with no control possible over their environmental credentials.
33. Regard has also been given to the applicant's reference to the 'Braintree' judgement in which the court considered the interpretation of the term 'isolated' as used in paragraph 55 of the NPPF (now paragraph 79). It is acknowledged that the previous refusal made reference to the term 'isolated' and that this site would not be regarded as isolated in the context of the meaning given to the term 'isolated' in that judgement.
34. It is also acknowledged that whilst paragraph 103 of the NPPF accepts that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, for the reasons above, even allowing for such variations, it is once again considered that most journeys to and from the property would be made by private vehicle, which is the least sustainable mode of transport and contrary to the aims of the NPPF in respect of managing growth to promote sustainable transport.
35. Therefore, whilst having regards to all additional matters raised in this resubmission, there is still no reason to take any different view to that taken previously by the Council, and supported by the Planning Inspectorate, that the proposal would conflict with key aims of the NPPF, particularly Section 9 which seeks to actively manage patterns of growth and promote sustainable modes of travel like walking, cycling and public transport. There is also conflict with Wear Valley Local Plan Policy GD1, which among other things encourages access to public transport and priority to pedestrians and cyclists.

#### Character and appearance

36. Crawley Edge, as its name suggests, lies on the edge of the built development on Crawleyside Bank, facing the open countryside above Stanhope and in a sensitive landscape. The proposed dwelling would sit beyond the existing boundary wall of Crawley Edge and as such would extend the existing development distinctly outwards beyond the existing built development and into the surrounding countryside where it would be highly visible on the hillside.
37. Whilst this would not necessarily result in a visual intrusion into the landscape, given it would still be viewed closely in relation to the existing development and the confines of the former railway cutting, its visual impact would nevertheless be exacerbated by its design and materials, which depart significantly from the traditional vernacular appearance of development in the area. It is acknowledged that the existing dwelling Crawley Edge does too, but not as severely, as it utilises a pitched slate roof and

stone walls, which still respect the form and traditional characteristic of the area. It is also a lot less visible than the proposed dwelling would be.

38. The Design and Conservation Section did not comment on the previous application because they were not consulted, but that does not mean they cannot comment on the resubmission as it is a new application. They note that the former railway cutting and associated structures which cross the site have previously been identified as a non-designated heritage asset, but the proposal does not take into account any impact on the heritage value of this structure. Furthermore, whilst not completely dismissing the potential for appropriate modern architecture in the context of this site, it is considered that the proposed dwelling design, driven by its sustainability aims, rather than the positives of the local vernacular and setting, would be inappropriate in this particular context. This is evident in the design and access statement, which is almost silent on the relevance of the design to the site and its surroundings.

39. It is therefore considered that the proposed dwelling would be of an inappropriate design that would not fit well within its context and surroundings and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would in turn have a negative impact on the qualities of the Area of High Landscape Value, which is derived partly by the quality and character of the traditional building vernacular. Accordingly, there is conflict with Wear Valley Local Plan policies GD1 and ENV3. Policy GD1 requires new development to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, and designed to be appropriate in terms of form, mass, scale, layout, density and materials to the town or village in which it is to be situated. Policy ENV3 does not allow development which adversely affects the special landscape character and appearance of the Area of Landscape Value. There is also conflict with NPPF paragraph 127, which among other things seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

#### Highway safety

40. The proposed dwelling would take its access from the existing Crawley Edge access onto the B6278. The Highway Authority advises that sight visibility at this access is severely impaired by the high wall to the north east, to the extent that visibility of south west bound B6278 traffic would be commensurate with safety standards of 10mph traffic speeds only, which is considerably below the 85th percentile B6278 traffic speeds of just under 40mph through Crawleyside.

41. It must therefore be considered that the access provides substandard visibility for the new dwelling and as such there is conflict with Wear Valley Local Plan Policy GD1 and NPPF paragraph 108, which both require development to have safe access.

42. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is an existing access and therefore the same applies to the existing dwelling, the proposal would materially increase the use of the access. The recent changes to the NPPF lower the bar for refusals on highway safety grounds and no longer requires there to be a severe cumulative impact, which prevented refusal on these grounds previously. Paragraph 109 now states development should be refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, which the Highway Authority advice indicates is the case.

#### Other issues

43. Two ponds in and near the site were tested for Great Crested Newts, but were found to be unsuitable. No further valuable ecological features were identified. The Ecology

section has raised no objections. Therefore, in paying regards to the requirements of the Habitats Directive, the risk to protected species is considered to be low.

---

## CONCLUSION

---

44. As the housing policies of the Wear Valley Local Plan are out-of-date the application should be decided within the planning balance, meaning that planning approval should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.
45. The NPPF identifies three strands of sustainable development – social, economic and environmental, which must be sought jointly and simultaneously.
46. The contribution to housing supply is a benefit of the scheme, but the provision of one dwelling would make a very limited contribution in the grand scheme of the Council's housing supply, particularly as the Council is now able to demonstrate in excess of 5 years supply of deliverable housing land against the Government's standardised methodology for calculating OAN, which is now reflected in paragraph 60 of the NPPF. Similarly, any social and economic benefits from the provision of one house, including support for local services and the construction process would be equally modest and as such is afforded very limited weight.
47. Building to Passivhaus standard would create a dwelling with excellent energy efficiency, which is an environmental benefit of scheme. However, even if this would help towards ameliorating the CO<sup>2</sup> emissions from car travel associated with the dwelling, it would not be sufficient to outweigh the proposals conflict with other key environmental aims of the NPPF, particularly in terms of actively managing patterns of growth to promote sustainable transport like walking, cycling and public transport, with their associated effects on reducing pollution and health benefits. Furthermore, the adverse environmental impacts of the development on the character and appearance of the area and highway safety would also significantly outweigh any Passivhaus benefits.
48. Therefore, for the reasons given, and having regards to all matters raised, it is concluded that the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. As a result, the development is not considered to be sustainable development.

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons;

- 
1. The proposal, by reason of its location, would result in most journeys to and from the property being made by private vehicle, which is the least sustainable mode of transport and contrary to the aims of the NPPF, particularly Section 9, in respect of

managing growth to promote sustainable transport, as well as saved Policy GD1 of the Wear Valley Local Plan in this same respect.

2. The proposal by reason of its design, would not fit well within its context and surroundings and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and the Area of High Landscape Value. This is contrary to saved policies GD1 and ENV3 of the Wear Valley Local Plan, as well as NPPF paragraph 127.
3. The proposal by reason of the severely impaired visibility at the B6278 access point and material increase in the use of this access, would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This is contrary to saved Policy GD1 of the Wear Valley Local Plan, as well as NPPF paragraphs 108 and 109.
4. Consequently, these adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the development plan and the NPPF considered as a whole.

---

## **STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT**

---

The Local Planning Authority in arriving at its decision to recommend refusal of this application have, without prejudice to a fair and objective assessment of the proposal, considered the proposal in relation to relevant planning policies, material considerations and representations received, however, in the balance of all considerations, the issues of concern could not result in a positive outcome being achieved.

---

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

---

Submitted application form, plans supporting documents  
The relevant planning history and similar appeals  
The National Planning Policy Framework (2018)  
Wear Valley Local Plan  
The County Durham Plan (Submission Draft)  
County Durham Settlement Study 2012  
All consultation responses received

