

County Durham Plan

Schedule of Minor (Additional) Modifications June 2019

■	Schedule of Minor (Additional) Modifications	
1	Introduction	2
2	County Durham Plan	2
3	Policies Map	14
4	Sustainability Appraisal	15
5	Habitats Regulation Assessment	16
6	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	16
7	Durham Transport Model Appraisal Report	20
8	Durham Local Plan Traffic Impact Report	31
9	Exceptional Circumstances	36
10	Housing Need and Residual for Allocations Paper	37
11	Residential Internal Space Standards	45

1.1 The Pre-Submission Draft was consulted upon under Regulation 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. All representations made have been reviewed and carefully considered and it has been concluded that, subject to some minor text and formatting changes which need to be made, there are no matters arising from the representations that call into question the soundness of the Plan or the legality of its preparation that would prevent it being submitted to the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government in its current form.

1.2 Following consideration of the consultation comments, a schedule of minor (additional) modifications to the Plan and accompanying evidence base are proposed. These modifications do not alter the meaning or substance of the Plan and evidence base and accordingly, do not trigger the need for further assessment either by the Sustainability Appraisal or Habitats Regulations Assessment.

1.3 Notwithstanding this position and in the interest of good practice, it is proposed that officers continue to discuss issues raised during the consultation period with stakeholders in the run up to the Examination, to further minimise their areas of concern.

1.4 The Inspector, in examining the Plan and in light of representations made, may conclude that main or further minor (additional) modifications are required to make it sound and capable of adoption. Any 'main modifications' made in relation to soundness will need to be the subject of further consultation. The council has authorised the Corporate Director of Regeneration and Local Services to ask the Inspector under section 20(7C) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to recommend modifications to the Plan, to ensure that modification, if required, can be made to satisfy the requirements of subsection (5)(a) and make the document sound.

Table 1

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Introduction	Para 1.3	Removal of ' published in 2018 '.	To improve clarity and ensure that it is clear that it is the NPPF that is being referred to.	
How Do I Get Involved?	Para 1.9 - 1.16	Removal of consultation methods and contact details.	For clarification regarding stage of the County Durham Plan.	
Duty to Cooperate; Cross-Boundary Issues	Para 1.25	Removal of ' revised 2018 '.	To improve clarity and ensure that it is clear that it is the NPPF that is being referred to.	
What the County Durham Plan is Seeking to Achieve	Footnote added at para 2.15	Footnote inserted ' <u>Waste Data Interrogator data from EA, 2016.</u> '	For clarification.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Vision and Objectives	Objective 3	Addition of 'gypsies and travellers'.	As the Plan does seek to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers the council is proposing a minor modification for clarity.	ID 2420
Delivering Sustainable Development	Third paragraph, Sustainable Development Statement	Replace ' this Framework ' with ' <u>the National Planning Policy Framework</u> '.	To improve clarity and ensure that it is clear that it is the NPPF that is being referred to.	ID 1539 and ID 1804
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.11	The word ' draft ' has been removed.	To reflect that the guidance has been updated following consultation.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.11	The date of the guidance has been changed from ' July 2018 ' to ' <u>February 2019</u> '.	The date has been amended to reflect the updated guidance.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.15	The following text has been introduced to the supporting text: ' <u>The Planning Practice Guidance published in February 2019, noted that the 2014 based household projections should be used within the standard method to provide stability for planning authorities and communities, ensure that historic under-delivery and declining affordability are reflected, and to be consistent with the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Furthermore, the Guidance noted any method which relies on using the 2016-based household projections will not be considered to be following the standard method.</u> '	This has been included to update the supporting text to note that PPG has been updated following consultation and to set out relevant aspects of the Guidance.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.16	The word ' should ' has been replaced by ' <u>may</u> '. '...that authorities should <u>may</u> also consider previous delivery levels.	The text has been amended to reflect the updated PPG.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.17	The following has been removed from the supporting text: ' It is however recognised that the approach set out in the Technical Consultation is subject to consultation and if there are material changes in the final version of the guidance then a review of the Pre-Submission Draft may be required '.	The consultation has now concluded and the PPG has been updated.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.22	The text ' sites under 0.4 hectares (12 houses) ' has been replaced with 'Small scale housing developments (11 houses or less)'. '	Error in the number of units and to provide clarity.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.22	Words 'windfall allowance' added.	To provide clarity.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.22	Word ' not ' deleted.	Re-wording to provide clarity.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.22	Text added: starting three years after the base date (30th September 2018) To replace text: for the first three years of the Plan period as this would double count	Re-wording to provide clarity, and to correct error in that it should be 3 years from the base date of the Plan, not from the Plan period.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.22	Text added:	To provide clarity.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		To also include a windfall allowance before that point would potentially include some overlap and double counting with		
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.23	Text added: (12 units or greater)	To provide clarity.	
Policy 1 Quantity of New Development	Para 4.23	Text: recent past Replaced with: previous years	Re-wording to provide clarity.	
Policy 2 Employment Land	Table 3, Employment Land Allocations by Local Plan Monitoring Area (North Durham)	Add reference to B1 uses only. 'Lambton Estate (<u>B1 only</u>)'	Confirmation that B1 uses are only suitable at Lambton which reflects the planning permission (DM/15/02714/OUT)	ID 79
Policy 2 Employment Land	Para 4.32	Text added 'ELR which identify any constraints. <u>It should be noted that in some instances the site areas of the allocations detailed within the policy relate to net developable areas, the details of these are clarified within the ELR and may differ from the gross areas detailed on the online policies map.</u> '	For clarification to confirm that some site areas are net and therefore in some instances may differ from the figure quoted on the online policies map which are gross areas only.	ID 79
Policy 2 Employment Land	Table 4, Protected Employment Sites (West Durham)	Delete reference to Frosterley.	Frosterley reference incorrectly mentioned twice.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 3 Aykley Heads	Criteria c.	Correction of the cross reference (Policy 9 instead of Policy 10). '...as outlined in Policy 10 9 (Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development).'	The Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development Policy was wrongly referenced as Policy 10.	
Policy 3 Aykley Heads	Para 4.57	Replaced 'and' with 'any' '...the World Heritage Site or and <u>any</u> designated heritage assets...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 3 Aykley Heads	Para 4.48	Removal of capital letters '...vacancy rates within the C city C entre and...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 3 Aykley Heads	Footnote 19	Clarification that some council staff will be located within the city and across the county. '...within the city <u>and across the county</u> .'	To align with the Cabinet Report 17th Jan 2018.	ID 2226
Policy 4 Housing Allocations	Site Allocation H22 High West Road, bullet point 5	Amend 'A690' to read 'A689' '...roundabout on the A690 <u>A689</u> with...'	Typographical correction.	ID 1922 and ID 933
Building a Strong, Competitive Economy	Para 5.5	Replace 'up to' with 'approximately' in relation to IAMP job numbers. '...creating up to <u>approximately</u> 7,850 new jobs...'	For clarity.	ID 80

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 9 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development	Bullet 4	Brackets added to Durham City mention, these have replaced the commas. 'District Centres - Arnison Centre (Durham City), Sherburn Road/Dragonville, (Durham City)'	This clarifies that the district centres are within Durham City.	ID 81
Policy 9 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development	Para 5.34	Insert the word 'centre' '...support new retail and town <u>centre</u> proposals...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 13 Equestrian Development	Final paragraph in Policy 13	Amended policy number to '12' '...against Policy 13 <u>12</u> Permanent Rural Workers' Dwellings).'	Incorrect cross reference.	ID 53
Policy 18 Children's Homes	Para 5.176	Amend '27' to '33' '... 27 <u>33</u> of which are registered children's homes,..'	Updated figure to represent present numbers of children's homes in County Durham.	
Policy 18 Children's Homes	Para 5.176	Add 'March 2019' after (Ofsted data) '...which is the largest number in the north of England (Ofsted data <u>March 2019</u>).	Reference to clarify that this figure is from March 2019.	
Protecting Green Belt Land	Para 5.186	Amend 8,726 to 8,591 '...total land area of 8,726 <u>8,591</u> hectares...'	To clarify the total Green Belt post Green Belt amendments proposed in the Plan.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 20 Green Belt	Criteria c.	Amend 'is' to 'it' '...building providing that <u>it</u> does not...'	Typographical correction.	ID 1810
Sustainable Transport	Para 5.205	Add the word 'integration' '...Smart ticketing, <u>integration</u> , promotions and...'	Providing clarity that integrated bus services will make public transport more attractive.	ID 1350
Policy 22 Delivering Sustainable Transport	Para 5.216	Changing tense of sentence '...we have set <u>are setting</u> out our ambition for cycling in the forthcoming County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2019 289 which will also provides...'	To reflect latest position.	
Policy 23 Durham City Sustainable Transport	Para 5.224	Added 're-claim the space for people' '...sustainable transport modes, <u>re-claiming space for people</u> , and correcting...'	This clarifies that the prioritisation given to pedestrians in the city centre.	
Policy 30 Sustainable Design	Para 5.303	Footnote added to include weblink added to the Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2019-2029.	To provide detailed guidance and consistency in relation to cycling and walking.	ID 1096 and ID 1461
Policy 30 Sustainable Design	Para 5.318	Change 'efficient' to 'effective' '...Developments should make efficient <u>effective</u> use of land...#	Typographical correction.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 31 Hot Food Takeaways (A5 Uses)	Policy 31, first para	Corrected the cross reference Policy 9 instead of Policy 10. '...(as defined in Policy 10 9(Retail Hierarchy and...'	The Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development Policy was wrongly referenced as Policy 10.	ID 735 and ID 1836
Policy 33 Despoiled, Degraded, Derelict, Contaminated and Unstable Land	Footnote 115	'Appendix B' changed to 'Appendix C'. '...are set out in Appendix BC C.'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 35 Wind Turbine Development	Para 5.372 First bullet point	Added 'Micro - under 11 metres in height;' to the bullet point list of assessed wind turbine sizes <u>'Micro - under 11 metres in height;'</u>	For consistency and clarity between this list and the policies map key.	ID 2929
Policy 36 Water Management and Policy 37 Water Infrastructure	Para 5.390	Additional reference to the geological conditions '...drainage system <u>is suitable to the geological conditions and applies...</u>	To add clarity.	ID 2957
Policy 36 Water Management and Policy 37 Water Infrastructure	Para 5.392	'...date climate change allowances <u>which can be found on the Met Office-UK Climate Projections web page.</u>	To add clarity	ID 1118
Policy 36 Water Management and Policy 37 Water Infrastructure	Para 5.395	Additional reference to the Tyne, Wear and Tees Rivers Trusts '...can be found on <u>the websites of their respective websites hosts: the Tyne, Wear and Tees River Trusts.</u>	To add clarity.	ID 2957

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 38 Durham Heritage Coast and Wider Coastal Zone	3rd paragraph of the policy	Addition of footnote '...major development, as <u>defined in the glossary</u> ,...'	To add clarity.	ID 1528
Policy 38 Durham Heritage Coast and Wider Coastal Zone	Para 5.415 Footnote 143	Inclusion of a web link to SPMT2 within the footnote	To add clarity.	
Policy 47 Stockton and Darlington Railway	Para 5.489	Change cross reference to Policy 30 '...must also accord with policy 30† Sustainable Design in the Built Environment.'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 47 Stockton and Darlington Railway	Para 5.490	Change the word 'objection' to 'objectives' '...the aims and objection <u>ives</u> ...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 49 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites	Footnote 183	'Appendix C' changed to 'Appendix D'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 49 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites	Policy 49, 3rd para	Delete 'on map C' '...safeguarding zone (where defined on Map C in the...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 49 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure	Para 5.505	'Appendix C' amended to 'Appendix D' and delete 'on Map C' '...listed in Appendix GD and are identified <u>on Map C</u> in the policies map...'	Typographical correction.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
and Waste Management Sites				
Policy 49 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites	Para 5.507	Amend references to ensure that 'Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone' are referred to with the correct name. '...minerals and waste <u>site</u> safeguarding zone...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 49 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites	Para 5.508	Amend reference to ensure that 'Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone' are referred to with the correct name. 'Appendix C' changed to 'Appendix D'. '...minerals and waste <u>site</u> safeguarding zone...' '...prepared (see Appendix <u>ED</u>).'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 49 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites	Monitoring Indicator	Amend reference to ensure that 'Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone' are referred to with the correct name. '...a Minerals and Waste <u>Site</u> Safeguarding Zone...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 52 Meeting Future Aggregate Requirements	Criteria 1a	Cross reference from 'policy 58' to 'policy 59' '...Policy 58 <u>59</u> or as a non-strategic site ...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 52 Meeting Future Aggregate Requirements	Para 5.530	Renumbered policy references '...Policy 52 <u>51</u> seeks...' '...Policy 53 <u>52</u> provides...' '...Policy 53 <u>52</u> (part 1)...'	Typographical correction.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		'...Policy 53 <u>52</u> (part 2)...' '...Policy 53 <u>52</u> (part 3)...'		
Policy 54 Surface Mined Coal and Fireclay	Criteria B5	Amend 'Policy 56' to 'Policy 57' '...with Policy 56 <u>57</u> (Safeguarding...'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 54 Surface Mined Coal and Fireclay	Para 5.554	Amend 'Policy 53' to '54' '...under Policy 53 <u>54</u> (Surface Mined Coal and Fireclay).'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 55 Natural Building and Roofing Stone	Second para	Amend policy reference from 'Policy 40' to 'Policy 39' '...Policy 39 <u>40</u> (North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 57 Safeguarding Mineral Resources	Criteria e	Criteria e amend 'Appendix C' to 'Appendix D' '...appendix C <u>D</u> of the plan.'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 57 Safeguarding Mineral Resources	Para 5.569	Amend 'Appendix C' to 'Appendix D' '...(please see Appendix C <u>D</u>).'	Typographical correction.	
Policy 60 Strategic Area of Search to the South of Todhills Brickworks	First para of the policy	Amend reference to 'Policy 52' to 'Policy 53' '...with Policy 52 <u>53</u> (Brick Making Raw Materials)...	Typographical correction.	
Policy 61 Waste Provision	Para 5.596	Add 'Waste Management Capacity Study and Addendum 2018' after 'Plan period in the' in the first sentence. '...Plan period in the <u>Waste Management Capacity Study and Addendum 2018</u>'	To add clarity.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Appendix A	Strategic Policies	<p>The following policies are not strategic and therefore should be removed from Appenix A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 7 – Visitor Attractions • Policy 8 – Visitor Accommodation • Policy 13 – Equestrian Development • Policy 14 – Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and Soil Resources • Policy 18 – Children's Homes • Policy 19 – Type and Mix of Housing • Policy 22 – Delivering Sustainable Transport • Policy 25 – Provision of Transport Infrastructure • Policy 29 – Safeguarded Areas • Policy 31 – Hot Food Takeaways (A5 uses) • Policy 32 – Amenity and Pollution • Pollution 33 – Despoiled, Degraded, Derelict, Contaminated and Unstable Land • Policy 34 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy • Policy 41 – Trees, Woodlands and Hedges • Policy 56 – Reopening of Relic Building Stone Quarries for Heritage Projects 	Owing to a printing error, an Addendum was issued to 'Appendix A' in January 2019	
Appendix C	Para C1	<p>Amend cross reference</p> <p>'...National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 3433(Despoiled, Degraded, Derelict, Contaminated and Unstable Land)...</p>	Typographical correction	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Appendix C	Policy Drivers	Amend cross reference '...the NPPF and Policy 56 <u>57</u> (Safeguarding Mineral Resources)...'	Typographical correction	
Appendix D	Para D1	Amend 'Policy 56' to 'Policy 57'. Amend 'Policy 50' to 'Policy 49'. Insert 'Site'. '...Mineral Safeguarding Area (Policy 56 <u>57</u>) or be viewed as inappropriate development within a Minerals and Waste <u>Site</u> Safeguarding Zone (Policy 50 <u>49</u>)...'	Typographical correction.	
Appendix D	Para D2	Amend 'Policy 49' to 'Policy 57'. Insert 'Site' '...(Policy 49 <u>57</u>) or be viewed as inappropriate development within a Minerals and Waste <u>Site</u> Safeguarding Zone (Policy 49):'	Typographical correction.	
Appendix D	Para D3	Amend 'Mineral Safeguarding Area' to Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone' '...sterilising development within a Mineral Safeguarding Area <u>Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone</u> (Policy 49):'	Typographical correction.	

3.1 The following table sets out the minor (additional) modifications made to the Policies Map which was subject to an Addendum in January 2019. This document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 2

Policies Map Reference	Site Name	Correct Reference	Explanation
H9	Former Roseberry Comprehensive School	<u>H11</u>	Typographical correction
H10	Former Blackfyne School	<u>H16</u>	Typographical correction

Policies Map Reference	Site Name	Correct Reference	Explanation
H11	East of Muirfield School	<u>H17</u>	Typographical correction
H12	Laurel Drive	<u>H18</u>	Typographical correction
H13	South of Knitsley Lane	<u>H19</u>	Typographical correction
H14	Rosedale Avenue	<u>H20</u>	Typographical correction
H15	High West Road	<u>H22</u>	Typographical correction
H16	Former Tudhoe Grange Lower School, Durham Road	<u>H24</u>	Typographical correction
H17	Former Tudhoe Grange Upper School, St Charles' Road	<u>H25</u>	Typographical correction
H18	Land East of Ash Drive	<u>H26</u>	Typographical correction
H19	Former Chamberlain Phipps	<u>H28</u>	Typographical correction
H20	Bracks Road	<u>H29</u>	Typographical correction
H21	Copelaw	<u>H30</u>	Typographical correction
H22	Eldon Whins	<u>H31</u>	Typographical correction
H23	Land at Woodham College	<u>H32</u>	Typographical correction
H24	Cobblers Hall	<u>H33</u>	Typographical correction
H25	North Blunts	<u>H36</u>	Typographical correction
H26	Seaham Colliery	<u>H37</u>	Typographical correction
H27	Former Seaham School	<u>H38</u>	Typographical correction
H28	Land off Leazes Lane	<u>H43</u>	Typographical correction

4.1 The following table sets out the minor (additional) modifications made to the Pre-Submission Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report of the County Durham Plan. This document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 3

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 4 Housing Allocations	Para 4.161 - Bullet 15	Amend A690 to read A689	Typographical correction	
Policy 5 Durham City's Sustainable Urban Extension	Para 4.212, Bullet 5	Amendment to figure cited	Typographical correction	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Policy 5 Durham City's Sustainable Urban Extension	Para 4.217	Amendment to figure cited	Typographical correction	
Policy 23 Durham City Sustainable Transport	Para 4.217	Amendment to figure cited	Typographical correction	

5.1 The following table sets out the minor changes made to the Pre-Submission Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (HRA) report. The minor changes reflect comments made as part of the Duty to Cooperate process and the document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 4

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
7. Coastal Avoidance Measures and Alternative Solutions	Para 7.0.1	Deletion of language relating to 'likely significant effects' and insertion of wording relating to 'avoidance of adverse effects' on integrity.	To improve clarity	Following meeting held with Natural England on the 22nd February 2019
7.2 Measure 2: Provision / Enhancement of Alternative Natural Greenspace	Map showing Lodge Field Plantation green space	Replaced original Lodge Field Plantation map with an updated version	To improve clarity	Following meeting held with Natural England on the 22nd February 2019
7.2 Measure 2: Provision / Enhancement of Alternative Natural Greenspace	Map showing Tweed / Moray Close green space	Replaced original Tweed / Moray Close figure with an updated version	To improve clarity	Following meeting held with Natural England on the 22nd February 2019
7.3 Access Management and Monitoring	Table 15, item 4	Amend 'e.g.' to 'i.e'	Typographical error	Following meeting held with Natural England on the 22nd February 2019
7.3 Access Management and Monitoring	Table 15, item 5	Addition of reference to the car parks that will be removed	To improve clarity	Following meeting held with Natural England on the 22nd February 2019

6.1 The following table sets out the minor changes to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 5

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
	3.111	Removed the following text 'With Junction 63 and the area around Junction 63 being having been recently upgraded, it is not anticipated that any capacity issues will be flagged in the next round of SRN modelling' and replaced with Junction 63 and the area around junction 63 have been recently upgraded.	To provide further clarity to paragraph	Highways England
	Un-numbered paragraph between 3.191 and 3.192	Removed the following text 'With Junction 61 and the area around 61 due to be completed in 2019, it is not anticipated that any capacity issues will be highlighted in the next round of SRN modelling.' and replaced with Works to junction 61 and the area around junction 61 are scheduled to be completed in 2019.	To provide further clarity to paragraph	Highways England

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
	3.210	Removed the following text 'However, the impact on Junction 59 will be modelled as part of ongoing work between DCC, Highways England and Darlington Borough Council. Highways England will respond fully on these junctions.'	To provide further clarity to the section	Highways England
	3.236	Removed the following text 'However, the impact on Junction 59 will be modelled as part of ongoing work between DCC, Highways England and Darlington Borough Council. Highways England will respond fully on these junctions.'	To provide further clarity to the section	Highways England
	3.257	Removed the following text ' However, the impact on Junction 60 will be modelled as part of ongoing work between DCC, Highways England and Darlington Borough Council. Highways England will respond fully on these junctions.'	To provide further clarity to the section	Highways England

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
	Un-numbered paragraph between 3.161 and 3.162	<p>Removed the following text 'Strategic Road Network - Junction 62</p> <p>At Junction 62 of the A1(M), road safety improvements related to existing issues and capacity enhancement measures are proposed to facilitate wider growth in the Durham City area. Junction 62 is a key junction, connecting Durham City with the A1(M), Sunderland and the wider region. Provisional funding has been made available from NECA for delivery of the Junction 62 scheme in 2019/20, subject to a full business case being produced.'</p>	To provide further clarity to the section	Highways England
	3.274	Text changed from 'The council have also submitted a bid for funding so the junction of the A19/A1018 near Seaham can be improved.' to 'The council have also submitted	To provide further clarity to the section	Highways England

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		a joint HIF bid with Sunderland City Council for funding so the junction of the A19/A1018 near Seaham can be improved, discussions around any potential programme of works are ongoing with Highways England and the final scheme would be agreed with them before implementation.'		

7.1 The following table sets out the minor changes made to the Durham Transport Model Appraisal Report. The document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 6

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
2.2.2	Para 1	in total there are 3,714 <u>2510</u> proposed dwellings, all of which are forecast to come forward after 2022.	Value was not correct	805
3.2.2	Para 5	Paragraph added.	Specify the unit for results within the report	805
3.2.3	Table 3.1.1	Table added.	Specify the unit for results within the report	805
4.1.3	Table 4.1	Values for Junctions 1 and 4 updated.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
4.1.3	Para 4	<u>At Junction 4 (A690 / New Elvet (Leazes Bowl) junction) the poorest performing movement is the A690 to/from Claypath eastbound at 99% in the PM peak.</u> It should also be noted that	Comment updated due to junction correction	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		the A690 corridor and New Elvet has large sections which are constrained.		
4.1.3	Para 5	The results highlight that Junction 6 (A690 / A181 Gilesgate roundabout) shows the A690 to Claypath arm <u>Gilesgate eastbound</u> is the poorest performing movement at 103%.	Comment updated due to junction correction	805
4.1.3	Para 8	Junction 9 (A690/A691/Milburngate Bridge junction), shows that the A690 to Milburngate southbound <u>westbound</u> is approaching capacity in both the AM and PM peak at 94 <u>101</u> % and 92 <u>96</u> %, respectively.	Comment updated due to junction correction	805
4.1.4	Table 4.2	Some values updated for Route 1 and Route 2	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
5.2.2	Table 5.1	Table updated.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
5.2.2	Para 2	Text updated.	Comments updated to reflect changes in Table 5	805
5.2.2	Para 4	Overall, across the wider network, there is expected to be an increase of 17 <u>19</u> % and 41 <u>13</u> % in total delay at junctions across the network in the AM and PM peak respectively.	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 5.1	805
5.2.4	Table 5.2	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction?	805
5.2.4	Para 2	Text updated.	Comments updated to reflect changes in Table 5.	805
5.2.4	Para 4	Overall, across the wider network, there is expected to be a large increase of 37 <u>39</u> % and	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 5.2	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		52 54% in total delay at junctions across the network in the AM and PM peak respectively.		
5.2.5	Para 4	Average increases of 34 % and 8% in journey times (two-way) across all three routes are anticipated in the AM peak for 2022 and 2037 respectively.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
5.2.5	Table 5.3	Values from 2015 Route 2 eastbound updated.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
5.4.4	Table 5.4	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
5.4.4	Para 3	Paragraph added.	Details about Junction 4 were removed from paragraph 2 and further explained in this paragraph.	805
5.4.4	Para 4	Junction 7 (A691 / B6532 (County Hall) roundabout) with increases of 40 11% and 56 55% in the AM and PM peak respectively.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
5.4.5	Table 5.5	Values for 2015 Route 2 updated.		805
5.4.5	Para 4	Average increases of 34 % and 9 10% in journey times (two-way) across all three routes are anticipated in the AM peak for 2022 and 2037 respectively. By comparison, average increases in two-way journey times of 4% and 7 8% are anticipated by 2022 and 2037 in the PM peak.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
6.1.2	Para 3	On average, a reduction in traffic of 5% and 6% is expected to occur across the nine junctions for the AM and PM peak respectively	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
6.1.2	Table 6.1	Values updated for Junction 1. Some percentages have also been updated for Junctions 4 and 5.	Values for Junction 1 updated due to junction correction. Remaining values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
6.1.2	Table 6.1	Values updated for Junction 1. Some percentages have also been updated for Junctions 2 and 9.	Values for Junction 1 updated due to junction correction. Remaining values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
6.1.2	Para 3	Junction 5 (A177 South Road / Stockton Road / Quarryheads Lane signal controlled junction) in the AM peak shows a 13% <u>14%</u> improvement in the poorest performing movement VoC.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
6.1.2	Table 6.1	Differences in Total Movements and Poorest Performing Movement updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
6.1.2	Table 6.2	Differences in Total Movements and Poorest Performing Movement updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
6.1.4	Para 2	Text updated.	Text updated in order to include description for PM Peak period	805
6.1.4	Para 4	On average, a reduction in traffic of <u>54%</u> and <u>65%</u> is expected to occur across the nine junctions <u>in the AM and PM peaks</u> , as traffic is reassigned onto the WRR in comparison to the Do Nothing Scenario A.	Comments updated to reflect changes in Table 6.3	805
6.1.4	Table 6.3	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
6.1.4	Table 6.3	Differences in Total Movements and Poorest Performing Movement updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
6.1.4	Table 6.4	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
6.1.4	Table 6.4	Differences in Total Movements and Poorest Performing Movement updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
6.1.5	Table 6.5	Some values updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
6.1.5	Para 2	As expected the A167 is shown to have the largest journey time benefits, with the WRR expected to reduce journey times (two-way) by <u>87%</u> in the AM peak and <u>4311%</u> in the PM peak,	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
6.1.5	Para 3	The results highlight that a WRR provides on average, two-way journey time savings of 3% across the 3 routes in the AM peak and <u>87%</u> in the PM peak compared to the Do Nothing Scenario A in 2037.	Value was technically correct but was updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
7.1.4	Para 2	The data highlights that on average, the WRR generally has a positive impact on both traffic flows and journey times across the network in both the AM and PM peak. This is with the exception of Junction 1 (A167 / A691 Sniperley Park junction), which has an increase in delay of <u>4811%</u> in the AM peak when compared to the Do Nothing Scenario B. <u>While, Junction 7 has a 4% increase in delay in the PM peak.</u>	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 7.1. Text added to include description for PM Peak period.	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
7.1.4	Para 3	On average, a reduction in traffic of 4% and 65% is expected to occur across the nine junctions for the AM and PM peak respectively	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 7.1.	805
7.1.4	Table 7.1	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
7.1.4	Table 7.1	Differences in Total Movements and Poorest Performing Movement updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
7.1.4	Table 7.2	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
7.1.4	Table 7.2	Differences in Total Movements and Poorest Performing Movement updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	
7.1.5	Para 4	As expected the A167 is shown to have the largest journey time benefits, with the WRR expected to reduce journey times (two-way) by 409% in the AM peak and 98% in the PM peak, compared to the Do Nothing Scenario B in 2037.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
7.1.5	Table 7.3	Some values updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
8.2.2	Para 2	Slight delay of 3% and 1% can be seen at Junction 2 (A167 / A690 (Neville's Cross) and Junction 3 (A167 / A177 South Road junction) respectively in the AM peak, most likely due to an increase in traffic accessing the NRR via the A167. <u>A 2% increase in delay can also be seen at junction 5 in the PM peak, as traffic utilises this route to access the NRR.</u>	Text updated in order to keep the most significant figure. Text added to include description for PM Peak period.	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
8.2.2	Para 3	Text updated	Comments updated to reflect changes in Table 8.1 and 8.2	
8.2.2	Para 4	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 1922% time savings in the AM peak and 4011% in the PM peak.	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 8.1 and 8.2	805
8.2.2	Table 8.1	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
8.2.2	Table 8.1	Table updated	Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	
8.2.2	Table 8.2	Values updated for Junction 1. Some values have also been updated for Junctions 2, 4 and 9.	Values for Junction 1 updated due to junction correction. Remaining values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
8.2.2	Table 8.2	Table updated	Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	
8.2.3	Para 2	However, Junction 46 (A690 / New Elvet (Leazes Bowl) roundabout) A181 (Gilesgate) does show signs of improvement, reducing to less than 50% VoC. In Little change can be seen in the PM peak, with the A690 corridor from the A1(M) exception of Crossgate Peth no longer approaching the city centre from the east is shown to benefit from implementation of the NRR, similarly to the pattern found in 2022. This is evident, as the capacity constraints on these links reduce, while Junction 4 (A690 / New Elvet (Leazes Bowl) roundabout) reduces to less than 50% VoC.	Junction reference error	805
8.2.4	Para 2	Text updated.	Text updated in order to keep the most significant figure.	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
8.2.4	Para 2	Slight delay increases of 6% <u>5%</u> at Junction 2 (A167 / A690 (Neville's Cross) junction) can be seen in the AM peak	Comments updated to reflect changes in Tables 8.3	
8.2.4	Para 3	Text updated.	Reference values correct but text updated in order to include significant figure Comments updated to reflect changes in Tables 8.3 and 8.4	805
8.2.4	Para 4	As a result of the re-distributional impacts associated with the NRR, traffic movements across the nine junctions are expected to reduce by around 8 <u>7</u> % and 10% in the AM and PM respectively compared to the Do Nothing Scenario A.	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 8.3	
8.2.4	Para 4	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 24 <u>24</u> % time savings in the AM peak and 40 <u>28</u> % in the PM peak.	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 8.3 and 8.4	805
8.2.4	Table 8.3	Values updated for Junction 1.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
8.2.4	Table 8.3	Table updated	Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	
8.2.4	Table 8.4	Values updated for Junction 1. One other value has also been updated for Junction 7.	Values for Junction 1 updated due to junction correction. Value for Junction 7 was technically correct but was updated due to decimal place rounding correction.	805
8.2.4	Table 8.4	Table updated	Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
8.2.5	Para 3	Text updated.	Text reworded and significant figures added. Comments updated to reflect changes in Table 8.5	805
8.2.5	Table 8.5	Some values updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	805
8.2.5	Para 3	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 45 <u>19</u> % time savings in the AM peak and 9 <u>10</u> % in the PM peak in 2022, while 2037 shows an improvement of 46 <u>51</u> % in the AM and 28 <u>27</u> % in the PM.	Values updated due to junction correction.	805
8.3	Para 3	As a result of the re-distributional impacts associated with the NRR and no reduction at Milburngate, traffic movements across the nine junctions are expected to reduce by around 7 <u>8</u> % and 9 <u>10</u> % in the AM and PM respectively, compared to the Do Nothing Scenario A in 2022	Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	
8.3	Para 3	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 49 <u>18</u> % time savings in the AM peak and 10% in the PM peak in 2022, while 2037 shows an improvement of 49 <u>20</u> % in the AM and 27 <u>29</u> % in the PM.	Distance error when NRR in place	
9.2.2	Para 2	The greatest improvements to the poorest performing VoC can be seen at Junction 1 (A167 / A691 Sniperley Park roundabout) in the AM peak, going from 100% to 54 <u>52</u> % from the Dryburn Park	Comments updated to reflect changes in Tables 9.1 and 9.2	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		to A167 southbound. Likewise, in the PM peak Junction 7 (A691 / B6532 (County Hall) roundabout) reduces from 92% to 52% <u>51%</u> from B6532 to A691 SB.		
9.2.2	Para 3	As a result of the re-distributional impacts associated with the highway intervention, traffic movements across the nine junctions are shown to reduce by 43 <u>14</u> % and 47 <u>16</u> % in the AM and PM respectively, compared to the Do Nothing Scenario B.	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 9.1 and 9.2.	805
9.2.2	Para 3	As a result of the re-distributional impacts associated with the highway intervention, traffic movements across the nine junctions are shown to reduce by 14% <u>15%</u> and 16% in the AM and PM respectively, compared to the Do Nothing Scenario B. This highlights that the combined relief roads and reduction in lanes at Milburngate Bridge results in a more comprehensive re-distribution of traffic across the network compared to both Scenario 1, 2 and 3. This is reflected in the delay, with the largest time saving out of all the scenarios being 28% <u>29%</u> in the AM peak and 17% in the PM peak.	Comments updated to reflect changes in Tables 9.1 and 9.2	
9.2.2	Table 9.1	Values updated for Junction 1. Table updated.	Values updated due to junction correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	805
9.2.2	Table 9.2	Values updated for Junction 1. Table updated.	Values updated due to junction correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
9.2.4	Para 3	As a result of the highway intervention, traffic movements across the nine junctions are shown to reduce by 11% and 46 <u>15</u> % in the AM and PM respectively	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 9.4	805
9.2.4	Para 3	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 30% time savings in the AM peak and 35 <u>36</u> % in the PM peak.	Values updated to reflect changes in Table 9.4	805
9.2.4	Para 3	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 30 <u>31</u> % time savings in the AM peak and 36 % <u>35</u> % in the PM peak.	Comments updated to reflect changes in Tables 9.3 and 9.4	
9.2.4	Table 9.3	Values updated for Junction 1. Table updated.	Values updated due to junction correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place.	805
9.2.4	Table 9.4	Values updated for Junction 1. Table updated.	Values updated due to junction correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place.	805
9.2.5	Table 9.5	Some values updated. Table updated.	Values were technically correct but were updated due to decimal place rounding correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place.	805
9.3	Para 3	As a result of the re-distributional impacts associated with the NRR, WRR and no reduction at Milburngate, traffic movements across the nine junctions are expected to reduce by around 12% and 45 <u>14</u> % in the AM and PM respectively, compared to the Do Nothing Scenario B in 2022 and 40 <u>9</u> % and 43 <u>12</u> % in 2037.	Values updated due to junction correction	805
9.3	Para 3	This is reflected in the delay, with a total of 25 <u>26</u> % time savings in the AM peak and 47 <u>13</u> % in the PM peak in 2022.	Values updated due to junction correction. Distance error on A690 when NRR in place.	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
9.3	Para 3	As a result of the re-distributional impacts associated with the NRR, WRR and no reduction at Milburngate, traffic movements across the nine junctions are expected to reduce by around 42 <u>13</u> % and 44 <u>15</u> % in the AM and PM respectively, compared to the Do Nothing Scenario B in 2022 and 9 <u>10</u> % and 42 <u>13</u> % in 2037.	Distance error on A690 when NRR in place	

8.1 The following tables sets out the minor changes made to the Durham Local Plan Traffic Impact Report. The document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 7

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
4	Para 4	By the year 2022, the number of vehicles on the Durham City road network between 8am and 9am is expected to increase by approximately 4%, resulting in a two-way increase in journey times on the city's major routes of up to circa <u>6</u> %.	Value was technically correct but was updated due to decimal place rounding correction. Previous value was 5%	805
4	Para 5	It is anticipated that the key junctions across the city, including the Sniperley roundabout, Neville's Cross and Leazes Bowl, will be required to handle in total in the region of an additional <u>700</u> vehicles in 2022 and <u>1800</u> vehicles in 2037 in the morning peak.	Values updated due to junction correction. Previous values: 1700 in 2022 and 2800 in 2037	805
4	Figure - Page 19	Percentage of journey times increase in 2022	Figure updated to reflect changes in comment 805	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
5.1	Para 9	Similarly, a reduction in vehicles of approximately <u>7%</u> is seen through key junctions in the city, illustrating that traffic levels within the centre are reduced as a result of the NRR.	Value was technically correct but was updated due to decimal place rounding correction. Previous value: 8%	805
5.1	9	Between 8am and 9am, in excess of <u>1,800</u> vehicles use this alternative route in both directions. This results in a reduction of circa 13% of vehicles through the city centre in both directions.	Value updated due to error in distances on A690 in NRR attachment link area. Previous value 1,700	
5.1	Para 10	<p>A key facet of the Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan was that together with the creation of a Northern Relief Road, demand restraint measures would be introduced in the city centre. <u>One such measure which has been tested in the Durham Strategic Transport Model is a reduction in the number of lanes on Milburngate Bridge, from two lanes per direction to one lane per direction, in order to reallocate road space to sustainable modes. The introduction of the NRR improves journey times in both directions on the A167 and A177 in the AM peak, as shown below, but has a lesser effect on delays on the A690 due to the lane reduction on Milburngate Bridge. This is advantageous as it encourages use of the NRR for through traffic.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A167 - 5% journey time reduction southbound and 3% reduction northbound</u> • <u>A691/A177 - 4% journey time reduction westbound</u> 	<p>This paragraph has been updated to explain that a reduction in lanes on Milburngate Bridge has been tested. This has not been mentioned earlier in the document, so the sudden mention of a lane reduction in the previous version of this paragraph was confusing.</p> <p>Also, bullet points for journey time figures have now been split by direction. This is because the A690 journey time decreases westbound but increases eastbound, which meant quoting a two-way figure was slightly misleading.</p>	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<u>and 6% reduction eastbound</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A690 - <u>4% journey time reduction westbound and 3% increase eastbound</u> 		
5.3	Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce the two-way journey times along the A690 by up to circa 3% and the A167 by up to circa 13% ; 	Value updated due to reference error and then error in distances on NRR . Previous value 7% Values updated due to error in distances on A690 in NRR attachment link area. Previous values 7% and 14%.	
Appendix		The technical report was added as Technical Appendix to the public facing report.	It was missing in the latest issued report as pointed out from representation from the City of Durham Trust	805

8.2 The following changes were made to the appendix of the Durham Local Plan Traffic Impact Report. The document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 8

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
1.0	Para 2	WebTAG is now referred to as TAG. Changed throughout the document.	Change in title from DfT	
6.1	Table 5	Updated with results from revised base model	Further update to base model undertaken after May 2018	
6.1	Table 6	Updated with results from revised base model	Further update to base model undertaken after May 2018	
6.1	Para 5	In the AM scenario, all calibration screenlines are all within the required guidelines. This indicates that	Text changed to correspond to update of Table 5	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		movements into and out of Durham city centre have been captured and are well represented in the model.		
6.1	Para 6	In terms of validation screenlines, H and I meet the criteria in both directions, with L inbound and N outbound also meeting the criteria. Screenlines L outbound and N inbound are very close to being within guidelines. Screenlines J shows a larger difference to criteria due to under-representing the levels of flow compared to observed data. This is a known issue within the model which will be rectified through further development and refinement of the model.	Text changed to correspond to update of Table 5	
6.1	Para 7	In the PM scenario, all calibration screenlines are within criteria except screenlines D inbound and K outbound. Screenline D is an external screenline and covers two main A-roads, the A167 and A691. These routes are also captured by screenline A and K which are both internal screenline performing well within criteria for the inbound direction. This indicates that the flows on these routes are corrected closer towards the city centre.	Text changed to correspond to update of Table 6	
6.1	Para 8	In terms of validation screenlines, screenline H, J, and L meet criteria in both directions, with I inbound and L outbound also meeting the criteria. Screenlines I outbound and L inbound fall outside the guidelines.	Text changed to correspond to update of Table 6	
6.1	Para 9	Across both time periods, whilst some screenlines fall outside the criteria, all GEH values are less than 10.	Text added as further analysis of updated tables	
6.2	Table 7	Relaxation of 'Individual flows within 100 veh/hr of counts for flows less than 700 veh/hr' to within 150 veh/hr has been removed.	Model results meet guidance without the relaxation of the criteria.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
6.2	Table 8	Updated with results from revised base model	Further update to base model undertaken after May 2018	
6.2	Table 9	Updated with results from revised base model	Further update to base model undertaken after May 2018	
6.3	Table 11	Updated with results from revised base model	Further update to base model undertaken after May 2018	
6.3	Table 12	Updated with results from revised base model	Further update to base model undertaken after May 2018	
6.3	Para 5	It can be seen that the AM scenario falls within guidance with 88% of routes meeting criteria, with only route 1 southbound and route 5 westbound not meeting the criteria. Route 1 takes in the A167, including the Neville's Cross junction, and Route 5 takes in areas of Gilesgate and roads to the south and west of the city centre. The results show that the model is 'running quicker' than the observed journey times.	Text changed to correspond to update of Table 11	
6.3	Para 6	The journey time criteria are also met in the PM scenario with 88% of routes within guidance, with only route 2 westbound and route 8 southbound not meeting the criteria. Route 2 and Route 8 takes in several of the most constrained locations in the city including Milburngate Bridge, and Leazes Bowl. The results show that the model is 'running slower' than the observed along Route 2 and 'running quicker' than the observed journey times along Route 8.	Text changed to correspond to update of Table 12	
7.2	Para 2	The housing specifically detailed within the model is listed in Table 14. These have been split into committed sites		

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		and County Durham Plan sites. Committed sites with over 20 dwellings per site are listed individually, with the remaining 89 sites listed together at the bottom of the table.		
7.2	Table 14	Table 14 updated to reflect the current housing sites being considered as allocations within the County Durham Plan (CDP).	Reflects latest CDP allocations	
7.2	Table 15	Table 15 updated to reflect the committed employment sites.	Reflects latest committed employment sites	

9.1 The following tables sets out the minor changes made to the Exceptional Circumstances report. The document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 9

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
4	4.6	By the year 2022, the number of vehicles on the Durham City road network between 8am and 9am is expected to increase by approximately 4%, resulting in a two-way increase in journey times on the city's major routes of up to circa <u>6%</u> .	Reflects change to Durham Local Traffic Impact Report. Value was technically correct but was updated due to decimal place rounding correction. Previous value was 5%	805
4	4.7	It is anticipated that the key junctions across the city, including the Sniperley roundabout, Neville's Cross and Leazes Bowl, will be required to handle in total in the region of an additional <u>700</u> vehicles in 2022 and <u>1800</u> vehicles in 2037 in the morning peak.	Reflects change to Durham Local Traffic Impact Report. Values updated due to junction correction. Previous values: 1700 in 2022 and 2800 in 2037	805

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
4	4.24	Similarly, a reduction in vehicles of approximately <u>7%</u> is seen through key junctions in the city, illustrating that traffic levels within the centre are reduced as a result of the NRR.	Reflects change to Durham Local Traffic Impact Report. Value was technically correct but was updated due to decimal place rounding correction. Previous value: 8%	805
4	4.24	<u>'eastbound on the A690'</u> added.	The bullet points for journey time figures have now been split by direction in the Durham Local Plan Traffic Impact Report. This is because the A690 journey time decreases westbound but increases eastbound, which meant quoting a two-way figure was slightly misleading.	
4	4.55	reduce the two-way journey times along the A690 by up to circa <u>3%</u> and the A167 by up to circa <u>13%</u>	Reflects change to Durham Local Traffic Impact Report. Value updated due to reference error and then error in distances on NRR . Previous value 7% Values updated due to error in distances on A690 in NRR attachment link area. Previous values 7% and 14%.	

10.1 The following tables sets out the minor changes made to the Housing Need and Residual for Allocations Paper. The document remains otherwise unchanged.

Table 10

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Standard method for calculating local housing needs	Sub heading after para 5	Change of sub heading title from: 'Standard method for calculating local housing needs' to <u>'Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment'</u>	To provide clarity to confirm that this section relates to Planning Practice Guidance (PPG),	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
			which includes the Standard Method.	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 6	Insertion of the following text: <u>'Following the October 2018 Technical Consultation, the Planning Practice Guidance was updated on the 20th February 2019. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section includes the standard method for assessing local housing needs.'</u>	Since the publication of the Pre Submission Draft CDP the PPG section on Housing and Economic Needs Assessment has been updated (on the 20th February 2019). This paragraph reflects this context.	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 6 text box	Replacement of the text: 'Set the baseline using national household growth projections, for the area of the local authority. Taking the most recent projections, calculate the projected average annual household growth over a 10 year period (this should be 10 consecutive years, with the current year being the first year).' With: <u>'Set the baseline using national household growth projections (2014-based household projections in England, table 406 unitary authorities and districts in England) for the area of the local authority. Using these projections, calculate the projected average annual household growth over a 10 year period (this should be 10 consecutive years, with the current year being used as the starting point from which to calculate growth over that period). Note that the figures displayed are rounded and individual cells need to be viewed in order to see the full number.'</u>	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 7	The text: 'To note, the 26th October 2018 guidance directs the start date should be 2019. This is taken to supersede the element of step 1 which notes for the purposes of the calculation the 'current year being the first year. In line with the Technical Consultation, DCC have made use of 2014 based live tables' has been removed from the text box at paragraph 6 and set out at paragraph 7.	For clarity	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 7	Addition of the text: ' <u>The Planning Practice Guidance confirms use of the 2014 based household projections.</u> '	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 9 text box	The text: ' For each 1% increase in the ratio of house prices to earnings, where the ratio is above 4, the average household growth should be increased by a quarter of a percent. No adjustment is applied where the ratio is 4 or below. Where an adjustment is to be made, the precise formula is as follows ' Has been replaced with: ' <u>No adjustment is applied where the ratio is 4 or below. For each 1% the ratio is above 4 (with a ratio of 8 representing a 100% increase), the average household growth should be increased by a quarter of a percent. To be able to apply the percentage increase adjustment to the projected growth figure we then need to add 1. Where an adjustment is to be made, the precise formula is as follows:</u> '	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 14	The text: ' Planning Practice Guidance contains a section: When might a higher figure than the standard method need to be considered? (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-10-20180913). This notes: ' Has been replaced with: <u>Planning Practice Guidance contains a section: When might it be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates?(Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20190230).</u> This notes:	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 14 text box	The text: ' Therefore there will be circumstances where actual housing need may be higher than the figure identified by the standard method... ' Has been replaced with: <u>'Therefore, there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates...'</u>	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 15 text box	The text: ... Where additional growth above historic trends is likely to or is planned to occur over the plan period, an appropriate uplift may be considered. This will be an uplift to identify housing need specifically and should be undertaken prior to and separate from considering how much of this need can be accommodated in a housing requirement figure. Circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to: where growth strategies are in place, particularly where those growth strategies identify that additional housing above historic trends is needed to support growth	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p>or funding is in place to promote and facilitate growth (e.g. Housing Deals);</p> <p>-</p> <p>where strategic infrastructure improvements are planned that would support new homes;</p> <p>-</p> <p>where an authority has agreed to take on unmet need, calculated using the standard method, from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground</p> <p>Has been replaced with:</p> <p><u>This will need to be assessed prior to, and separate from, considering how much of the overall need can be accommodated (and then translated into a housing requirement figure for the strategic policies in the plan). Circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to situations where increases in housing need are likely to exceed past trends because of:</u></p> <p>-</p> <p><u>growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable, for example where funding is in place to promote and facilitate additional growth (e.g. Housing Deals);</u></p> <p><u>strategic infrastructure improvements that are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally; or</u></p> <p><u>an authority agreeing to take on unmet need from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground;</u></p>		

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 15 text box	<p>The text:</p> <p>In addition authorities should also consider:</p> <p>previous delivery levels. Where previous delivery has exceeded the minimum need identified it should be considered whether the level of delivery is indicative of greater housing need ...</p> <p>Has been replaced with:</p> <p><u>There may, occasionally, also be situations where previous levels of housing delivery in an area, or previous assessments of need (such as recently produced Strategic Housing Market Assessment) are significantly greater than the outcome of the standard method. Authorities will need to take this into account when considering whether it is appropriate to plan for a higher level of need than the standard model suggests.</u></p>	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	
Planning Practice Guidance Housing and Economic Needs Assessment	Para 20	<p>The text: '027 Reference ID: 2a-027-20180913' Has been replaced with: '024 Reference ID: <u>2a-024-20190220</u>'</p>	The text has been updated to reflect the content of the updated February 2019 Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG.	
Other Sources of Housing Supply	Para 37	<p>The text:</p> <p>37. Government guidance states that local plans may include allowances for windfall sites (non-allocated sites) which may come forward at some time in the future if there is evidence to justify that allowance. As small sites under 0.4 hectares (12 houses) have</p>	<p>To amend an error in the text referring to "plan period" when it should have been the base date of the Plan.</p> <p>To amend an error in the reference to (12</p>	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p>historically made a significant contribution to past housing delivery (an average of 117 houses per annum for the past five years) it is considered that it would be appropriate to include an allowance, rounded down to 110 per annum, for small sites. This would reflect the contribution small sites can make but which does not make future housing delivery over reliant on them. This figure has not been applied in the residual for allocation calculation for the first three years of the Plan period as this would double count those small sites already included in the supply of existing commitments.</p> <p>38. Due to the age of the existing local plans in County Durham, large windfalls have made a significant contribution to housing delivery in the recent past. However, although it is accepted that some large windfalls may still receive planning permission during the Plan period, it is considered that these should not be relied upon to meet our housing requirement. We therefore consider it inappropriate to include an allowance for large windfall sites as this could undermine the purpose of the local plan in providing certainty on where new housing should go.</p> <p>Has been amended to:</p> <p><u>38. Government guidance states that local plans may include allowances for windfall sites (non-allocated sites) which may come forward at some time in the future if there is evidence to justify that allowance. Small scale housing developments (11 houses or less) have historically made a contribution to past housing delivery</u></p>	<p>houses) which should have been 11 houses or less. To amend an error in the text where it refers to 110 per annum and it should be 80 per annum. Other amendments to provide more clarity.</p>	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p><u>(an average of 117 houses per annum for the past five years).</u> <u>However, it is expected that with the Plan in place the number of windfalls will reduce, therefore it is considered that an allowance of 80 per annum on small sites would be appropriate. This would reflect the contribution small sites can make but does not make future housing delivery over reliant on them. This windfall allowance figure has been applied, starting three years after the base date (30th September 2018) in the residual for allocation calculation. To also include a windfall allowance before that point would potentially include some overlap and double counting with those small sites already included in the supply of existing commitments.</u></p> <p><u>39. Due to the age of the existing local plans in County Durham, large windfalls (12 units or greater) have made a significant contribution to housing delivery in previous years. However, although it is accepted that some large windfalls may still receive planning permission during the Plan period, it is considered that these should not be relied upon to meet our housing requirement. We therefore consider it inappropriate to include an allowance for large windfall sites as this could undermine the purpose of the local plan in providing certainty on where new housing should go.</u></p>		

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
Residual for Allocation	Para 42 Table	<p>The text in row B and C of the table:</p> <p>Windfall allowance for sites under 0.4 hectares (12 houses) (80 pa from 2021 onwards)</p> <p>Windfall allowance for sites over 0.4 hectares (12 houses)</p> <p>Has been amended to:</p> <p>Windfall allowance for small scale housing developments (11 houses or less) (80 pa from 2021 onwards)</p> <p>Windfall allowance for small scale housing developments (11 houses or less)</p>	To correct the reference to 12 houses to 11 houses or less, remove the reference to the site size to avoid confusion and rewording for clarity.	

11.1 The following table sets out the changes made to the Residential Internal Space Standards evidence document. The document remains unchanged otherwise.

Table 11

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
3.1 Need	3.3	<p>Additional locations have been added to the list:</p> <p><u>"Peterlee"</u> and <u>"Stanley"</u></p>	The survey has been expanded from the evidence submitted against the Pre-Submission draft of the Plan, to include additional sites in Peterlee and Stanley.	
3.1 Need	Table 2	<p>The figures in the table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "63.8" • "-8.9" • "86.2" • "2.6" 	The survey has been expanded from the evidence submitted against the Pre-Submission	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		Have been updated to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>"63.9"</u> • <u>"-9.1"</u> • <u>"87.1"</u> • <u>"3.6"</u> 	draft of the Plan. This has led to slight changes to the findings and figures.	
Gross Internal Areas (GIA)	3.9	The text: "86.2" Has been changed to: <u>"87.1"</u>	The survey has been expanded from the evidence submitted against the Pre-Submission draft of the Plan. This has led to slight changes to the findings and figures.	
Gross Internal Areas (GIA)	3.10	The text: "the shortfall between the survey average (86.2m²) and the NDSS requirement for this level of occupation increase to -8.6%" Has been changed to: <u>"this highlights that the average property (87.1m²) is falling below the NDSS requirement for this level of occupation"</u> .	The survey has been expanded from the evidence submitted against the Pre-Submission draft of the Plan. This has led to slight changes to the findings and figures.	
Gross Internal Areas (GIA)	3.11	The text: "The smallest properties sampled in this range measured 71m². One of these properties was marketed as 3b4p, while the other was marketed as providing accommodation for five persons. The NDSS requirements for these properties is 84m² and 93m² respectively. In percentage terms, these properties are between -15.5% and -23.7%." Has been changed to: <u>"The smallest three bedroom properties in the sample measured</u>	The survey has been expanded from the evidence submitted against the Pre-Submission draft of the Plan. This has led to slight changes to the findings and figures.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<u>71m². One of these properties was marketed as 3b4p, while the other was marketed as providing accommodation for five persons. The NDSS requirements for properties providing these levels of accommodation are 84m² and 93m² respectively. In percentage terms, these properties provide -15.5% and -23.7% of the space that they would do if they were built to NDSS."</u>		
Gross Internal Areas (GIA)	3.13	The text: "...a small proportion of new builds, and, anecdotal evidence indicates that the observations in respect of the Framwellgate Moor scheme would likely be confirmed elsewhere." Has been changed to: <u>"...a small proportion of new build supply and anecdotal evidence suggests they tend to provide ample internal space standards."</u>	Amendment to ensure factual accuracy.	
Bedroom Size	3.14 & 3.15	The text: "Analysis of available information in relation to bedroom sizes shows that only around 53% of surveyed properties include a master bedroom that meets the minimum size requirement in terms of floor area. For second bedrooms the situation is worse. Marketing material and floor plans were assessed and where a double bed was shown the room was assessed against the standards for a two person room (11.5m²) set out in the NDSS. The results show that only around 34% of surveyed properties provided the minimum floor area. This trend worsens for third and fourth bedrooms. For example for three bedroom properties just 24% meet the minimum floor area requirement for single and double occupancy." Has been changed to:	The survey has been expanded from the evidence submitted against the Pre-Submission draft of the Plan. This has led to slight changes to the findings and figures.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p><u>"Analysis of available information in relation to bedroom size shows that more than a quarter of surveyed properties do not include a master bedroom that meets the minimum floor area requirement. Marketing material and floor plans were assessed and where a double bed was shown the room was assessed against the standards for a two person room (11.5m²) set out in the NDSS. For second bedrooms the results show that only around 54% of properties provided the minimum floor area. This trend worsens for third and fourth bedrooms. For example, as few as 23% of three bedroom properties provide the minimum floor area requirement for the third bedroom (including where they are identified as double or twin rooms). One such three bedroom property includes a third bedroom which measures 3.65m² - i.e. less than half NDSS requirements (which is 7.5m² for a single bedroom).</u></p>		
Affordable and Discounted Market Sale Housing	3.15, 3.16 & 3.17	<p>The text</p> <p>"The majority of surveyed affordable dwellings were two bedroom two storey units. None met NDSS standards when assessed against the relevant occupancy level indicated in the planning drawings. This presents issues, as Registered Providers should ensure they satisfy national space standards as a condition upon securing grant funding from the Home and Communities Agency. We are also aware of issues in relation to discounted market sale housing, which provides further opportunities for people entering the property market. However it appears that some of these products are built below NDSS levels and are proving</p>	<p>Further discussions have taken place with Registered Providers as intimated in the first draft of the evidence document. The text has been updated to reflect these additional findings.</p>	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p>difficult to sell when the first owners wish to move on to larger properties. We intend to explore this matter further over the coming months and to build up a record of those resale properties that struggle on the market, particularly where it is noted that this is due to the size of the property. We will then assess whether those units meet space standards and determine the extent of the contribution that smaller properties make in meeting needs, given the apparent lack of appeal in the second hand market."</p> <p>Has been changed to:</p> <p><u>"The majority of surveyed affordable dwellings were two bedroom two storey units. None met NDSS standards when assessed against the relevant occupancy level indicated in the planning drawings. This is problematic, as Registered Providers (RP) need to ensure their properties satisfy national space standards as a condition upon securing grant funding from the Home and Communities Agency. Discussions with two separate RPs operating in County Durham highlighted problems with the S106 stock being offered to them by market developers. A representative for one of the RPs noted concerns that some people will be so pleased to buy their first property with Help2Buy that they may not consider the longer term implications. The RP however will own these homes forever and needs to know that people will still choose to rent from them 20 years down the line (when they aren't shiny and new anymore). RPs are also keen for settled tenants so that they stay in situ long term - if they feel the need to move to something larger, this</u></p>		

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p><u>incurs void costs and dissatisfaction amongst customers. Further issues sited included that while small room dimensions have been the main issue with customers, lack of storage is also a problem in some properties. We are also aware of issues in relation to discounted market sale housing, which provides further opportunities for people entering the property market. Some of these products are built below NDSS levels, and our intelligence suggests that they are proving difficult to sell when the first owners wish to move on to larger properties. In some instances it is noted that this is due to the lack of space in the property."</u></p>		
Consultation Feedback	3.18, 3.19 & 3.20	<p>The text:</p> <p>"Feedback from the Preferred Options County Durham Plan (2018) consultation clearly advocates adopting minimum internal space standards. Concerns were raised in respect to inadequate internal space within new properties in particular. While the national guidance does not include a test on this information, it nevertheless provides further support for adopting the standards. Just five representations were made against applying NDSS, citing viability concerns and impacts on delivery of affordable housing."</p> <p>Has been changed to:</p> <p><u>"Consultation feedback from residents clearly advocates adopting minimum internal space standards. Concerns have been raised regarding inadequate internal space within new properties in particular. While national guidance on adopting NDSS does not take this information into account,</u></p>	A further round of consultation has been undertaken since the first evidence document was published and this is reflected in the document.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<p>it nevertheless provides further support for adopting the standards. The house building industry have raised concerns during the consultation on the CDP. These concerns included the potential impacts in terms of viability, delivery of affordable housing and delivering properties that provide a stepping stone for first time buyers. Our evidence however demonstrates that homes can be built to NDSS without impacting upon deliverability, while discount market sale properties which are purportedly providing access to the housing market are, in some cases, less attractive due to their lack of internal space (amongst other things) when they are marketed as second hand properties. It is also acknowledged that a transition period will be in place to allow the industry to gear up for the change, while viability will be taken into account when assessing proposals against the standard."</p>		
Wider Local Context	3.21 & 3.22	<p>New section has been added to the second draft, as follows:</p> <p><u>"The County Durham Plan clearly articulates an ambitious but deliverable vision to capitalise on the range of opportunities which exist to move the county forward through the plan period to 2035. Durham should secure a good, competitive standard of housing moving forward to support its continued regeneration and ensure that its housing offer is fit for purpose. Setting minimum standards for internal floorspace will help to achieve this by ensuring that homes built in the county are good quality and have enough space to be lived in as intended. The SHMA (2019) demonstrates that County Durham is</u></p>	Further work has been undertaken since the first evidence document was published and this is reflected in the document.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<u>predominantly self-contained as a housing market area (HMA). There is, however, some overlap with Sunderland to the East, Newcastle and Gateshead to the North and Darlington to the South East. Sunderland, Newcastle, and Gateshead are all proposing to adopt the NDSS in their local plans. There is therefore a risk that, if County Durham does not also implement the space standards, first time buyers in the North and East of the county could choose to move out of the local authority area in order to access better quality housing.</u>		
Trends over Time	3.23 & 3.24	<p>New section has been added to the second draft, as follows:</p> <p><u>"Government data on EPC floorspace over time (xii) shows that, within County Durham, there has been a slight decline in average internal floorspace since 2015. Implementing the standards therefore represents an opportunity to prevent the average size of dwellings from declining still further, by setting an absolute minimum requirement for internal floorspace. The picture for England as a whole differs, with an overall trend towards an increase in floorspace since 2011 and a slight decline only in the past two years. This adds further support to the view that in order to be able to compete with other regions in the country, County Durham would benefit from having a policy safeguarding higher average internal floorspaces. The highest average GIA in Durham in the past decade was 94m² in 2015; for England as a whole the highest average GIA was 127m² in 2012. The average GIA in England as a whole has not dropped below 100m²</u></p>	Further work has been undertaken since the first evidence document was published and this is reflected in the document.	

Section	Policy / Para / Figure	Change Made	Explanation	Relevant Representation
		<u>since 2008, again demonstrating that homes in County Durham are disproportionately small."</u>		
3.3 Timing	3.22 & 3.28	The text " ...approved after 1 August 2021, which gives at least 12 months from adoption of the County Plan...before 1 August 2021. " Has been changed to: " <u>approved a year after the Plan is adopted...before the policy comes into effect.</u> "	To provide greater flexibility in relation to the timescales for the County Durham Plan.	



Braille



Audio



Large print

Cdpconsultation@durham.gov.uk
03000 260 000