

Policy 7

Id No Respondent

347 Bellway, Persimmon, Miller, Yuill Homes

142 Bett Homes (North East)

141 Brethren's Gospel Trusts

Policy 7

We also note that the Draft RSS does not include an equivalent policy to policy H2 of the Tees Valley Structure Plan. Policy H2 would allow for the release of a 'strategic greenfield housing site' "south of Middlesbrough" and "adjacent to the main urban area of west Stockton". This option was included in the Structure Plan on the basis that a shortfall of previously developed land was envisaged in these authorities. The increased housing requirement outlined in Draft RSS would reinforce this possibility and given the fact that RSS will eventually supersede the Structure Plan we would seek specific reference to this topic in RSS in policy 7 - Tees Valley Region. The need to maintain such an option is imperative given on-going concerns over the deliverability of major regeneration schemes such as Middlehaven.

Policy 7 states that plans and strategies should encourage: "the development of 80 hectares of land for airport related uses to enable Durham Tees Valley Airport's potential as an economic driver to be realized and cater for its anticipated passenger growth." Whilst the consortium would support such efforts future plans and strategies should not seek to develop green field land when nearby previously developed land and allocated employment land is already available. Eg. Land at Durham Lane Industrial Estate and former Cenargo bonded warehouse site on Durham Lane. Land in this area is highly accessible to the airport and the surrounding main transport routes and should be protected from inappropriate non-employment use development (this comment also applies to policy 21).

Supported

We object to the omission of references to community facilities including places of worship, education facilities and burial grounds; All of which have an important role in 'sustainable communities'. Housing and economic prosperity must be accompanied by a broad community provision, including the needs of a range of faith and religious groups and appropriate facilities.

Without prejudice to the above, we would also query the reason for special identification of the Tees Valley City Region being identified and the special planning pressures which indicate that additional or special policies are needed in this area distinct from the region as a whole. We would be concerned if this were to be interpreted at LDD level that some aspects of the generic policies, including the need for community infrastructure, was of a lower importance in areas outside the city region.

In our submission, unless there is a special need in any sub region, we would favour a strengthening of the generic policies elsewhere in the draft plan and a minimalist approach in sub-regional policy statements.

Id No Respondent

248 C A B E

Policy 7

CABE strongly supports the inclusion of this policy and the advocacy role this has in promoting the operational structures and organizations in place that represent the common interests of the city-region. Yet the role of the Regional Spatial Strategy should enhance the level of existing work by legitimatizing it within the statutory planning framework, and ultimately in the Local Development Frameworks for the five local authority areas within the Tees Valley.

There is a danger that the Regional Spatial Strategy simply reflects a series of existing initiatives that are being promoted against localized interests. There is the potential to be more pro-active regarding setting priorities and / or differentiation between these initiatives and providing a criteria or attribute based approach to defining the nature of sustainable communities in a context appropriate for the northeast region [Policy 7 section m) p50]. Part of this would imply significant aspects of additional supporting work to pro-actively identify sustainable locations [potentially within the context of Transit Orientated Development policy] against sound spatial analysis. The mapping of sub-regional infrastructure [both physical and social /community] such as the existing and proposed public transit networks, the combined effects of the greenspace strategies for the Tees Valley and areas of significant cultural investment. It is considered that this work would significantly add to the regional detail of the strategy and help provide a higher level of spatial precision within the key diagram for the city region [p51].

We strongly support many of the principles intended to protect and enhance the environment, particularly the key challenges associated with large scale carbon reduction and CABE would support collaborative work to demonstrate the role that the construction industry can have as part of this challenge. In this regard, the Regional Spatial Strategy could encourage and support demonstration projects [within larger regeneration projects such as the Housing Market Renewal Programmes on Tyneside and in the Tees Valley] that go beyond BREEM standards and show the potential for carbon neutral development.

Id No Respondent

428 Campaign To Protect Rural England

Policy 7

Para 2.86 - supports, but feels that RSS does not give adequate consideration to the possible differences in need and planning policy requirement between towns within the city-regions and towns outside them.

B) Would welcome emphasis on local job creation and local workforces here.

D) Consideration also needs to be given to the medium term impact of the poor environment and health suffered by thousands of people in the Tees Valley area.

F) s) Wish to have assurances that national and international wildlife sites were not harmed and that development on brownfield land.

G) Q) It is inappropriate to support growth in air travel. Proposed development of 80Ha of land at Durham Tees Valley Airport should be deleted and all proposals to accommodate air transport should be dropped.

I) Development of Wynfield and netPark is inconsistent with the sequential approach outlined in Policy 3 and no justification given for their exemption from the policy. Would like to see reference to these two sites removed from the policy and the rest of RSS.

Add two extra bullet points under Sustainable Communities:

p-2) 'establishing are strategic Green Belt for Tees Valley which will strengthen inner-city regeneration and maintain the distinctive character of the outlying towns and villages.'

p-3) 'Providing quality public open green space, including tree planting, as part of all urban regeneration initiatives.'

352 Church Commissioners for England

The Commissioners support the Tees Valley City Region approach

282 City of Durham Trust

Object to (q), or that part in para 2.123 which relates to the County Council's idea of "an airport park and ride facility near Durham City." The project would only involve those living in the central area, midway between airports. Such people will hardly travel a relatively short distance from home in order to park 15 miles from an airport. (no business executive would contemplate this strategy anyway.) One or a combination of bus/train/taxi is the obvious strategy. The present train from Durham to Newcastle, together with the Metro system to the airport, running via Durham bus station, is a possibility, but the numbers traveling to/from Teesside will always remain disproportionately fewer. Lastly an airport park and ride will be either at the expense of spaces of those e using the facility daily for the City, or require an extension into Green Belt. Both options are to be discouraged.

438 Counden Leeholme Comm Partnership

We are a former mining community and have brownfield sites that could be used for affordable housing.

Extra mainstream funding needed for transport as two villages have no transport

Id No Respondent

332 Darlington Borough Council

Policy 7

15. Prior to the release of this Submission Document, a draft had been agreed at Tees Valley officer level which included important additional sections and policy statements relating to Darlington. Thus, in paragraphs 2.81 and 2.112 the key role Darlington plays as a gateway to the Tees Valley and North East is recognized.

16. In addition, the policy associated with the 'Tees Valley City Region' (Policy 8) is worded, giving Darlington and Hartlepool equal standing with regeneration in Middlesbrough, Stockton and Redcar:

"...a) giving priority to the regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar; Hartlepool Quays and Central Park Darlington, and the links into their town centres for appropriate mixed use development;..."

17. Again the section related to the Tees Valley City Region is appropriate in that:

- (a) It reflects the Northern Way documents;
- (b) It reflects the agreed Tees Valley Vision;
- (c) It recognizes the detailed economic research which show that different parts of the Tees Valley can contribute different things to its regeneration;
- (d) The 'town centre links' phrase is important, because regeneration sites can not exist in isolation: they need to integrate with their surroundings.

Id No Respondent

349 Defence Estates

Policy 7

Tees Valley City Region

Policy 7 sets out how the polycentric development and redevelopment of the Tees Valley city region should be supported by strategies, plans and programmes. The policy identifies specific roles for Darlington as an employment location and as a sub-regional centre for locating the majority of new retail and leisure development, whilst additional development in other centres should be consistent with their scale and function to enhance their vitality and viability. The policy states that housing should be developed to support the economic growth strategies in sustainable locations. The supporting text to Policy 7 (such as paragraphs 2.77, 2.81, 2.88 and 2.112) confirms this approach and states that the sphere of influence of the Tees Valley City Region and Darlington in particular, covers a large part of North Yorkshire, stretching into Richmondshire and Hambleton Districts.

Defence Estates (DE) object to Policy 7 of the Submission Draft RSS for the North East.

The Ministry of Defence has prepared the Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (July 2005) to provide a strategic long term planning vision for Catterick Garrison. The Long Term Development Plan (LTDP) will enable informed decisions to be made regarding future military, other public and private sector investment at the Garrison, which will enable it to support the delivery of defence capability.

The LTDP, due to be launched this Autumn, has been prepared against the background of overarching Army planning documents such as the Strategy for the Army Estate and the Super Garrison concept that sets the framework for likely future military growth and the need to build a sustainable military and civilian community at Catterick Garrison. Such growth may have downstream impacts on areas in the south of the region in particular towns and service centres such as Darlington. Clearly, at this stage it is difficult to assess these impacts but the intended longer term growth should be recognized as a major economic driver situated in close proximity to the southern regional boundary.

DE recognize that Catterick Garrison lies within Yorkshire and Humber region, however as the city regions concept is based on flexible geographies DE consider that reference should be made to the long term development of Catterick Garrison within the Tees Valley City Region.

DE consider that the long term development of a sustainable military and civilian community at Catterick Garrison would be compatible with the polycentric development and redevelopment of the Tees Valley city region, however the current policy and supporting text does not refer to an area of major investment in close proximity to the southern regional boundary.

DE would welcome the opportunity to discuss the LTDP in more detail following the launch of the document in the autumn. DE consider that the above changes would ensure that the long term development of Catterick Garrison accords with the polycentric development and redevelopment of the Tees Valley city region of the Submission Draft RSS for the North East.

DE comments on housing provision are addressed in our submission on policies 28-30.

28 Durham Cathedral

Para 2.112 and 2.121

Welcomes amendment to wording of supporting text and policy to recognize potential of land near A66 and on links to Darlington town centre. Cathedral willing to be involved in discussions on bringing forward its land as part of development of this area. Development potential of this site should be recognized in policies 19 and/or 21.

Comments on earlier draft of RSS reiterated regarding land around Newton Bewley, Hartlepool. This land can make a significant contribution to the achievement of economic aims being capable of providing land for service industries to support the petrochemical and other industries in Tees estuary area and is well located for transport links.

Id No Respondent

202 Durham County Council

Policy 7

Durham County Council supports the changes in the locational strategy (Policy 5) and the expanded sections on the two City Regions and Rural Areas (Policies 6, 7 and 8) to recognize the role of the towns and rural service centres outside the core cities and the role of Durham City as a main town.

Durham County Council supports the references to NetPark in Policies 7 & 19. The importance of the North East Technology Park, Sedgefield, as a focus for investment, continues to be recognized in the Submission Draft RSS, as one of 7 prestige employment sites of regional significance. Details of the site area have been amended to reflect the site development brief.

Policies 6 & 7 on the City Regions should make reference to supporting the development of green infrastructure: greenways, community woodlands and accessible natural greenspace in the countryside around towns.

172 Durham Heritage Coast

Policy 7 for Tees Valley City Region there is specific mention of Environment and subsequent support for the Heritage Coast but an equivalent policy is not included in Policy 6. We note this inconsistency

102 Durham Tees Valley Airport

Tees Valley City Region

DTVA supports the recognition of the economic benefit of growth of the Airport (paragraph 2.100), the recognition of its potential to attract inbound tourism to the region (paragraphs 2.101 and 2.102) and of the importance to global industries located in the region of aviation links to London (paragraphs 2.102 and 3.35).

Connectivity

DTVA supports the recognition in paragraphs 2.103 to 2.106 that connectivity with other markets is an important competitive advantage for Tees Valley businesses.

The Air Transport White Paper states that air freight remains an important target sector for DTVA. Planning permission exists at the South Side of DTVA for a major air freight facility. The current planning application for expansion of the Airport includes provision for a cargo facility on North Side. These developments offer huge potential for rapid movement of goods to and from international markets. It is considered that they should be recognized in the RSS. DTVA objects to the omission of reference to air freight. It requests that reference to air transport be added in the first sentence of paragraph 2.105.

DTVA also requests addition of the following after paragraph 2.106:

“Existing and planned cargo handling facilities at Durham Tees Valley Airport presents an opportunity for improved rapid transit of goods to and from other UK regional and international markets. Development of these facilities could significantly improve the competitiveness of Tees Valley businesses”.

Policy 7 – Tees Valley City Region

DTVA supports the principle of Policy 7 g) and considers it could be clarified by amending the wording to:

Encouraging the development of an additional 80 ha of land at Durham Tees Valley Airport for airport-related employment uses, to enable the Airport’s potential as an economic driver to be realized and to cater for its anticipated passenger and cargo growth”.

DTVA supports Policy 7 q).

Id No Respondent

98 English Heritage

Policy 7

Para 2.84 Support English Heritage welcomes reference to the tourism potential of Kirkleatham.

Para 2.117 - appears to be growing resistance to the demolition of areas of older terraced housing in Middlesborough and South Bank. Care should be exercised with such a value-laden observation. Property age is not the sole determinant in housing market failure.

Policy 7 Object - The 'environment sections of this policy should make specific reference to the potential of, for example, major tourism initiatives such as those at Shildon and Kirkleatham. The Tees Valley has a rich heritage but does not use its social and economic potential well.

95 English Nature,

Propose re-name sub heading "Environment" as "Environment, Heritage, Tourism and Culture" to better reflect the heritage, tourism and culture aspects of the city region strategy and for consistency with Policy 6

Propose insert new text at end of policy under new the new "Environment, Heritage, Tourism & Culture" sub heading:

y) identifying, developing and implementing green infrastructure in the city region to provide a healthy and enhanced environment for the benefit of present and future communities" to ensure that green infrastructure provision is fully integrated into regeneration and development of the city region

Propose change- show SPAs/SACs/Ramsar Sites/NNRs and SSIs on the Tyne & Wear City Region Map to reflect the advice in PPS9 and to be consistent with the national landscape designations shown on the existing map

Amend bullet point (w) to: "subjecting development proposals in or likely to affect the Saltholme Nature Reserve, Teesmouth National Nature Reserve, the Heritage Coast and the Tees Estuary to rigorous examination" to more reflect the requirements of PPS9

Id No Respondent

200 Environment Agency

Policy 7

2.101

“Whilst the majority of passengers traveling through Durham Tees Valley Airport will be holiday makers to foreign countries, the potential exists to attract tourists to the Tees valley city region. If most of the passengers will be outgoing holidaymakers, how is the airport going to ‘drive the region’s economy’? Is there evidence to suggest that tourists will be attracted to the Tees Valley region?”

“the Coastal Arc initiative will exploit the potential of the coast as an economic driver.. There is no real explanation of ‘Coastal Arc’ until much later, in paragraph 2.110. This needs to be addressed to help the reader.”

2.125

there are key environmental assets, which must be conserved or enhanced. The RSS needs to conserve/enhance all environmental assets.

Policy 7

“(w) subjecting development proposals in Saltholme Nature Reserve, the Heritage Coast and the Tees Estuary to rigorous examination” - What about the areas and impacts outside the designated sites, which are also important?”

2.133

This paragraph deals with agriculture and the importance of changes that are impacting on agriculture and rural land management. The Natural Resource Protection aspects should be strengthened by adding the following text: Natural resource management functions remain vital. The Region's soils and aquatic environments are a key natural resource that need to be both protected and enhanced.

Id No Respondent

163 Friends of the Earth North East

Policy 7

Friends of the Earth broadly support the city region approach as an important expression of the Locational Strategy's development focus in the key conurbations and main towns. However, policy 6 contains a number of policy elements which are inconsistent with the overarching framework of sustainable development, and with other cross-cutting policies such as the sequential approach.

Under the 'Economic Prosperity' heading, we oppose the inclusion of point d) on the grounds of environmental justice and sustainable development. Much of the Tees Valley area already experiences some of the greatest environmental problems in the country, with significant environmental degradation in several parts. A significant proportion of this environmental degradation is due to the high concentration of heavy industry in the area, particularly around Wilton, Redcar, Billingham and Hartlepool. These communities suffer a great deal from problems of poor air quality (in 2003, the number of days when air pollution was moderate or higher was 78 in Middlesbrough and 80 in Redcar against the England average of 51) and contaminated land (residents in Seaton Carew have been notified by the Council not to dig in their gardens because the ground is contaminated). Respiratory diseases and cancer rates in the towns around the Wilton chemical site are significantly above the national average. A comparative study with women of a similar socio-economic group and with similar lifestyles in Sunderland demonstrated that the high occurrence of health problems on Teesside cannot be attributed solely to personal habits such as diet and smoking (Ref: Case control study of cancer in women on Teesside, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, <http://www.ncl.ac.uk/pahs/research/project/787>)

Environmental justice is about upholding everyone's right to live in a clean, healthy, attractive environment, and this is a principle which the RSS explicitly endorses on page 97:

'Some parts of the region suffer from poor environmental quality, often as a result of former industrial activity and associated dereliction. The right of everyone to live in a clean, healthy, attractive environment is a central principle of the RSS.'

Sustainable development requires decision-making that integrates environmental, social and economic objectives. No one of these three should be prioritized over the others- to do so is to act unsustainably. Any further expansion of the chemical and steel industries in the Tees Valley would have strong negative environmental consequences, as well as adverse social impacts. We would also contend that the economic benefits would be limited, as a heavily industrialized area with poor environmental quality will actively deter many already 'footloose' businesses from deciding to locate there. Despite the chemical and steel industries being well-established in the Tees Valley, the area is one of the most deprived in the whole country. In our view, this is due considerably to the area's reliance on these industries which has served as a major deterrent to other sectors of the economy locating there because of the associated environmental and social problems.

Friends of the Earth accepts that these industries have a role to play in the Tees Valley economy. However, any further expansion would breach the principles of environmental justice and sustainable development which are at the heart of the RSS. It would also breach the RSS's vision of a region where, 'present and future generations have a high quality of life' (p.6) by failing to address the poor quality of life currently experienced by many Tees Valley residents. What this area needs is economic diversification, and an emphasis on attracting clean, non-polluting businesses that will serve to 'balance out' the concentration of heavy industry and offer people employment options. For this reason, we support point e) on trying to expand the renewable energy and recycling sectors in the Tees Valley. The RSS recognizes the importance of this itself on page 11 where it highlights that, 'the transition of the economy from the industrial heritage of coal mining, ship building, chemicals and steel production to a more broadly-based economy centred on information-based 'knowledge' industries and the service sector,' is a key challenge for the region.

We would therefore like to see point d) amended as follows:

d) prioritizing the economic diversification of the Tees Valley by attracting new, clean technology and knowledge-based businesses , particularly to the areas with a high concentration of heavy industry

Friends of the Earth supports in principle plans for an expansion of Teesport to contribute to greater sustainable freight distribution. However,

Policy 7

given its proximity to internationally and nationally important wildlife sites and the risks posed by dredging, it must be ensured that any expansion does not cause environmental harm. We suggest the following amendment to point f):

f) supporting the development of Teesport for the export of steel and a deep sea container port, subject to the absence of adverse environmental impacts such as marine dredging and effects on biodiversity species and habitats and the improvement of rail-freight connections.

We object to points g) and q) as aviation is an inherently unsustainable transport mode. While it has a role to play in the transport mix and in assisting economic and tourism development, the continued expansion of this industry is simply incompatible with sustainable development. A strategy aiming to achieve the sustainable development of a region, which has as one of its key values, 'recognizing global responsibilities' (p. 6) and states that, 'The RSS recognizes that climate change is the single most significant issue that affects global society in the 21st century,' (p.58) cannot support the continued expansion of the aviation industry.

Secondly, the importance of the aviation industry to the regional economy is frequently overplayed. Policy 6 point n) talks of the airport's potential as an economic driver. Despite the best efforts of various bodies to find evidence for such a claim, there simply is none. Indeed, a report commissioned by Steer Davies Gleave for One North East in August 2003 entitled, 'Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East' concluded that, 'More transport infrastructure and service provision will not in itself drive economic growth- it can only support other measures and policies' (p.2). We request that point g) be deleted, and point q) replaced with:

q) securing public transport improvements to Durham-Tees Valley airport to ensure high accessibility by sustainable modes

We oppose point i) on the two prestige employment sites of Wynyard and NetPark. Both of these are Greenfield sites and therefore their development is inconsistent with Policy 3: The Sequential Approach. They are also extremely poorly connected by public transport, and exhibit very poor accessibility by walking and cycling. Their development will actively work against the RSSs objectives on reducing the need to travel and tackling the causes of climate change. They are also likely to undermine efforts to regenerate urban centres. They may provide economic benefits (although we believe that other suitable sites could easily be found), but being inaccessible to many of the people most in need of employment means the social benefits will be limited, while the impact on the environment will be negative through the needless building on greenfield land, and the increasing number of car journeys and CO2 emissions that will result. They therefore fail the sustainable development test.

We would like to see reference to these three Prestige Employment Sites removed from this policy, and the rest of the RSS, as their inclusion runs contrary to much of what the document says it is trying to achieve.

We oppose the support for a new river crossing of the Tees in point v). Friends of the Earth believes that road-building should always be the option of last resort after the possibilities for public transport or other solutions to address the specific need in question have been fully explored. Road traffic accounts for 25% of carbon dioxide emissions, a figure which is continuing to rise. Strong negative social impacts include clear links to health problems in children and adults, noise problems and accidents. Addressing climate change and achieving social justice necessitate an urgent reduction in traffic levels and strong modal shift away from cars and onto public transport. Increasing road capacity will have directly the opposite effect.

The policy is very light on environmental objectives, and we would like to see the following added under the 'Sustainable Communities' heading:

Id No Respondent

Policy 7

- Ensuring the protection and enhancement of all urban open spaces for public enjoyment, and the creation of new ones where possible.
- Maximizing the opportunities for tree planting, habitat creation and the greening of urban areas wherever possible.

To point p), add: 'in line with policy 4 (sustainable consumption and construction)'

We support point w), but the wording needs to be strengthened as follows:

w) protecting Saltholme Nature Reserve, the Heritage Coast and designated sites in the Tees Estuary from development unless it can be demonstrated to be consistent with sustainable development.

215 Government Office For The North East

Heading above Para 2.77 Not consistent with Tyne and Wear.

Para 2.105 The Northern Way aspiration is to increase the proportion using Northern ports by 3 percentage points from 22% to 25% - not by 3%.

Para 2.125 Refers to Durham and Yorkshire Dales AONB's – should this read 'North Pennines AONB' and 'Yorkshire Dales National Park'?

Policy 7 This policy has 5 sub sections and as with the comments relating to policy 6 above should relate clearly to the locational strategy and the policies in chapter 3.

a) Central Park Darlington is referred to in Policy 13 however the other areas are not specifically mentioned in Economic Development Policies e.g. Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative.

b) Coastal Arc doesn't read through into the rest of the document.

h) Not mentioned in the Economy Chapter Policy.

j) Doesn't emerge as a priority in the rest of the document.

k) Policy 14 supports further and higher education but the Wilton Centre is not mentioned for R&D.

l) Redcar is not mentioned in Policy 16.

p) There is no policy on high standards of design from an environmental quality point of view to carry this policy forward.

q) Policies 21 and 49 airport policies do not mention freight.

s) Term Northern Gateway not used in port policies 22 or 49.

w) Not carried through the rest of the document.

x) Policy 41 covers this but the terminology of carefully considering local impacts is not used and could conflict.

Policy 7 Connectivity section too scheme based without justification. Part 't' is general statement which states that support should be given to exploring need for infrastructure improvements rather than seeking to explore transport outcomes that need to be met in order to achieve rest of policy and what role transport can play through the use of softer or demand management measures to make better use of existing network as much as major infrastructure. For example it may be necessary to reconsider location of proposed regeneration sites in terms of transport sustainability.

Policy 7 What is meant by 'giving priority to' (parts 'a' and 'd')?

Id No Respondent

195 Grainger Trust

Policy 7

The geographic extents of the regeneration areas are included on the city region map on page 51. This helps to clarify the extent of the city region and the regeneration areas, although there is seen to be no definitive boundary of the city region (paragraph 2.77). Specific towns are still named in policy 7, instead of regeneration areas, which can again be seen to hamper regeneration aims and limit development opportunities in certain towns.

GT object to this policy and the dependency on English Partnerships to examine the appropriate mechanisms for the Agency to contribute to the process of revitalizing priority smaller coalfield areas. This may hamper the success of the Durham Coalfield Communities Housing Market Renewal Initiative and lead to greater deprivation. The regeneration of areas including Chilton and Ferryhill Station would be able to fulfill these needs, providing sustainable, revitalized communities. Development in these areas should therefore be encouraged

164 Hallam Land Management Ltd

Regeneration

same comments as in Policy 6 in respect of a) and b) apply to a), b) and c) in Policy 7

Id No Respondent

147 Harlepool Borough Council

Policy 7

Policy 7 is supported because of the emphasis this places upon the polycentric development and redevelopment of the Tees Valley city region and, in regeneration terms, the equal priority the policy gives to the regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar; Hartlepool Quays and Central Park Darlington and the links into their town centres for appropriate mixed use development.

The wording in the regeneration section of Policy 7 of the RSS has been developed on the basis of the strategic approach contained within Tees Valley Vision and is strongly supported by Hartlepool Borough Council and the Hartlepool LSP. Hartlepool Quays is a particularly important regeneration area for Hartlepool and is considered to be of regional if not national significance. It is vital to making a step change in the pace and quality of regeneration in Hartlepool and as a consequence achieving benefit for the rest of the North East region.

The support given to the regeneration of the Coastal Arc from Hartlepool Headland to East Cleveland for appropriate development is also welcomed. This being one of three spatial zones identified by the above-mentioned Tees Valley Partnership strategic framework document "Tees Valley Vision" and the spatial strategy this promotes in order to raise the economic performance of the Tees Valley and improve the quality of life of its people.

The associated sections within Policy 7 in relation to Sustainable Communities, Connectivity and Environment are also welcomed and supported. These are considered, along with the remainder of Policy 7, to be consistent with the main development principles of the RSS as set out in the early parts of Section 2, namely :-

- To promote an urban and rural renaissance
- To contribute to the sustainable development of the region
- To reflect a sequential approach to land allocations and
- To include appropriate phasing and plan, monitor, manage mechanisms for new development

All of which are considered helpful to the development of the Hartlepool Local development framework (LDF).

Please note however the concerns expressed in relation to Policy 7 para. h) on the accompanying Comment Form.

Policy (h) within the Economic Prosperity section of Policy 7 is opposed because this only serves to understate the potential role of Hartlepool (and other areas) in raising the economic prosperity of Tees Valley within the North East region. It is inconsistent with an overall polycentric approach to development and redevelopment within the Tees Valley city region, runs counter to the equal prioritization given to the various initiatives contained within the earlier Regeneration Section of Policy 7 and reinforces the objections raised elsewhere (Comment Form in relation to Para 2.78 of the RSS refers) about the designation of Hartlepool as a main town and it being excluded from the core area of the conurbation.

Paragraph (h) should be amended to read "supporting the development of major new business and financial services and leisure, tourism, cultural and retail development in Stockton, Middlesbrough, Redcar, Hartlepool and Darlington".

This paragraph, together with the preceding paragraph 2.77 incorrectly describes and explains the polycentric settlement pattern of the Tees Valley. Hartlepool should not be designated as a main town within the RSS as it forms part of the Tees Valley conurbation. As such the RSS inadequately translates the polycentric nature of the Tees Valley within the supporting text (an Integrated City Region) that justifies policy 7 for the Tees Valley city region and confuses the differing degree of prioritization between areas of the Tees Valley by understating the role of Hartlepool.

The Tees Valley City Region diagram (page 51) at the end of the Tees Valley City Region section of the RSS is also inaccurate. The grey

Id No Respondent**Policy 7**

shaded area for Hartlepool does not represent the full extent of the built up area of Hartlepool by excluding areas of the southern part of the town, part of Seaton Carew and adjacent industrial areas. This gives the (wrong) impression that Hartlepool is detached from the currently designated conurbation of Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar. The grey shaded area for Hartlepool should be extended to become more closely linked with the remainder of the conurbation.

Changes to the text for the Tees Valley City Region section need to reflect the above comments by describing a polycentric model of spatial development for the Tees Valley where the focus for growth needs to be centred on the conurbation (Middlesbrough, Stockton, Redcar and Hartlepool) together with the main town of Darlington. Along with the changes suggested elsewhere to policy 7 itself, such amendments will support regeneration in all these parts of the City Region so that they can maximize their potential to contribute to regional economic growth, sustainable development and social inclusion within the Tees Valley.

454	Hartlepool Civic Society	<p>do not support item i) Wynyard is viewed as an obstacle to ensuring fullest investment in existing urban areas. We urge Wynyard is not given special support but rather this is directed to Queens Meadow and Victoria Harbour.</p> <p>We question whether Wynyard will strengthen economy of Harlepool as it is remote from Hartlepool and could actually pose a threat to the attraction of Harlepool and so weaken its economy</p>
160	Highways Agency	<p>Regeneration: priority to both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough, and Redcar. Hartlepool quays, central park Darlington, for mixed use development. Supporting regeneration of the coastal arc and supporting regeneration of the smaller towns such as Newton Aycliffe, bishop Auckland and Saltburn for sustainable indigenous growth.</p> <p>Economic Prosperity: Priority to major heavy industrial, chemicals and port related development like Teesport; encouraging development of 80 hectares of land for airport related uses; supporting development of Wynyard and NetPark as prestige employment sites; supporting Darlington and Newton Aycliffe as employment locations to take advantage of their proximity to the A1, A66 and East Coast Main Line</p> <p>Sustainable Communities: locating majority of new retail and leisure development in the sub-regional centres of Middlesbrough and Darlington, whilst additional development in other centres should be consistent with their scale and function; sustainable locations on previously developed land in areas where it does not undermine existing housing markets.</p> <p>Connectivity: encourage growth of passenger and freight services from Durham Tees Valley Airport for international markets; develop a modern integrated public transport network; growth of Teesport as northern gateway port; supporting improvements to A66, new river crossing and reducing congestion on A19.</p> <p>Environment: subjecting development proposals in the Saltholme Nature Reserve, the Heritage coast and the Tees Estuary to rigorous examination.</p>
424	Home Builders Federation	<p>The HBF supports the Tees Valley city region approach</p>

Id No Respondent

451 Marchday Group

Policy 7

Para 2.81 - Marchday fully supports the recognition in para 2.81 that Darlington plays an important role for a variety of different reasons as a sub-regional centre.

The para makes references to the importance Darlington makes to the north east regarding employment, retail, architecture and transport. There is also recognition that Darlington is an attractive market town possessing a good quality environment enabling it to attract financial, business services and logistics not otherwise located in the Tees Valley or the North East and that it serves a wide catchment area covering South Durham, parts of North Yorkshire, Richmondshire, Humbleton. This particular issue also suggests that considerable commuting throughout the catchment takes place. This may result in concerns that sustainable objectives are not being fully addressed and that policy should seek to alter this pattern by encouraging greater levels of new local housing for Darlington to satisfy a broad range of need requirements in quality environments within Darlington's settlement area, and particularly on available brownfield sites.

It is unfortunate that para 2.81 makes no reference to the fact that Darlington also plays a vital role in satisfying and contributing to sub-regional housing needs within both the public and private sectors and regarding a variety of housing types.

It is therefore contested that this para be altered to also make reference to housing and that Darlington plays an important role in providing for mixed communities and much needed new housing for middle and upper income groups of families.

In addition, it is suggested that reference is made within para 2.81 that the 50 hectare former BAT factory site now known as Lingfield Point owned by the Marchday Group to the north east of the town centre provides a unique opportunity for an exemplar mixed use urban regeneration project comprising of a variety of land uses and housing types that will all greatly assist in enabling Darlington to attain a critical regeneration mass, allowing it to be recognized as a leading renaissance settlement in the North East, ensuring it maintains and develops its important sub-regional role.

Marchday welcomes identification within para 2.112 that Darlington has a vital role to play in Tees Valley as a strong, developing and dynamic centre serving a wide catchment. However it is contested that reference should also be made to the major urban regeneration opportunity that comprises the 50 hectare Lingfield point site, owned by the Marchday Group. Lingfield Point is a substantial previously developed site able to accommodate quality employment opportunities and land for a variety of other activities, including housing.

The scale of this opportunity is such that the level of regeneration that can be accommodated throughout Lingfield Point means the site must be recognized as being of sub-regional if not regional importance. Important in terms of scale and quality of development for both employment and residential purposes that can be and will be achieved and that consequently, it is deserving of identification in this paragraph.

The location of the site means that in terms of connectivity it will benefit from a new and a dedicated site access off the Darlington Eastern Transport Corridor linking to the town centre and surrounding radial routes.

The Eastern Transport Corridor is a key component to ensuring the overall regeneration of Darlington takes place and within a time frame corresponding to the town's Local Development Framework. Therefore this paragraph should also place considerable emphasis on indicating that delivery of the Eastern Transport Corridor is fundamental to ensuring the long term urban renaissance of Darlington as a whole is achieved.

Lingfield Point is important to the future renaissance of Darlington given it can accommodate a mix of land uses including good levels of new housing, all in a highly sustainable location, that it should be specifically referred to under criteria A alongside Central Park Darlington.

Id No Respondent

Policy 7

Lingfield Point presents a unique opportunity to demonstrate that a substantial previously developed brownfield site can be redeveloped to satisfy up to date Government Planning Policy statements.

Therefore criteria A should be redrafted as follows:

"a giving priority to the regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar, Hartlepool Quays, Central Park and Lingfield Point, Darlington and the links into their town centres for appropriate development"

550 Member of Public

d) Giving priority to major new heavy industrial, chemical and port related development

-Change "giving priority to" to "supporting, where proven to be sustainable", as otherwise there will be yet another increase in greenhouse gases in our region.

e) Supporting the expansion of the renewable energy and recycling sector and their links to sustainable regeneration

-Change "supporting" for "giving priority" to, as it is essential that our renewable energy production increases to meet National targets and mitigate the effects of climate change.

g)Encourage development of 80 hectares land for airport related uses to enable to cope with anticipated passenger growth

-Airport expansion should not be allowed unless the increased greenhouse gases produced can be offset elsewhere in the RSS.

x) Encouraging the development of renewable energy whilst carefully considering the local impacts of proposals

-Change "encouraging" to "ensuring". Targets have already been set in policy 40 therefore we must ensure they are met.

470 Member of Public

I agree that the goal of "Sustainable Communities" will be best served by locating the majority of new retail and leisure development in the sub-regional centres of Middlesbrough and Darlington. The responsibility to prove beyond doubt that additional development in other centres is consistent with their scale and function and will enhance their vitality and viability should rest with the developers.

I also support most of the other points, but I am not convinced that the net benefits of encouraging the growth of passenger and freight services from Durham Tees Valley Airport will ever outweigh the social and environmental impact of increased air traffic

453 Member of Public

Support response of FoE

Id No Respondent

185 Middlesbrough Council

Policy 7

It is considered that further clarification is required in policy 7(a) on the precise area covered by the description 'both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar.' It would be more appropriate to refer to the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative area.

Policy 7 should be amended to make specific reference to the prioritization of the core area, the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative, rather than both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar.

The submission draft RSS does not recognize in policy the role that Middlesbrough performs as the primary sub regional centre for the Tees Valley. It is a higher order centre than Darlington, with a significantly higher market share and prime Catchment population.

Requested changes - In policy 7 (m), Middlesbrough should be identified as the primary sub-regional centre for the Tees Valley city region for retail and leisure purposes.

Para 2.122 advises that investment will be concentrated on routes between Redcar and Middlesbrough; Hartlepool and Stockton / Middlesbrough; Stockton and Darlington; and Darlington and Durham. Whilst this paragraph highlights the importance of connectivity with the urban core of the Tees Valley, It does not address the core need for public transport infrastructure improvements in the core area between Stockton and Middlesbrough town centres.

Requested Changes

1) Specific reference should be made to the need to improve public transport infrastructure between Stockton and Middlesbrough town centres as part of the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative.

The RSS does not recognize the need for a transport link along the East Middlesbrough Corridor to alleviate congestion on the existing principal routes into Middlesbrough town centre (especially Marton Road), improve public transport accessibility, and assist in the regeneration of key sites within the town. Such a route would provide significantly enhanced linkages to two of the countries most deprived communities in East Middlesbrough and Greater Eston (in Redcar & Cleveland). The Provisional Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 identifies a road link between Swan's Corner and the Parkway, called the East Middlesbrough Gateway, as a priority scheme. This is an evolution of the East Middlesbrough Transport Corridor.

Requested Changes

1) In Para 2.122 and policy 7, under connectivity, specific reference should be made to the role of the East Middlesbrough Corridor in reducing congestion, improving accessibility, and assisting with the regeneration of the area. The scheme should be identified as a transportation priority.

Para 2.120 The current capacity of the A19/A66 has resulted in the Highways Agency issuing Article 14 directions in the Tees Valley. Unless infrastructure improvements are prioritized, a number of regeneration schemes in the Tees Valley may not be implemented. Improvements to highway infrastructure along the A19 and A66 within the core area of the Tees Valley city region, therefore, needs to be highlighted in RSS as a priority, above schemes outside the immediate sphere of the city regions.

Requested Changes

- In para 2.120 specific reference should be made to the need to improve highway infrastructure on the A19 and A66 in the core area of the city region, in order to ensure that regeneration schemes can be implemented.

The Council also objected at the consultation draft RSS stage to the lack of prioritization of the urban core in Policy 7, which deals with the

Id No Respondent**Policy 7**

development strategy for the Tees Valley city region. The amended policy prioritizes the regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar; Hartlepool Quays and Central Park, Darlington for mixed use development. It is considered that the North East Assembly should further clarify the precise area covered by the description 'both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar. It would be more appropriate to refer to the Stockton, Middlesbrough Initiative area. In terms of economic prosperity, Policy 7 also supports the development of business and financial services and new city scale leisure, culture and retail development in Stockton and Middlesbrough.

Objection - Policy 7 should be amended to make specific reference to the prioritization of the core area, the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative, rather than both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar.

Policy 7 seeks to locate the majority of the Tees Valley's new retail and leisure development in the sub-regional centres of Middlesbrough and Darlington. Policy 25 also relates to retail and leisure floor space and includes the same hierarchy of centres as Policy 7. The representations on the consultation draft RSS requested that Middlesbrough be identified as the sub-regional centre for the Tees Valley city region. As the requested amendments have not been made, it is recommended that the Council objects to these two policies.

Objection - In policies 7 and 25, Middlesbrough should be identified as the primary sub-regional centre for the Tees Valley city region for retail and leisure purposes.

272 Middlesbrough Town Centre Company

Policy builds on the theme by giving a regeneration priority to key regeneration sites as well as support for development of business and financial services and new city scale leisure, cultural and retail development in the corridor embracing Stockton, Middlesbrough and the intervening land, while clarifying that the location of major new retail and leisure development should take place in the sub regional centres of Middlesbrough and Darlington. Representations have already been made flagging up the considerable difference in retail studies of these two centres. The inclusion of both as a sub regional status reflects more convenience politically than the trading reality.

449 National Trust North East

Similar to representations on Policy 6: the Trust requests that part (g) of the policy be deleted. The Trust objects to part n) of this policy. It is unsustainable in every way, and contrary to statements at the beginning of the document about recognizing our global responsibilities. There has been no evidence provided by the assembly to show that the airport is an economic driver. This is an assumption, and a dangerous one. No-one has provided a cost benefit analysis to show the benefits to the economy versus the costs to local residents in terms of air quality and noise, the impact on the environment that air travel has, or the impact on the domestic tourism economy. This is therefore not sustainable development, as the policy only considers the economic benefits. This is contrary to the requirement of the Planning Act 2004, and contrary to the government's own UK Sustainable Development Strategy, and contrary to the Environment Section of Policy 2 in the RSS.

There is an assumption here that has not been supported in the Technical Papers, that the airport is an economic driver for the region, and that its value as an economic driver far outweighs the environmental costs (which have not been quantified either) both locally and globally, of continuous demand led airport expansion.

Id No Respondent

94 Nectar

Policy 7

Policy 7 is generally supported by NECTAR.

Walking is promoted at various places in the Regional Spatial Strategy and should be given emphasis in Policy 7. Attention should be drawn to the need to ensure that the regeneration of the areas identified is predicated on a presumption in favour of the pedestrian and where conflict arises, against the motorist; pedestrian zones, street layouts, crossing arrangements, road signs etc should be designed to enhance the quality of life of those who live and work in the area. An attractive and desirable built environment should become a key feature of any sustainable community. Emphasis should be placed on the need to provide attractive access on foot to key services (health, shopping, recreation etc) locally provided.

Pursuing the growth of air travel is unsustainable and would make impossible the essential reductions needed in CO2 emissions. The role of air travel should be presented in perspective; the East Coast Mainline Railway stations bring a greater number of people into the City Region. The land grab proposed for the airport, is based on unbridled predict and provide forecasts and is unsustainable; it must not be pursued. The Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport gives a very partial statement on the economic impact of the airport which relies largely on circumstances elsewhere and does not address the key factors of the net outflow of tourists (cost nationally £17billionpa), the aviation fuel and VAT exemptions (Cost nationally £10billionpa) or the environmental costs and consequences related to aircraft CO2 and other emissions. The national figures quoted in the Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport serve to show how small the volume of business is at around 10% of the passengers carried by the rail and 5% of those carried by the bus industry.

Reference should be made to the role and value of the emerging private transport links being developed for healthcare, social inclusion, disability and educational purposes. Such dedicated links offer a valuable opportunity to reduce car dependence. Similarly, reference should be made to the potential impact of free concessionary bus travel for older people and the impact this may have on other provisions and services.

A new crossing of the River Tees (Policy 7v) would be unsustainable unless it provided for rail as well as road links; clearly any such project would be of lower priority than rail gauge enhancements to Teesport. Reference should be made to the use of road user charging and parking controls to manage car traffic within the central areas of the City Region. The proposals to dual the A66 across the North Yorkshire Moors would appear to be indirect conflict with the aspirations of Paragraph 2.125.

The case should be made in the text and identified in the Policy for continuing to work towards bringing funding for the railway in the Region within the scope of such emerging bodies as the Regional Transport Board. General reference should be made to the preservation of passenger and freight rail routes and facilities to ensure their availability for future use as the modal shift measures promoted in the Regional Spatial Strategy bear fruit in the medium to long term.

The rail services supported in the Policy should include an intercity quality link between Sunderland and Newcastle, as part of the developed Durham Coast railway linking the key towns of the two City Regions. This link would then extend the potential for business travel from the Tees Valley City Region to the thriving economies of Edinburgh and Glasgow as well as to the English towns and cities further south.

Improvements to the railway stations in the City Region should be identified as part of a comprehensive plan for encouraging modal shift away from the car as well as to develop a gateway approach at key locations. Both residents and in-bound tourists would benefit from this approach.

Based around Policy 7L and the various references in the supporting text, a separate section should be developed in Policy 7 to reflect the initiatives and importance of tourism to key areas of the City Region. Coast, Moors, the Esk Valley railway and railway heritage are all themes with great tourist potential. Improved stations would be positive attractions to in-bound tourists.

Id No Respondent**Policy 7**

- 817 Newcastle Great Park Consortium
- In respect of policy 7 and 21 the Newcastle Great Park Consortium welcomes the identification of Newcastle Great Park as a Prestige Employment Site. However, in relation to policy 7 the consortium considers that Newcastle Great Park has an important role to play in the development and regeneration of the city region and delivery of the regional vision.
- The draft RSS is underpinned by a strategy which seeks to reduce economic disparities focusing development within the conurbations and towns of the two city regions. Through a reduction in the economic disparities the strategy anticipates population growth will be achieved through population retention and in-migration. In addition, in seeking to meet housing needs the draft RSS recognizes that "the supply of high quality housing and living environments will be a key driver to facilitate and support economic growth by helping to attract and retain the region's workforce."
- Newcastle Great Park represents a key opportunity to provide such high quality housing in close proximity to a prestige employment site, thereby delivering sustainable communities, and this must be considered in strategies, plans and programmes at the local level. Accordingly, it is considered that the important role of Newcastle Great Park should be acknowledged within policy 7 as a priority action to delivering the regional vision.
- 338 Northumberland Tyne & Wear NHS
- As 6 above.
- 194 PD Ports (Teesport & Seal Sands)
- PD Ports are pleased with the inclusion of paragraph 2.124 but request an amendment of the third sentence to read "... this could require the opening up of South Bank Wharf".
- With specific reference to the new diagram / map of the City Region, PD Ports believe that the red ellipse illustrating a 'Chemical Expansion Area' should be amended to be a fuller circle that covers more land either side and including land to the north of the River Tees.
- 152 PD Ports (Victoria Harbour)
- We support the fact that the new Policy 7 now refers at (b) to the regeneration of the Coastal Arc from Hartlepool Headland to East Cleveland.
- At (h) this policy talks of "new city scale leisure, cultural and retail development in Stockton and Middlesbrough" and at (m) to retail and leisure supporting "majority of new retail and leisure ... in Middlesbrough and Darlington ... additional development in other centres .. consistent with their scale and function" rather than naming Stockton, Hartlepool and Redcar which we would prefer.
- Supporting paragraph 2.110 refers to Victoria Harbour and correctly reads "Its redevelopment for mixed-uses will provide a regionally significant critical mass of facilities that will be a catalyst to creating new demand and stimulating further inward investment".

Id No Respondent

406 Port of Tyne

Policy 7

Economic Prosperity

f. I do not disagree with the support for Teesport on these two matters but as indicated earlier, the Tyne should be similarly promoted and supported in Policy 6. We at the Tyne operate a successful feeder Port container operation and both import and export steel product to the economic benefit of the Region.

The 'Strategy document' must be balanced. As written, it could distort the market.

Connectivity

s. 'Supporting the development of Teesport as a Northern Gateway Port'.
We have no problem with that but the report should also insert an additional item into the Policy to provide similar support for the Port of Tyne. We request that such a statement is inserted.

Id No Respondent

66 Railfuture NorthEast

Policy 7

Railfuture northeast supports Policy 7

Walking is promoted at various places in the Regional Spatial Strategy and should be given emphasis in Policy 7. Attention should be drawn to the need to ensure that the regeneration of the areas identified is predicated on a presumption in favour of the pedestrian and where conflict arises, against the motorist; pedestrian zones, street layouts, crossing arrangements, road signs etc should be designed to enhance the quality of life of those who live and work in the area. An attractive and desirable built environment should become a key feature of any sustainable community. Emphasis should be placed on the need to provide attractive access on foot to key services (health, shopping, recreation etc) locally provided.

Pursuing the growth of air travel is unsustainable and would make impossible the essential reductions needed in CO2 emissions. The role of air travel should be presented in perspective; the East Coast Mainline Railway stations bring a greater number of people into the City Region. The land grab proposed for the airport, is based on unbridled predict and provide forecasts and is unsustainable; it must not be pursued. The Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport gives a very partial statement on the economic impact of the airport which relies largely on circumstances elsewhere and does not address the key factors of the net outflow of tourists (cost nationally £17billionpa), the aviation fuel and VAT exemptions (Cost nationally £10billionpa) or the environmental costs and consequences related to aircraft CO2 and other emissions. The national figures quoted in the Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport serve to show how small the volume of business is at around 10% of the passengers carried by the rail and 5% of those carried by the bus industry.

A new crossing of the River Tees (Policy 7v) would be unsustainable unless it provided for rail as well as road links; clearly any such project would be of lower priority than rail gauge enhancements to Teesport. Reference should be made to the use of road user charging and parking controls to manage car traffic within the central areas of the City Region. The proposals to dual the A66 across the North Yorkshire Moors would appear to be indirect conflict with the aspirations of Paragraph 2.125.

The case should be made in the text and identified in the Policy for continuing to work towards bringing funding for the railway in the Region within the scope of such emerging bodies as the Regional Transport Board. General reference should be made to the preservation of passenger and freight rail routes and facilities to ensure their availability for future use as the modal shift measures promoted in the Regional Spatial Strategy bear fruit in the medium to long term.

The rail services supported in the Policy should include an intercity quality link between Sunderland and Newcastle, as part of the developed Durham Coast railway linking the key towns of the two City Regions. This link would then extend the potential for business travel from the Tees Valley City Region to the thriving economies of Edinburgh and Glasgow as well as to the English towns and cities further south.

Improvements to the railway stations in the City Region should be identified as part of a comprehensive plan for encouraging modal shift away from the car as well as to develop a gateway approach at key locations. Both residents and in-bound tourists would benefit from this approach.

Id No Respondent

42 Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council

Policy 7

Support the Tees Valley City Region strategy as set out in Policy 7 with reference to the Redcar & Cleveland area. Particular support is given to the regeneration of both banks of the Tees as far as Redcar as this recognizes that this area is one of the primary economic drivers of the Tees Valley and there is need for its regeneration and continued investment to modernize and update this areas to maintain its attractiveness to employers.

Support the inclusion of Saltburn in the list of East Cleveland regeneration area settlements.

Para 2.8 That the definition of major planning applications referred to in paragraph 2.8 be set out in the Glossary to ensure a consistent approach is adopted throughout the region.

444 Royal Mail Property Holdings

We would like to support the comments made in Para 2.106 which state that significant capacity for large-scale logistics operations is being created at Faverdale Industrial Estate in Darlington, where close access to the A1(M) and A66 is likely to see major investment, following the example set by Argos Direct.

We support the comments made in Para 2.117 stating that new housing is also needed to support the economic growth strategies to be provided in sustainable locations, mainly on previously developed land, in areas where it does not undermine existing housing markets and with good accessibility to where growth in jobs is being planned.

We welcome the statement made in Para 2.121 that Road improvements are particularly important to the Tees Valley for the movement of freight. It then goes on to state that the city region gives particular priority to the A66(T) Darlington Bypass improvements, which will not only improve connectivity but, also service new employment sites along the road.

403 Sainsbury's Supermarkets

We support the broad locational strategy advocated in this policy. This reflects the city region of Tees Valley based on the conurbation of Stockton/Middlesbrough/Redcar. We agree that RSS should also support the continued growth of Darlington and Hartlepool and the sustainable indigenous growth, primarily to meet local needs, of the Regeneration Area Towns.
In terms of retail investment, it is right that the majority of new floorspace should be located in the sub-regional centres of Middlesbrough and Darlington, but that additional development in other centres should be consistent with their scale and function.

Id No Respondent

190 Sedgefield Borough Council

Policy 7

Para 2.77 - 2.125 The locational strategy states that future development opportunities should be focused on the conurbations and main towns in the City Regions. In Sedgefield Borough, Newton Aycliffe, Spennymoor and Shildon are recognized as main towns in the Tees Valley City Region. The Borough welcomes the broad City Region concept, in terms of land use planning opportunities, in both the RSS and Northern Way Growth Strategy. However, it should be recognized that within the City Regions, the conurbations and main towns offer a variety of locational and sustainable advantages. Similarly, the economic and tourism value of the Darlington and Shildon areas in terms of railway heritage has not been fully recognized as part of the Tees Valley City Region context. The "birth of the railways" heritage theme should not just link Shildon to Stockton. There is potential to extend this theme further to include the Weardale railway, further into the Durham Dales.

It is important that the economic opportunities offered by the Aycliffe Industrial Park along with Newton Aycliffe and the connectivity of the Darlington-Bishop Auckland rail corridor for employment, retail and leisure activities, as well as serving some of the most disadvantaged communities in the South Durham part of the Tees Valley City Region is fully identified in the RSS to ensure that economic opportunities are maximized.

Sedgefield Borough Council therefore broadly supports the Tees Valley City Region concept but requests that additional text is included to fully address the opportunities offered within the Newton Aycliffe - Darlington area of the City Region, linking employment opportunities with transport accessibility.

228 Stockton Borough Council

Policy 7 goes on to provide a specific policy direction to the Tees Valley City Region which is to be broadly welcomed. Its supporting text at inter alia paragraphs 2.107 and 2.108 continue to make reference to the priority that must be given to the regeneration along the river banks of the urban core of the SMI area to foster the growth of the wider City Region. This is largely reflected in Policy 7 which sets out a series of sub-regional priorities including :-

- The regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton and Redcar for mixed use developments
- Encouraging the development of 80 hectares of land for airport related uses at Durham – Tees Valley Airport
- Giving priority to major new heavy industrial and port-related development at inter alia Billingham and Seal Sands, to promote economic prosperity
- Supporting business and financial services and new city scale leisure, culture and retail development in Stockton and Middlesbrough
- Supporting development of Wynyard and NetPark as prestige employment sites

The Consultation Draft referred specifically to the 135 hectares at “Wynyard Business Park” for Prestige Employment. This Council previously objected on the basis that this did not take into account the extant planning permission for the former Samsung Site (now Wynyard One) which should be recognized in the RSS. In view of the fact that RSS can only indicate broad locations for development, the toning down of the reference in Policy 19 to “Wynyard” suggests that this is a generic term that includes the two sites thereby providing the necessary flexibility with the LDF to formally identify the two sites. These references are therefore supported (notwithstanding the objections to Policy 18).

151 Sunderland ARC

Tees Valley City Region is supported

Id No Respondent

207 Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit

Policy 7

The specific policy direction given in policy 7 for the Tees Valley city region is welcome, in particular the emphasis given on regenerating the core urban areas and concentrating most development within the conurbation and main towns. The policy will support major regeneration schemes planned or underway in the Tees Valley including Central Park in Darlington, North Shore in Stockton-on-Tees, Victoria Harbour in Hartlepool, and Middlehaven in Middlesbrough.

Para 2.120 This paragraph acknowledges the important roles of the A19 and A66 roads in the Tees Valley. However the paragraph should also recognize that further infrastructure improvements will be necessary on these routes, and to the adjacent local road network, to support and implement key regeneration projects as part of the Stockton/Middlesbrough Initiative. This is particularly important in view of recent Article 14 Directions issued by the Highways Agency in respect of the A19 and A66. These Directions can restrict the grant of planning permission and unless infrastructure improvements are prioritized a number of major schemes may be delayed or not implemented

Para 2.122 This paragraph advises that public transport investment will be concentrated on routes between Redcar and Middlesbrough; Hartlepool and Stockton/Middlesbrough; Stockton and Darlington; and Darlington to Durham. However it should also address the need for public transport improvements in the core area between Stockton and Middlesbrough town centres as part of the Stockton/Middlesbrough Initiative

Id No Respondent

148 Tees Valley Regeneration

Policy 7

TVR give their fullest support to the City Region concept, and the requirement for SPP's to concentrate the majority of development in the conurbations and main towns of the Tyne and Wear and the Tees Valley city regions. This is fully in line with the new 'Northern Way' initiative being spearheaded by the ODPM.

As a Government funded agency, TVR recognizes and supports the full range of Government initiatives. However, we are aware of the arguments being put forward by those promoting the Newcastle / Gateshead Pathfinder that seek a stronger bias towards the Tyne and Wear City Region (refer Policy 6). We would add that it is difficult to see how new housing in Newcastle / Gateshead will assist the regeneration of the Tees Valley. There is little evidence that regenerating one major conurbation (Newcastle/Gateshead) will make a real difference to the Tees Valley sub-region. The Tees Valley is an equally important sub-region for the North East region and deserves separate consideration.

TVR are therefore delighted that there is a comprehensive policy for the Tees Valley City Region and keen to ensure that it properly reflects the strategic priorities for the area. There is quite rightly extensive text and policies for each City Region with maps (paragraphs 2.77 to 2.125 refer to Tees Valley) and the new expanded Policy 7 is our main focus.

Policy 7 encourages Strategies, Plans and Programmes (SPP's) to (a) give priority to the regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar; Hartlepool Quays; and Central Park, Darlington and the links into their town centres for appropriate mixed-use development and this is broadly welcomed. We would suggest however, in order to avoid any confusion as to the major priorities that specific mention is made to each of the TVR projects (eg. Greater Middlehaven, North Shore, Victoria Harbour and Central Park). They should not be prejudiced by other schemes in the wider locality.

We are pleased to note that the new Policy 7 now refers at (b) to the regeneration of the Coastal Arc from Hartlepool Headland to East Cleveland, which is consistent with TVR's objectives.

We are also pleased to note that the Policy at (d) and (f) gives priority to major new heavy industrial, port-related development and supports the export of steel plus a deep sea container port at Teesport. This clearly recognizes the significant international, national and regional role of the port, who are working in partnership with TVR.

However (g) encourages the development of 80 hectares of land, but still says for 'airportrelated' uses, which in our view will seriously constrain the development of the land and hence Durham Tees Valley airport. This needs to be properly explored at the Public Examination with the key parties.

At (h) this policy talks of "new city scale leisure, cultural and retail development in Stockton and Middlesbrough" and at (m) to retail and leisure supporting "majority of new retail and leisure .. in Middlesbrough and Darlington ... additional development in other centres .. consistent with their scale and function" rather than naming Stockton, Hartlepool and Redcar as such. With regard to (m) it is pointed out that Middlehaven, Victoria Harbour, Central Park and North Shore would all be considered edge of centre sites. Among these, Middlehaven and Victoria Harbour are also intended to include elements of retail and leisure development. In all cases, the need to integrate the sites with town centres has been recognized and, subject to need and sequential analysis, would be extremely well suited to major retail and leisure uses.

We still suggest that there is sufficient merit for including additional economic prosperity drivers within the policy. As will be clear from the description of development proposed at

Id No Respondent

Policy 7

Middlehaven in Section 2 of this submission, it is intended that Middlehaven accommodates the new Middlesbrough College. Due to the simultaneous construction of new business in the mixed-use development, an ideal opportunity for a cluster development is presented. We therefore believe that this opportunity is recognized and supported by an additional point within the policy.

With reference to (r), as set out in the description of the LRT project in Section 2, a feasibility study into the LRT has already been completed. Phase 1 of this study has concluded and identified that there is an opportunity to make better use of the existing heavy rail network and existing funding streams to deliver the sub-regional connectivity and links required by Tees Valley to make it more competitive, an attractor to further inward investment, and as an attractive place for business relocation and for people to live. Therefore the policy could go further, but we will aim to present further information to the Public Examination in March 2006. Paragraph 2.108 refers to Stockton-Middlesbrough and the TVR projects. It rightly refers to it as the 'urban core of the city region'.

Paragraph 2.110 refers to Victoria Harbour and reads "Its redevelopment for mixed-uses will provide a regionally significant critical mass of facilities that will be a catalyst to creating new demand and stimulating further inward investment".

Paragraph 2.112 refers to Central Park as a 'major employment location'. This should be extended to refer to the residential and educational elements of the scheme which we have recently made RANE aware of. Paragraph 2.123 discusses Durham Tees Valley Airport and rightly refers to the need to link its expansion with improved access, a Travel Plan and new bus / train services. A park & ride from Durham is also suggested. This is helpful and relates to the LRT work being undertaken for TVR discussed earlier.

43 Teesdale District Council

Para 2.125 should read North Penines AONB - not Durham AONB Penines.

Para 2.128, Teesdale is currently experiencing high demand for industrial units as a result of the development of Small Medium Enterprise's, likewise the population of the District is no longer in decline.

Id No Respondent

415 Tithe Barn Land

Policy 7

Page 43, para 2.90

I agree. I have been saying this for some time and still have the map of Traffic Flows on Yorkshire and Humberside Regional Trunk Road Network 1992, which was current when I first quoted from it.

Page 43, para 2.92

I read this with interest. Part of this scenario could have been anticipated from Cleveland County Council figures given at their inquiry in the early 1990s. No executive housing in Stockton town, so once people had to move from their roots to fulfill natural aspirations they could move anywhere, and so they did, to North Yorkshire. The Secretary of State for the Environment John Gummer even made a ministerial statement proposing a choice of back-to-roots campaign for housing policy with much the same fervour as proponents of the current policy of building homes on contaminated sites and business parks on green field sites.

Page 44, para 2.96 & 2.97

If suitable housing is not available, the higher paid will move out. I think of your calculation of 141,000 houses needed and 107,000 to be provided.

Page 50, Policy 7

Policy n) I disagree. The phrase “developing housing to support the economic growth strategies in sustainable locations” is good. It should be the first and main aim of administrators and of local politicians of every persuasion to make conditions suitable for the prosperity of their area to increase. Without wealth generation there should be no social improvements, otherwise we are merely mortgaging our grandchildren’s futures. The rest of the paragraph is just criteria, which will not aid growth and may handicap it. There is a presumption for development on brown field sites. It serves no useful purpose to put constraints on development merely to further a central Government broad-brush policy. Maybe GONE would want the “mainly”—more than 51% -- to be included, but this Submission Draft is published by North East Assembly, The Voice For The Region, and the prosperity of the region should be the over riding objective.

If central Government is concerned about the prosperity of the N.E. and housing provision in the Thames corridor, the why does it not move the DEFRA and Defence out of Whitehall, to the Tees valley and convert the redundant buildings into flats?

243 Wear Valley District Council

Opposition to:

- the wording of the policy as it should be aligned to strengthen support for the regeneration of Bishop Auckland.
- the wording of the policy as it diminishes the scope for regeneration in Bishop Auckland and seeks to establish a relative scale of activity whose impact may not be measurable.
- the policy as it should reflect the need for housing market renewal in the Durham Coalfield areas that are situated in the Tees Valley City Region. The wording should therefore be aligned with that in Policy 6.

Id No Respondent

412 Wynyard Clubs

Policy 7

A key issue is to accelerate delivery of regeneration. Within Policy 7, under the heading of 'Economic Prosperity', the draft RSS properly supports "the development of Wynyard and NetPark as prestigious employment sites". Given the proximity of the high quality development on the adjacent Wynyard Estate it makes sense to consider the complimentary nature of these two juxtaposed communities. Accordingly, the RSS should demonstrate that it can secure an area of exceptional housing and associated community development in that location if the region is to prove attractive to the 'captains of industry' who are needed to stimulate, steer and deliver the type of investment that will help galvanize the regeneration of the north east and the Tees Valley in particular.

The objectives outlined in the Draft RSS demand, amongst other things, an ability to attract more people of the right calibre into the region - and that means getting the right number of houses, of the right mix in the right places. As it stands, the draft RSS places undue constraint on the number of dwellings allowed within Tees Valley during the plan period. Moreover, it does not give strong enough guidance for either the level of provision for much needed 'executive' housing within the borough, or appropriate location for such 'executive' housing. A failing of the Draft RSS is to acknowledge that it is not possible to shoehorn the highest quality investment opportunities into inner city areas. Draft RSS and Policy 7 do not go far enough to provide the strategic guidance to enable very distinct communities, such as Wynyard, to evolve and, in so doing, deliver one of the key components essential to the wider strategy of securing regeneration for the area.

Wynyard Estate was given planning permission in 1991 for a mixed business park, housing and leisure development. However it remains incomplete. However it remains incomplete. Consequently, the growing emphasis by the government on the need to create, and maintain, sustainable communities, lends focus to the lack of leisure - related and community facilities within Wynyard - facilities that the new community understandably anticipated when the original vision was evolved. For its part, the revised Draft RSS, recognizes that in creating sustainable communities two of the criteria to be taken into account in assessing the sustainability of land for development are: The nature of the development and its locational requirements; the potential contribution of development to the strengthening of local communities and their social cohesion.

The community Wynyard is an existing, but incomplete, asset that should not be overlooked in the provision of essential, high quality housing. No other location within the Tees Valley offers such an excellent environment for living; and working. However, the fact that Wynyard is incomplete and requires a further injection of development to make it really sustainable means that it is imperative that the RSS gives due recognition to Wynyard for both additional high quality housing and community facilities. Those facilities and related development must be located at Wynyard if they are to fulfill their role in securing a properly supported and socially cohesive community.

Should recognize need to:

Top-slice a specific quota for very high quality executive housing, supported by further community facilities; and identifies Wynyard as a preferred location for such provision.