



**GOVERNMENT OFFICE  
FOR THE NORTH EAST**

# **North East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021**

## **Summary of Representations**

**July 2008**

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

Further Proposed Change (Feb 08) Policy Number	Final RSS Policy Number	Policy Name
1	1	North East Renaissance
2	2	Sustainable Development
2A	3	Climate Change
3	4	The Sequential Approach to Development
4	5	Phasing & Plan, Monitor and Manage
5	6	Locational Strategy
5A	7	Connectivity and Accessibility
5B	8	Protecting and Enhancing the Environment
6	9	Tyne and Wear City Region
7	10	Tees Valley City Region
8	11	Rural Areas
12	12	Sustainable Economic Development
13	13	Brownfield Mixed-use Locations
14	14	Supporting Further and Higher Education
15	15	Information and Communications Technology Networks
16	16	Culture and Tourism
17	17	Casino Development
18	18	Employment Land Portfolio
18A	19	Office Development Outside of City and Town Centres
19	20	Key Employment Locations
21	21	Airports
22	22	Ports
23	23	Chemical and Steel Industries
24	24	Delivering Sustainable Communities
25	25	Urban and Rural Centres
26	26	Metrocentre

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

27	27	Out-of-Centre Leisure Developments
30	28	Gross and Net Dwelling Provision
31	29	Delivering and Managing Housing Supply
32	30	Improving Inclusivity and Affordability
33	31	Landscape Character
34	32	Historic Environment
35	33	Biodiversity and Geodiversity
36	34	The Aquatic and Marine Environment
37	35	Flood Risk
38	36	Trees, Woodlands and Forests
38A	37	Air Quality
39	38	Sustainable Construction
40	39	Renewable Energy Generation
41	40	Planning for Renewables
42	41	Onshore Wind Energy Development
43	42	Overall Minerals Strategy
44	43	Aggregate Minerals Provision
45	44	Opencast Coal
46	45	Sustainable Waste Management
47	46	Waste Management Provision
48	47	Hazardous Waste
49	48	International Gateways
50	49	Regional Transport Corridors
51	50	Regional Public Transport Provision
52	51	Strategic Public Transport Hubs
53A	52	Strategic Framework for Demand Management
53	53	Demand Management Measures
54	54	Parking and Travel Plans
55	55	Accessibility within and between the City Regions
56	56	Accessibility in Rural Areas
57	57	Sustainable Freight Distribution

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: General</b>	
	<b>Summary of representations / Statement of Reasons</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary of responses statement of reasons could be more detailed.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Role of RSS</b>	
<b>FPC 1</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendments have weakened the document in terms of environmental sustainability and climate change.</li> <li>Locational efficiency is not strongly represented in the document.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope and content of document welcomed.</li> <li>Pleased that policies designed to support the growth and increasing role of universities in the regional economy.</li> <li>Support for Further Proposed Changes.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment</b>	
<b>FPC 2</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for FPC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AA should consider sites potentially affected by RSS but outside the region.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: International Planning Context</b>	
<b>FPC 4</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for Further Proposed Change.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: National Planning Context</b>	
<b>FPC 5</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome change but “as a whole” adds little and may confuse.</li> <li>• General support for FPC 5.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Regional Planning Context</b>	
<b>FPC 6</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to update to reflect the new Integrated Regional Framework.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC 6.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: RSS Growth Assumptions</b>	
<b>FPC 7</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections related to figures and data used to arrive at housing numbers.</li> <li>• Scale of increased allocation may have an adverse impact on the regeneration of difficult brownfield sites.</li> <li>• Flood risk should be taken into account when allocating housing numbers to district councils.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC 7.</li> <li>• Plan, Monitor, Manage approach supported.</li> <li>• The recognition of the need for an increased housing allocation in the light of new information.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 1.80 needs extending to ensure concentration of housing, designed for local needs, provides for affordability, and promotes sustainable transport modes.</li> <li>• Clarification that these are guideline figures and do not represent a ceiling.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Sustainable Development</b>	

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>Policy 2, FPC 8-10</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to IRF needs updating to reflect the latest version, other references to government guidance should also be updated.</li> <li>• FPC8 should be strengthened to read “with immediate effect” or “as a matter of priority”.</li> <li>• Text should include reference to derelict buildings and “polluter pays” principle.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The references to reduce energy consumption; to minimise water consumption; SUDS and the Code for Sustainable Homes.</li> <li>• Retention of and changes to Policy 2.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Climate Change</b>	
<b>Policy 2A, FPC 11 - 15</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References to the IRF in Policy and supporting text require updating.</li> <li>• Policy and text should recognise that certain development will be judged against national targets rather those set at regional level.</li> <li>• Inappropriate to state in the supporting text that climate change could bring significant improvements in terms of biodiversity and geodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments updating policy and supporting text.</li> <li>• New changes of minor clarification.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests for minor changes to supporting text.</li> <li>• Conflict between Policy 2A and policies relating to airport expansion.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: The Sequential Approach to Development</b>	
<b>Policy 3, FPC 16</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the new change could exclude best use of previously developed land (PDL) in some villages.</li> <li>• Object to removal of “other” and replacement with “secondary”.</li> <li>• There should be a presumption against new housing in remote locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept FPC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference could be given to scale, character and setting of settlement.</li> <li>• Add text to refer to Eco-Towns.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Phasing &amp; Plan, Monitor and Manage</b>	
<b>Policy 4, FPC 17</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That housing figures will soon be out of date/ greater flexibility required in meeting housing needs.</li> <li>• Policy should continue to refer to desirability of building on PDL rather than Greenfield sites – could undermine city region brownfield targets.</li> <li>• Reference to impacts on housing market restructuring areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deletion of reference to PDL targets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear why faster economic growth demands more housing.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Locational Strategy</b>	

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>Policy 5, FPC 18-20</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To deletion of core areas.</li> <li>• Geographic definitions in light of local government reorganisation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of city regions.</li> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification sought regarding role of Amble (now identified as within Other Regeneration Areas).</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	
<b>Policy 5A, FPC 21-23</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic routes should be re-instated in Policy 5A.</li> <li>• Sustainable development should be emphasised in the Policy.</li> <li>• Change to “international gateways” shifts the emphasis of the policy towards ports and airports.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• Support change from “key regional” to “International” gateways of ports and airports.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater appreciation needed for cross-border issues in terms of spatial connectivity to adjacent Northern Way City-Regions.</li> <li>• Ports and rail links also provide opportunities for intra-national transport, which could be missed if they are defined as “International Gateways”.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: Protecting and Enhancing the Environment</b>	
<b>Policy 5B, FPC 24 - 26</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National designations and “offshore marine features” should be included.</li> <li>• Terminology - integration” rather than “balance”.</li> <li>• Changes to FPC 25 required to ensure Local Authorities follow HRA guidance.</li> <li>• Policy 5B should seek to maintain and enhance green infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional supporting text in FPC 24,FPC 25, and FPC 26.</li> <li>• FPC 25 reflecting the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Alone or in combination with other plans or projects” should be added to Policy 5B f.</li> <li>• Policies must ensure no adverse effects, in addition to the plan as a whole.</li> <li>• Reference to concentrating development in core areas should be re-inserted in FPC 20.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Tyne and Wear City Region</b>	
<b>Policy 6, FPC 27 - 40</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to use of Green Belt and identification of GB on Key Diagram.</li> <li>• Deletion of the City-Region Core Areas.</li> <li>• Policy 6.1c. Amble should be listed and the deletion of “indigenous...to meet local needs” changes meaning and emphasis of the paragraph.</li> <li>• Policy 6.6b should include nationally important sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The further proposed changes in general.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deletion of the reference to Green Belts in paragraph 2.79, additional emphasis on sustainability.</li> <li>• Wording of FPC 39 and paragraph 2.116 should more adequately reflect saved policy S5 in the Northumberland County and National Park Joint Structure Plan First Alteration (2005).</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disappointing that some of the key attractions of the region are omitted as part of the culture and tourism offer.</li> <li>• Need for further explanation as to how the key employment locations contribute to the broad locational strategy.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Tees Valley City Region</b>	
<b>Policy 7, FPC 41-45</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locationally specific objections including sustainability/location of development (Wynyard and NetPark).</li> <li>• Concern that the demolition in the sub-region will result in a net loss of social rented housing stock/ consistency of RSS policy wording regarding Housing Market Renewal initiatives.</li> <li>• RSS fails to reflect RES in terms of the ability to foster the renaissance of market towns as a driver for regional growth.</li> <li>• Policy 7.6b should apply to nationally designated sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• Policy 7 as it now allows their regeneration and development for “sustainable growth”.</li> <li>• References to Teesport and Darlington.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the SA recommendation to temper reference to airport growth.</li> <li>• Reference should be made to the need for sustainable design and construction techniques to be applied in Policy 7.4b.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: Rural Areas</b>	
<b>Policy 8, FPC 46-48</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to Amble being a rural service centre should be removed from Policy 8.</li> <li>• Obligation on the Country Estates to develop sustainable travel plans for the employment sites created.</li> <li>• Changes do not remove the possible confusion that the rural areas should accommodate housing specifically for those migrating to the region.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• The role large Country Estates can play within the rural economy.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Delivering Economic Prosperity and Growth</b>	
<b>Policy 12, FPC 49, 50</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening the scope of policies and definitions affecting mixed use brownfield development sites has diluted focus on Newcastle City Centre.</li> <li>• Locational strategy, “core area”, secondary settlements and “other local rural centres”.</li> <li>• Wynyard and NetPark are not in sustainable locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The criteria for sustainable economic growth.</li> </ul> <p>General support for proposed changes.</p>
<b>RSS Theme name: Brownfield Mixed-Use Developments (formerly “Regional”)</b>	
<b>Policy 13, FPC 51, 52</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locationally specific objections (site omissions).</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impact on Blyth Estuary.</li> <li>• Consistency with policy 26 needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for retention and amendments to policy.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Culture and Tourism</b>	
<b>Policy 16, FPC 53-55</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of leisure and tourism.</li> <li>• A strategic approach to sports facilities planning is required.</li> <li>• Environmental concerns – sustainable integration rather than balance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for further proposed changes.</li> <li>• Support the focus of facilities for major leisure and entertainment use in city centres.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to grow and sustain a variety and diversity of cultural offerings, which in themselves attract visitors and tourists and attract employment.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Employment Land Portfolio</b>	
<b>Policy 18, FPC56, 57, 58</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <p>Element of double discounting in Table 3.2 (table preceding policy).</p>
<b>RSS Theme name: Office Development Outside of the City and Town Centres</b>	
<b>Policy 18A, FPC 59</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria should mean that there is never justification for office development at Key Employment Locations.</li> <li>• Disagree that offices should be located wherever possible within city and town centres to support their vitality and viability. This is not the approach taken in emerging PPS4.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the FPCs.</li> <li>• Increase in permitted development at NETPark is more reflective of the RES.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel's reference to "other strategic employment locations including key employment locations" should be restored.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RSS Theme name: Key Employment Locations (formerly Prestige Employment Sites)</b></p>	
<p><b>Policy 19, FPC 60-61</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of representations</b></p>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word "encourage" does not go far enough.</li> <li>• To additional sites in non-central locations outside the Tyne and Wear conurbation.</li> <li>• Lack of justification for reinstatement of NetPark and Wynyard.</li> <li>• Total land at locations should reflect unallocated permissions as well as allocations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• Support the proposed full development of NetPark.</li> <li>• Welcome reference to demand management measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for NetPark to be increased to the upper limit of 49Ha.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like wording for Heighington Lane West to be changed to include general industrial to allow maximum flexibility.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Airports</b>	
<b>Policy 21, FPC 62, 63</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure success and sustainability of growth an integrated approach to planning and developing the region's sustainable transport network is required, with greater emphasis on investing in public transport as a pre-requisite to further airport expansion.</li> <li>• Utilities infrastructure should be co-ordinated with new development.</li> <li>• Strategic gap between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St George must be maintained.</li> <li>• Claim that the airport is an economic driver must be modified and the projected growth reconsidered.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes that make it clear that the policy is encouraging the sustainable growth of airport facilities and not encouraging the growth of airports.</li> <li>• RSS's airports policy.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Ports</b>	
<b>Policy 22, FPC 64, 65</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term should be "railway loading gauge" not "railway gauge".</li> <li>• Policy requires amending to ensure no adverse effects on conservation sites, and to take account of the potential issues arising from historic contamination of land and sediments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed changes that encourage the sustainable development of Teesport.</li> <li>• Recognition of the need to improve the rail infrastructure to serve Teesport is supported.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more specific commitment should be made to a deep sea container terminal at Teesport.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Delivering Sustainable Communities</b>	
<b>Policy 24, FPC 66, 67</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of criteria that deal with infrastructure provision, SUDS and water efficiency and conservation.</li> <li>• FPC 66 and FPC 67 additional wording.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green infrastructure and “or other suitable habitats” should be referenced in Policy 24f.</li> <li>• Additional supporting text should be added to ensure protection of European sites from impacts of over abstraction or inadequate waste water treatment.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Urban and Rural Centres</b>	
<b>Policy 25, FPC 68-69</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that FPC removes rural service centres from the policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> <li>• Support for inclusion of Redcar in the policy.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Metrocentre</b>	
<b>Policy 26, FPC 70</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last sentence of paragraph 3.52 is an inaccurate interpretation of, and goes beyond the national policy approach, and could lead to confusion. There is no evidence base to justify such a departure.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retention of Policy 26.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Out-of-Centre Retail and Leisure Developments</b>	
<b>Policy 27, FPC 70-71</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the FPC could be interpreted as meaning that local economic benefit is the sole criterion for approving out-of-centre leisure development.</li> <li>• Potential loss or disturbance to habitats and species needs to be taken into consideration when planning for leisure developments.</li> <li>• Rural leisure developments should be built applying sustainable design and construction techniques.</li> <li>• Policy 27 should refer to community and health benefits, is too vague and could lead to unsustainable leisure developments in the most unsustainable locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC 70 and FPC 71.</li> <li>• Reference to LDF tests.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Improving and Increasing the Housing Stock (including Gross and Net Dwelling Provision)</b>	
<b>Policy 30, 31 FPC 72-79</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figures too low – concern at “end loading” of housing figures need should be met now.</li> <li>• Figures too high - figures are expressed as floors not ceilings.</li> <li>• Allocations in the wrong places/too restrictive and may lead to greater difficulty in delivering more difficult brownfield sites.</li> <li>• To demolition, issues with respect to social rented housing/homelessness, without Historic Character Assessment Methodology, and the demolition of perfectly good houses contravenes principles of sustainable development.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support increased housing provision.</li> <li>• Figures are not a ceiling, thus providing greater flexibility.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk needs to be taken into account in allocating housing numbers – to introduce RFRA now would cause significant delay so there is a need for vigilant monitoring in LDF.</li> <li>• Support amendments but have proposed several small changes for clarification/consistency.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Policy theme: Improving Inclusivity and Affordability</b>	
<b>Policy 32, FPC 85, 86</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robustness of Gypsy and Traveller Review Study.</li> <li>• Omissions of areas from settlements with affordability problems.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> <li>• Reference to use of planning obligations.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Policy theme: Landscape Character</b>	
<b>Policy 33, FPC 87-89</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meaning of Policy 33c is unclear.</li> <li>• List of landscapes in Policy 33d is unnecessary.</li> <li>• FPC 89 should read “Catchment Flood Management Plans”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed changes.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 33b should include national sites (e.g. SSSI) as well as international sites.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Historic Environment</b>	
<b>Policy 34, FPC 90-92</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The criteria of Policy 34e should reflect the issue identified in FPC 24.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPC 91 and 92.</li> <li>• Enhanced recognition in FPC92 of the potential for heritage-led regeneration to contribute to economic and social regeneration.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</b>	
<b>Policy 35, FPC 93-96</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPC 95 should be amended to clarify responsibilities for all, and who should lead on this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed changes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to Whin Sill being a regionally significant geological feature should be added to FPC 93.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: The Aquatic &amp; Marine Environment</b>	
<b>Policy 36, FPC 97-99</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to national nature conservation sites should be added in the second bullet point of FPC97.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives of Policy 36 and the FPCs.</li> <li>• Recognition of “coastal squeeze”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional bullet point should be added to the policy to “promote water industry investment required to secure Water Framework Directive objectives”.</li> <li>• Comments providing alternative wording to FPC 99, including deleting “where possible” and including “and avoid and mitigate the risk of coastal squeeze...”, and include reference to eroding historic coastal landfill sites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RSS Theme name: Flood Risk</b></p>	
<p><b>Policy 37, FPC 100- 103</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of representations</b></p>
	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment to Policy 37 to include a reference to flooding from surface water run-off and surface water drainage systems.</li> <li>• FPC 100 changes of text.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supporting text should clarify the responsibilities of the Environment Agency and drainage authorities within strategic surface water flooding assessments, and consultations on development proposals.</li> <li>• Additional wording should be added to policy to ensure LDFs and planning proposals give regard to implementing sustainable design and construction principles.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RSS Theme name: Air Quality</b></p>	
<p><b>Policy 38A, FPC 105- 107</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of representations</b></p>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes do not reflect adequately the need for urban air quality initiatives. Air pollution refers to toxic or noxious gases and does not include greenhouse gases.</li> <li>• Further explanation should be added to show that adverse effects can be prevented.</li> <li>• National designations and effects on humans and the environment should be recognised in Policy 38A.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference to the impact of air quality on human health.</li> <li>• Strengthening of the guidance in FPC 105.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thrislington SAC should be added to paragraph 3.144.</li> <li>• Possible changes in the transport and traffic management systems will have an impact on air quality in the future.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable Energy Use (Includes Sustainable Construction)</b>	
<b>Policy 39, FPC 108, 109 &amp; 110</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim 10% target seen as too low /inflexible/ too high.</li> <li>• Removal of target negative step.</li> <li>• Seek reference to CEEQUAL.</li> <li>• Lack of regional specificity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the policy and FPC.</li> <li>• Support for allowing DPDs to set targets.</li> <li>• Support micro-renewable toolkit.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>Renewable Energy Generation</b>	
<b>Policy 40, FPC 111, 112, 113</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking reiteration of environmental or landscape policies elsewhere in the RSS.</li> <li>• Seeking reference to Annual Monitoring Report.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the policy and FPCs.</li> </ul>
<b>Planning for Renewables / Onshore Wind Generation</b>	
<b>Policy 41 and 42, FPC 114, 115, 116</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential conflict between wind turbines and aircraft/radar/MoD operations needs procedural clarification.</li> <li>• Omissions/inclusion of specific sites/issues (specifically landscape and environmental).</li> <li>• Addition of word “heritage” alters nature of policy.</li> <li>• Concern at potential number of windfarms in region.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the proposed changes.</li> <li>• Support for renaming of Tees Valley from broad areas of least constraint.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: Aggregate Mineral Provision</b>	
<b>Policy 43, FPC 117, 118</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<b>Support for</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for revised (higher) targets.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Other Minerals</b>	
<b>Policy 45, FPC 119- 120</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<b>Objectors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some supporting text is out of date.</li> <li>• Site specific issues.</li> <li>• Blight caused by areas of search.</li> </ul> <b>Support for</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Sustainable Waste Management</b>	
<b>Policy 45, FPC 121</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<b>Objectors</b> Request explicit reference to sewage treatment facilities.
<b>RSS Theme name: Waste Management Provision</b>	
<b>Policy 47, FPC122, 123</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<b>Objectors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of targets for construction and demolition waste.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs, as more robust targets for household and solid municipal waste.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: International Gateways</b>	
<b>Policy 49, FPC 127, 128</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting text should be amended to reflect the decision to approve the development of the deep-sea container facilities at Teesport.</li> <li>• There should be reference to the long term potential development of a high speed rail network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting text should highlight the potential for adverse effects and the need for assessment to ensure they are prevented.</li> <li>• Would welcome recognition in the RSS to the long term potential of the Tursdale rail freight interchange.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Regional Transport Corridors</b>	
<b>Policy 50, FPC 129-133</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference needs to be made to considering the ECML power supply upgrades on the Northumberland Coast SPA and Newham Fen SAC. Measures to prevent adverse effects should be incorporated.</li> <li>• Lack of reference to specific roads or proposals such as Tees River Crossing.</li> <li>• RSS includes insufficient measures to improve rural transport provision.</li> <li>• There should be reference to the long term potential development of a high speed rail network.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment to “prioritise major investment in” four key transport corridors should be reinstated in Policy 50.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of a rail-based metro system for the Tees Valley City Region and the longer term rail based solution in FPC 134 welcomed.</li> <li>• Welcome the positive attitude to development at Teesport and to rail gauge enhancements.</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of the need to address congestion welcomed.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Regional Public Transport Provision</b>	
<b>FPC Policy</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed changes will ensure a better alignment with the priority afforded to Teesport in the RES.</li> <li>• Linking of the phrase Ashington, Blyth and Tyne to express bus services is misleading and unhelpful. Preference is for support of a rail scheme.</li> <li>• Proposed metro scheme should continue through to Bishop Auckland, than to terminate at Darlington. Wording should be changed to read “focus on the Bishop Auckland to Saltburn Corridor”.</li> <li>• Changes to Policy 51g put the prospect of a rail based system outside the plan period.</li> <li>• New policy should be added to promote the re-opening of the Leamside Line.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• Provision of and increased investment for an effective and integrated public transport network in the region is supported.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There needs to be closer working with the rail network providers in aligning strategic planning aspirations and infrastructure investment plans for improved surface connections to major centres in England and the European mainland.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: Strategic Public Transport Hubs</b>	
<b>Policy 52, FPC 136</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Environmental capacity” should be defined in the Glossary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Demand Management Measures</b>	
<b>Policy 53A, 53 FPC 137</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional wording should be added to Policy 53A h referring to “smarter travel choices”.</li> <li>• Inclusion of “motorised” in Policy 53.2 is an improvement but misses the point that the problem is caused by cars that typically carry only the driver. Wording could be improved by changing to “low occupancy vehicles”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Parking and Travel Plans</b>	
<b>Policy 54, FPC 138</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPC 138 should be amended to include AMR recommendation that the local authority parking provisions requirements are reassessed to encourage more use of sustainable forms of transport.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> <li>• Recognition of the important role of the local authorities.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: Accessibility Within and Between the City Regions</b>	
<b>Policy 55, FPC 140, 141</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPC 139 should include reference to the need for an early assessment of proposals under the Habitats Regulations.</li> <li>• Reference to “the New Tyne Crossing” should be deleted from Policy 55.2e for consistency.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• Identification of need for additional crossing capacity of River Tees.</li> <li>• Inclusion of Rural Service Centres in FPC 140 is welcomed.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Accessibility in Rural Areas</b>	
<b>Policy 56, FPC 142</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to Weardale Railway should be included in Policy 56.</li> <li>• Deletion of Alnwick in FPC 142 highlights the need to delete the associated paragraph 3.255.</li> <li>• Proportion of people using the Tyne Valley line for the journey to work is constrained by the capacity of the trains. Reference should be made to the need to increase capacity, and an extra bullet point added to Policy 56.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPC.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Sustainable Freight Distribution</b>	
<b>Policy 57, FPC 143, 144</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should include a more pro-active approach statement on the Tursdale and the Leamside Line. The RSS misses the economic benefits which could be brought to the region by potential linkages between Teesport, Tursdale and the Leamside Line.</li> <li>• Further increases in capacity at Teesport and development at Tursdale will need Assessment under the Habitats Regulations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• The inclusion of the wording in FPC 143, and the recognition of the regional potential of the site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question whether the Tursdale site for a road-rail interchange is protected from any other development that may arise earlier.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Major Regional Transport Priorities</b>	
<b>FPC 145, 146</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include A1dualling schemes.</li> <li>• Reference to new rail services between Sunderland and London should be deleted as these services are now operational.</li> <li>• The Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Line proposal should be added to Table 4.</li> <li>• The phasing element should be restored.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for FPCs.</li> <li>• Welcome reference to the need for assessment of transport schemes under the Habitats Regulations.</li> <li>• Welcome the acknowledgement of the need for improved public transport between SE Northumberland and employment areas in Tyne and Wear.</li> </ul>

North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021  
Summary of Reps made upon Further Proposed Changes (Feb 08)

<b>RSS Theme name: Maps and Diagrams</b>	
<b>FPC 149, 152, 153, 154</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>
	<p><b>Objectors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map size.</li> <li>• Seeking minor amendments/consistency with other policy changes, including Green Belt.</li> <li>• Seeking removal and repositioning of “W” designation.</li> <li>• Full extent of Heritage Coasts not shown on the maps.</li> <li>• Key diagram and Environmental Information Map should be enlarged to while still keeping A4 format.</li> <li>• All internationally designated nature conservation sites should be shown on Insert Maps 5 (S) and (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Support for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes including showing strategic gaps.</li> </ul>
<b>RSS Theme name: Glossary</b>	
	<p><b>Summary of representations</b></p> <p>Some terms in RSS are missing / could be better defined in the Glossary</p>