

Summary of Responses

General

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Rachel Oxley, Countryside Agency
Summary of Representation	No comments at the present time
Council's Response	Noted
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Peter Rowe, Tees Archaeology
Summary of Representation	Support the above document as it takes on board previous advice
Council's Response	Support welcomed
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Pat Ritchie, One North East
Summary of Representation	One NorthEast welcomes SBC's proactive approach to promoting the comprehensive design and development of this strategically important area. Whilst the draft brief successfully establishes the broad parameters for development, it is considered that some aspects require further refinement and therefore endorses the letter of response from CABE @ Tees Valley.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	David Leyshon, Ramblers Association
Summary of Representation	We thank the Council for consulting the Ramblers Association on the consultation draft for the development of the Boathouse Lane site.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	Paragraph 2.42 of PPS12 states SPDs should be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement.
Council's Response	The Council has consulted in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement and in accordance with PPS12 as highlighted in the Statement of Consultation (see also the Statement of Consultation accompanying the draft documents).
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	Paragraph 2.42 of PPS12 states SPDs should be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement.

Council's Response	The Council has consulted in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement and in accordance with PPS12 as highlighted in the Statement of Consultation (see also the Statement of Consultation accompanying the draft documents).
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Reservations that the design guide is overly influenced by rigid engineering concepts and principles which do not reflect the existing situation on Boathouse Lane. It is hoped that the Council will consider whether its aspirations for iconic architecture, riverside walkways and a style of urban living which takes forward the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative objectives without some relaxation of traditional highway standards.
Council's Response	The engineering principles, as laid out in the Planning and Design Guide, are intended to act as a guide only for both potential developers and the Council.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	None
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Recognise policy support provided by EN17 recognising the suitability for a mixed use scheme
Council's Response	Noted
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Section 1: Introduction

Paragraph	Paragraph 1.2
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The SPD outlines the reuse of previously developed land in a central location near the Town centre/ This is consistent with PRPG1 policies DP1, DP2 and the Submission Draft RSS which aims to ensure the reuse of previously development land in sustainable locations. The principle of redevelopment of the site is welcomed.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	Paragraph 1.3 and Section 3
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The brief is also in general conformity with Policy 5 and Policy 7 of the Submission Draft RSS. Policy 7 gives priority to the regeneration of both banks of the Tees between Stockton, Middlesbrough and Redcar and the links to their town centres for appropriate mixed-use development.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	Paragraphs 1.5, 5.1, 9.5 and 9.6
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	We welcome the Key Objective "To protect and enhance the natural and historic environment." However while the document makes it clear that ecological surveys and mitigation measures will be required (sections 5.1, 9.5 & 9.6), there is no reference to developers being required to enhance the biodiversity of the site.

Council's Response	Agreed. In accordance with PPS9 the Brief will include reference to the many opportunities that exist to enhance as well as protect local biodiversity.
Recommendation	An additional bullet point has been included within 5.2 to emphasis the existing opportunity to enhance biodiversity.

Paragraph	Page 3, Paragraph 1.4
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	CABE would ask whether the brief fulfills the intended purpose of outlining the Council's aspirations for the site given the commonality of issues between the Boathouse Lane site and other strategically important development sites on the fringe of the town centre; including the aspirations for Tees Valley Regeneration's development at North Shore and the wider work currently being undertaken for the Southern Gateway (3.3,3.4) and by the SMI on the production of a framework plan for the Green Blue Heart. All of these sites have similar aspirations and/or potential to assist in the regeneration of the Tees Valley City region.
Council's Response	It is envisaged that any development on Boathouse Lane will complement the other strategically important sites along the River Tees corridor including that at North Shore, the Southern Gateway, Stockton Town Centre and as work on the Green Blue Heart. The Boathouse Lane site is clearly identified as a key development opportunity within the SMI context although text will be added for clarification.
Recommendation	Text added 1.3 and to the objectives paragraph 1.6

Section 2: Site Information

Paragraph	Page 4, Paragraph 2.2
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	CABE would suggest that this analysis [historical maps] does provide some interesting points of reference for future development: 1) the historical relationship with the river of long narrow building plots and the short end of the properties facing onto the water. This would be consistent with the approach to maximising the orientation of the buildings for the benefit for passive solar gain (paragraph 8.6)
Council's Response	Agree, the long narrow building plots can be replicated and this can provide the opportunity for passive solar gain.
Recommendation	Text added to Paragraph 8.6

Paragraph	Pages 4-5 Paragraph 2.1-2.4
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	The draft document usefully outlines the history of the site, noting its exceptional value and significance in respect of its railway heritage.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Section 3: Boathouse Lane Context

Paragraph	Section 3
Organisation/Individual	Pat Ritchie, One North East
Summary of Representation	The area covered in the brief is to be considered as part of the wider Southern Gateway and Riverside Sites Masterplan commissioned by SBC with funding from One North East. The relationship between the two documents needs to be fully explained and a consistent message established in terms of appropriate development, treatment of the public realm and provision of access and connections. This relationship and the planning status of these two documents needs to be clearly

	stated in the SPD.
Council's Response	Reference to the Southern Gateway is clearly made within section 3 of the Brief. It is understood that work on the Southern gateway and Riverside Sites Masterplan has not yet commenced. The Brief states its role as supplementary planning document.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Section 3
Organisation/Individual	Pat Ritchie, One North East
Summary of Representation	It is considered that references to and consideration of the neighbouring Parkfield Pathfinder initiative would also be beneficial.
Council's Response	The Council does not consider the area of Parkfield to be a direct neighbour to Boathouse Lane. However it is agreed that reference should be made to the initiative as part of the wider context.
Recommendation	An additional paragraph has been included within section 3: Boathouse Lane Context explaining the Parkfield Pathfinder project.

Paragraph	Section 3
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABA @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	CABA would suggest that work on Boathouse Lane could be incorporated into the wider work on the southern gateway due to; 1) the relationship with the waterfront and the aspirations for consistent quality in the treatment of the public realm, the appropriate ground floor uses along this waterfront route and the common boundary 2) the difficulties of improving pedestrian accessibility and connectivity to the town centre in isolation and without consideration of the highway and circulation along Bridge Road.
Council's Response	It is understood that the planning brief for Boathouse Lane will be incorporated into the wider work of the Southern Gateway and reference to the Southern Gateway proposals have been made in Section 3.
Recommendation	Reference to the Southern Gateway proposals have been made in Section 3.

Paragraph	Section 3
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABA @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	It is acknowledged that there is currently a level of commercial interest in the area and a corresponding there is the need for a comprehensive approach for development to avoid prejudicing adjacent sites or setting inappropriate precedents. Yet many of the stated objectives of the brief can only be fully met by a single and/or consistent approach to the design principles for the wider southern gateway.
Council's Response	The purpose of the Brief is to try and ensure comprehensive redevelopment of the Boathouse Lane site which takes into consideration the wider Southern Gateway site and does not prejudice the redevelopment of either the remainder of the Boathouse Lane site nor adjacent sites. It is recognised that the objectives of the Brief are not specific to the Boathouse Lane site and can be applied to the wider area. The design principles within the Boathouse Lane Brief will be consistent with those in the wider Master planning exercise for the Southern Gateway site.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Paragraphs 3.1, 6.14 and 8.16
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The SPD supports policy TC1, TC2 and TC3 of RPG1 as it is hoped the proposed development will enhance the vitality and viability of Stockton Town Centre and will help the regeneration of the centre. The site is also well served by public transport. Therefore is reducing the need for people to travel and offers access to further facilities within the town centre and therefore conforming with policies in RPG1 and Policy 25 of the emerging RSS.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.

Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Paragraph 3.2
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The location of Boathouse Lane close to Stockton Town Centre is important to the regeneration of Stockton as a whole. The approach will help to enhance the town centre and help create a sustainable community. The overall draft SPD and design guide is therefore considered to be generally consistent with RPG1 and the emerging RSS.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Section 4: Planning Context

Paragraph	Section 4
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	PPS12 also states SPDs may take the form of design guides, area development briefs, master plans or issue based documents which supplement policies in a DPD and should adhere to: national and regional polices and the LDF; clear cross references to the relevant policies; reviewed on a regular basis; published with a statement of conformity and community involvement.
Council's Response	These comments relate to the process for the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents. The Council knows of and has fully followed the process as set out in PPS12 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Regulations.
Recommendation	4.6 recognises the requirements of PPS12.

Paragraph	Section 4
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	PPS12 also states SPDs may take the form of design guides, area development briefs, master plans or issue based documents which supplement policies in a DPD and should adhere to: national and regional polices and the LDF; clear cross references to the relevant policies; reviewed on a regular basis; published with a statement of conformity and community involvement.
Council's Response	These comments relate to the process for the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents. The Council knows of and has fully followed the process as set out in PPS12 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Regulations.
Recommendation	4.6 recognises the requirements of PPS12.

Paragraph	Section 4: Planning Context
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	Given that the site is located within the highest risk flood zone 3, there should be reference to national guidance PPG25: Development and Flood Risk and draft PPS25 when considering the planning context for the design brief as this is a major constraint on how the site can be developed safely.
Council's Response	Agree. Reference will be made to policies on flood risk. These are also identified within the Sustainability Appraisal Report.
Recommendation	Reference to adopted policy EN32a, RSS Submission Draft Policy 37, PPG25 and draft PPS25.

Paragraph	Page 8, Paragraph 4.5
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	As this site is already allocated in the Stockton Local Plan [Policy EN17] the Environment Agency considers that the Council, as proposers of the site, should be providing an adequate FRA (flood risk assessment) to demonstrate how the site can be developed whilst managing the flood risk which affects the site. We would expect to see details of the mitigation measures shown in the FRA to be included within the design brief, especially where these affect the layout of the site.

Council's Response	Disagree. The Council is not proposing any development on Boathouse Lane itself. The Brief is merely to set out the planning and design principles for the site. The Brief specifically notes that the site lies within Flood Zone 3 and any planning application will need to be supported with a full flood risk assessment to be submitted and agreed by the Environment Agency.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Page 8, Paragraph 4.5
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	The SPD falls short of allocating parcels of land within the brief area for specific land uses. Unfortunately 2.43 of PPS12 states that SPDs may cover a range of issues, both thematic and site specific, which may expand a policy or provide further detail to policies but must not be used to allocate land.
Council's Response	The purpose of the planning brief anticipates future development proposals which may arise in the short or longer term, and which may take unforeseen forms. While a planning brief gives the Council better control over poor development proposals, its purpose is to provide a basis for imaginative development solutions. It clarifies planning parameters within which developers can explore options. A planning application has to be robust against changing property market conditions, a brief cannot provide absolute property market certainty. Land served by Boathouse Lane is allocated within the 1997 Local Plan.
Recommendation	Insert text into paragraph 1.4 for clarification.

Paragraph	Page 8, Paragraph 4.5
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	Paragraph 2.43 of PPS12 states SPDs may cover a range of issues, both thematic and site specific, which may expand a policy or provide further detail of policies in a DPD. They must not however, be used to allocate land.
Council's Response	The purpose of the planning brief anticipates future development proposals which may arise in the short or longer term, and which may take unforeseen forms. While a planning brief gives the Council better control over poor development proposals, its purpose is to provide a basis for imaginative development solutions. It clarifies planning parameters within which developers can explore options. A planning application has to be robust against changing property market conditions, a brief cannot provide absolute property market certainty. Land served by Boathouse Lane is allocated within the 1997 Local Plan.
Recommendation	Insert text into paragraph 1.4 for clarification.

Section 5: Site Constraints and Opportunities

Paragraph	Page 10, Section 5
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	Site constraints – given the previous usage of the site we welcome the inclusion of references to land contamination although we do feel that the message could be clearer and stronger. Therefore we suggest the following additions: 'Due to the industrial nature of the site the land is potentially contaminated and so a ground condition survey will be required together with an appropriate programme of remediation. We endorse the recently published PPS23 (available on the ODPM website at www.odpm.gov.uk) which states that it is the developer's responsibility to ensure the site is safe and suitable for its intended purpose, having regard to previous contamination. The Framework to achieve this is to carry out investigations in accordance with CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination. The link for this document is www.environment-agency.gov.uk/subjects/landquality . Additionally, it must be remembered that under the Water Resources Act 1991 it is an offence to "knowingly permit" pollution of controlled waters. The Environment Agency reserves the right to undertake its statutory powers.'
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Additional text added constraints paragraph 5.1.

Paragraph	Section 5
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The brief correctly identifies that the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and that a FRA will need to be carried out. However as mentioned earlier, this should have been carried out prior to the preparation of the Design Brief for the site, so that its findings could have been inform the overall layout of the site. A FRA should still accompany the detailed planning application, when submitted.
Council's Response	The Council is not proposing any development on Boathouse Lane itself. The Brief is merely to set out the planning and design principles for the site. The Brief specifically notes that the site lies within Flood Zone 3 and any planning application will need to be supported with a full flood risk assessment to be submitted and agreed by the Environment Agency. An additional paragraph will be added to Section 8 to further clarify some of the development principles in flood risk area.
Recommendation	An additional paragraph added as 8.19.

Paragraph	Section 5
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Conflicts between aspirations for the preferred second access via the site formerly occupied by SCS and the aspirations for iconic architecture. Given the clear alternatives to a secondary access into the site at this point then the suggestion that the desire for iconic architecture should have additional weight.
Council's Response	Two possible secondary access points have been identified. If the secondary access through the SCS site proves to be unfeasible and unable to deliver an iconic building then the possibility of the alternative access point should be explored before any preference is given to iconic architecture.
Recommendation	Reference to 'preferred' removed.

Paragraph	Section 5
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Correctly note that Boathouse Lane has a large number of fragmented ownerships. Woodford wish to work with the Council and other interested land owners to see how matters could be taken forward.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Page 10, Paragraph 5.1
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	Endorse and support final bullet point "previously developed land can often be rich in biodiversity and so an ecological survey will need to be conducted and appropriate mitigation measures sought." Surveys will need to cover bats in existing buildings and breeding birds, along with otter use of the waterfront. It is not thought that great crested newts are likely to inhabit the site. However areas of cleared ground may have the potential to support early successional semi-natural grassland and Local BAP species such as the dingy skipper butterfly.
Council's Response	Noted and additional information welcomed.
Recommendation	Text expanded and additional paragraphs added to section 8

Paragraph	Page 10, Paragraph 5.1
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	English Heritage is pleased to note that the heritage of the site is not regarded as a constraint – representing instead an opportunity to assist with the regeneration of the area, by being respectful of the international significance of the cultural assets within it.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.

Recommendation	No changes necessary.
-----------------------	-----------------------

Paragraph	Page 11, Paragraph 5.2
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	The issue of a marina has been raised without any significant forethought to the commercial viability of the development. Request that the Council reconsiders whether the Boathouse Lane is an appropriate siting for a marina and whether aspirations onto a larger area where a basin already exists (St Marks Basin) is more appropriate.
Council's Response	Agreed. Further work between the Council, Lamb & Edge and British Waterways to establish the commercial viability of the development, the decision has been taken to remove reference to the marina from the Brief.
Recommendation	Reference to the marina has been subsequently removed from the Brief although the Council still maintains that the optimal use of the waterfront should be made.

Paragraph	Page 11, Paragraph 5.2
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Group
Summary of Representation	Seems presumptuous and unnecessary to state at this stage that two access/egress points are required on the existing adopted highway network. It is clear that any secondary access will not be ideal from engineering stand point. Whilst we appreciate the guidance provided in design Bulletin 32, it should be noted this is "guidance" not a rule book and more recent and pertinent national planning advice stresses the need for flexibility to enable previously developed sites to be brought forward.
Council's Response	It is anticipated that the proposed Bus Priority measures for Mandale Road and Bridge Road area, which form an integral part of the South Stockton Link proposals, will create capacity issues at the Bridge Road South Stockton Link junction as traffic from the development site increases. The interaction of this junction and Riverside Roundabout is also a potentially critical issue, given their close proximity, that a second access would help to mitigate. A traffic model is being developed to assess any impact at this time, experience tells us this requirement is neither presumptuous or unnecessary. Furthermore, the requirement for a second access is not purely a traffic congestion requirement, it is also considered as essential for site permeability reasons, good access for site occupants, quality and direct links to the Trunk Road Network, facilities choice and provides for effective highway network management. It is accepted and agreed that any such access will require a degree of sympathetic and quality design to ensure that spatial aspects are appropriately considered, and is likely to be a "standard" design in terms of mitigating visual impact.
Recommendation	Text amended to include requirements for a second access.

Paragraph	Page 11, Paragraph 5.2
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	We suggest an additional bullet point which emphasises the potential to incorporate biodiversity benefits in the scheme design. There are clearly potential biodiversity benefits here as well as constraints!
Council's Response	Agreed. In accordance with PPS9 the brief will include reference to the many opportunities that exist to enhance as well as protect local biodiversity.
Recommendation	An additional bullet point has been included within 5.2 to emphasis the existing opportunity to enhance biodiversity.

Section 6: Layout Principles

Paragraph	Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The principles of the draft SPD are predominately related to design and the very local implications of regional policies for creating sustainable communities. The document also contains a number of detailed policies landmarks, built frontages, urban realm and landscape. These objectives are welcomed although inappropriate to comment on very local site specific issues.

	The policy approach supports RPG1 and the emerging RSS policies aimed at improving the living environments and ensuring the renaissance of the region.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Roy Parker, Central Area Partnership Board
Summary of Representation	Welcome future development on Boathouse Lane especially retirement homes or apartments for the elderly in this prime service location.
Council's Response	Agree that Boathouse Lane lies within a sustainable location of prime service location which in normal circumstances may be considered appropriate for accommodation for the elderly. However, the area of Boathouse Lane lies within Flood Zone 3 (high risk). Consultation draft PPS25: Development and Flood Risk identifies residential institutions such as residential care homes and dwelling houses designed, constructed or adapted for the elderly or other people with impaired mobility as being as a "highly vulnerable" risk. Table D.1 specifically notes that the highly vulnerable uses should not be permitted in this zone.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The Brief should state the following minimum requirements for any development of Boathouse Lane site: 1) Finished floor levels should be set at a minimum 5.0 metres AOD (1:200 year level plus an additional allowance of 600mm for wind and wave action plus 200mm climatic change allowance to give protection against sea level rise and geological tilt – as per PPG25). 2) Safe, dry access and egress from site needs to be provided in times of flooding. 3) Surface water systems designed to take account of tide-locking of system during flood event, which will involved storage on site. 4) No net loss of floodplain – i.e. wholesale raising of sites may displace further flood waters onto third parties.
Council's Response	Agree, further clarification on flood risk issues welcomed.
Recommendation	Include text within paragraph 8.19 on design principles.

Paragraph	Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	This draft SPD provides sufficient information in terms of policy, constraints, design etc but falls short of providing "opportunities." The land uses appear to be prescriptive for this site and should be broadened to allow flexibility allowing of market forces to determine the land uses.
Council's Response	The purpose of the planning brief anticipates future development proposals which may arise in the short or longer term, and which may take unforeseen forms. While a planning brief gives the Council better control over poor development proposals, its purpose is to provide a basis for imaginative development solutions. It clarifies planning parameters within which developers can explore options. A planning application has to be robust against changing property market conditions, a brief cannot provide absolute property market certainty but it does give examples of some of the land uses which may be acceptable. Land served by Boathouse Lane is allocated within the 1997 Local Plan.
Recommendation	Text included to paragraph 1.4 for clarification.

Paragraph	Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	This draft SPD provides sufficient information in terms of policy, constraints, design etc but falls short of providing

	"opportunities." The land uses appear to be prescriptive for this site and should be broadened to allow flexibility allowing of market forces to determine the land uses.
Council's Response	The purpose of the planning brief anticipates future development proposals which may arise in the short or longer term, and which may take unforeseen forms. While a planning brief gives the Council better control over poor development proposals, its purpose is to provide a basis for imaginative development solutions. It clarifies planning parameters within which developers can explore options. A planning application has to be robust against changing property market conditions, a brief cannot provide absolute property market certainty but it does give examples of some of the land uses which may be acceptable. Land served by Boathouse Lane is allocated within the 1997 Local Plan.
Recommendation	Text included to paragraph 1.4 for clarification.

Paragraph	Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	As a general point, many of the design principles could be more effectively communicated through plans and diagrams, including three-dimensional representation in the form of scale and massing that shows the development site within the wider context of the southern gateway and the town centre.
Council's Response	Many of the design principles could be more effectively communicated through plans and diagrams including a three-dimensional representation however the resources are not available at the current time and as the Council is not proposing any development itself this is not considered necessary.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Paragraph 6.2
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	The requirement to contribute to off site infrastructure does not feature heavily in the Lamb and Edge evaluation. I would be grateful if you confirm whether the Lamb and Edge work took full and proper account of requirements for any potential S106 Agreements.
Council's Response	The Lamb and Edge Economic Vitality Appraisal did not evaluate the requirement to contribute to significant off site infrastructure. The purpose of the Economic Vitality Appraisal was to assess the viability and potential demand for the proposed uses as set out in the Brief and not the overall viability of any given development.
Recommendation	No changes necessary to paragraph 6.2.

Paragraph	Page 12, Paragraph 6.3-6.4
Organisation/Individual	Pat Ritchie, One North East
Summary of Representation	References to iconic buildings/features need qualifying and suggested locations for such elements should be justified. Careful consideration should be given to the use of the word 'iconic' as a descriptor for significant elements as the connotations may be misleading.
Council's Response	The word 'iconic' has been used in the same sense as in the submission draft RSS and that an iconic building or feature in this prominent location should have an impact as a visual landmark and could generate interest in Stockton and may contribute to delivering an urban renaissance. The Council will encourage iconic buildings to be environmentally sustainable and enhance views along the River Tees corridor.
Recommendation	Text added paragraph 6.4 and 6.5

Paragraph	Paragraphs 5.2 and 6.2
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	There should be some background justification for an 'iconic' or landmark building as a gateway feature and how this would relate to thing regarding the southern gateway as a whole. In part there needs to be a clearer justification for the selection of

	this site in comparison to alternative sites and that the role of the building has to relate to the long range impact (this should go beyond the those views indicated within the 'important view' indicated in figure 5), the presence it has on the skyline and the assumed 'public' use of all or some of the building.
Council's Response	The text has been expanded to include justification for the selection of the former SCS site for an iconic building and that the building should enhance the listed buildings present along Bridge Road and Victoria Bridge itself.
Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 6.4
Paragraph	Page 12, Paragraph 6.4
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	This section of the document argues for the provision, on the site, for an iconic building or feature. The irony of this requirement is not lost on English Heritage, in that the study area already possesses an iconic building of international status. The Council has an unprecedented opportunity to brand and market the site to maximise this unique selling point in ways which can confer significant economic advantage.
Council's Response	Agree that the site already possesses an iconic building of international status.
Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 6.4 and 8.20
Paragraph	Page 12, Paragraph 6.5
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	There is strong support for the delivery of sustainable communities through an urban scale and mixed use but the overall level of development and residential mix could be set out in more detail following an exercise in testing the urban capacity of the development site; although there is a danger that there is an undue focus on flats and smaller residential units to meet the required density if it is considered in isolation from the quality of development and the actual housing need met through mix and variety as part of a sustainable community.
Council's Response	The Council is not proposing to carry out an urban capacity test for the Boathouse Lane site. The site has been identified for mixed use and the Council will look to achieve densities in line with PPG3 and SPG4. Agree that housing numbers should not be considered in isolation from the quality of development and the actual housing need met through a mix and variety of land uses.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Page 13, Paragraph 6.6
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	On behalf of our clients we would seek to promote the JT Dove site, as identified upon the attached plan for residential development for the following reasons: 1) Provides an excellent opportunity to ensure that this prominent location creates a key gateway to the regeneration of Boathouse Lane 2) Ensures easy access to residents to Thornaby rail station and close walking distance to local employment and services 3) Ability to enhance the environment around the listed buildings and build upon the appearance of Stockton and the wider River Tees corridor 4) Encourage the regeneration of Boathouse Lane by establishing a quality form of development upon a key site.
Council's Response	The purpose of the planning brief anticipates future development proposals which may arise in the short or longer term, and which may take unforeseen forms. While a planning brief gives the Council better control over poor development proposals, its purpose is to provide a basis for imaginative development solutions. It clarifies planning parameters within which developers can explore options. A planning application has to be robust against changing property market conditions, a brief cannot provide absolute property market certainty. Land served by Boathouse Lane is allocated within the 1997 Local Plan.
Recommendation	Text included to paragraph 1.4 for clarification

Paragraph	Page 13, Paragraph 6.6
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	On behalf of our clients we would seek to promote the Arriva Plc site, as identified upon the attached plan for residential development for the following reasons: 1) Provides an excellent opportunity to ensure that this prominent location creates a key gateway to the regeneration of Boathouse Lane 2) Ensures easy access to residents to Thornaby rail station and close walking distance to local employment and services 3) Ability to enhance the environment around the listed buildings and build upon the appearance of Stockton and the wider River Tees corridor 4) Encourage the regeneration of Boathouse Lane by establishing a quality form of development upon a key site.
Council's Response	The purpose of the planning brief anticipates future development proposals which may arise in the short or longer term, and which may take unforeseen forms. While a planning brief gives the Council better control over poor development proposals, its purpose is to provide a basis for imaginative development solutions. It clarifies planning parameters within which developers can explore options. A planning application has to be robust against changing property market conditions, a brief cannot provide absolute property market certainty. Land served by Boathouse Lane is allocated within the 1997 Local Plan.
Recommendation	Text included to paragraph 1.4 for clarification
Paragraph	Page 13, Paragraph 6.6
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	The concept of the site developed predominately for residential use is warmly welcomed.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary
Paragraph	Paragraph 6.7
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The SPD is in general conformity with Policy H4 of RPG1 as the housing aspect of the development is going to be on previously developed land and Policy 32 of the emerging RSS as the development will help to improve inclusivity as the development is close to public transport and has good access to jobs, services and other facilities.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Paragraph 6.7
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The document states that it maybe appropriate to exceed densities of over 30-50 dwellings per hectare, this is not view that is supported by the emerging RSS, which states that densities of 30-50 dwellings per hectare are appropriate to make the most efficient use of land and concentrate development in urban areas.
Council's Response	The Council has removed reference to exceeding densities above that stipulated in PPG3. The Council has however left in a table taken from adopted SPG4 on flatted development.
Recommendation	Text amended to paragraph 6.7.
Paragraph	Page 13, Paragraph 6.9
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Paragraph 6.9 suggests that the Council will require affordable housing from the development yet the Council has not yet

Council's Response	undertaken a Housing Needs survey. Are you [the Council] in a position to seek to secure affordable housing on this site? Policy HO4 of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan seeks to ensure affordable housing is provided on developments exceeding 2 hectares (5 acres) to an extent to be agreed between the Council and the Developer as appropriate to meet housing need. The Council's Housing Strategy 2005-2008 gives an overview of the local housing market and the current housing need within the Borough. As a guide to developers for negotiating Section 106 Agreements for affordable housing, the Council will require the following mix of tenure: 50% of the affordable units should be shared ownership; and 50% to be social rented. This is intended to act as a general guide and the exact mix will be a matter of negotiation in each case to take account issues of viability and mix. 1 bed – 10%; 2 bed – 25%; 3 bed 40%; 4+ bed 15%' 2 bed bungalow (elderly) 10% mix.
Recommendation	Additional text to be inserted in paragraph 6.10 for clarification.

Paragraph	Paragraph 6.10
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The document states that there is come evidence for an affordable housing issue in Stockton, the document does set any affordable housing/special needs limit. RPG1 Policy H7 and the emerging RSS require affordable housing to be provided if need has been established through an up to date housing needs study. There would be concern if such provision was not made in light of findings in the study.
Council's Response	The Council has commissioned an local housing assessment which will update the Council's existing housing needs assessment.
Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 6.10.

Paragraph	Paragraphs 6.10 and 8.8
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Woodford are happy with the concept of lifetime homes and also accept the aspiration to build to higher standards of energy conservation.
Council's Response	Support welcomed
Recommendation	No changes necessary

Paragraph	Page 13, Paragraph 6.11
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt
Summary of Representation	The issue of B1 activity on the site and it may be suitable providing it has no detriment to residential amenity, given that a key requirement for a use to forward in class B1 is that it cannot have any detriment to residential amenity. If it does, it will fall within another use class, commonly B2. Perhaps the Council would like to clarify this point?
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Paragraph 6.12 amended.

Paragraph	Page 15, Section 6
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The potential of the develop site for water-based recreation and in particular angling should be taken into consideration. Disable access for anglers in the form of disabled angling platforms together with environmental enhancements to the river edge habitat would help create a valuable amenity and an enhance ecosystem. Disabled access for anglers along the Tees is limited and the agency received many calls from disable anglers each year asking for provision of disabled angling platforms.
Council's Response	Agree, the opportunity for water based recreation opportunities.
Recommendation	Text added as paragraph 6.18

Paragraph	Page 15, Paragraph 6.17
------------------	-------------------------

Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The Environment Agency should be fully consulted at an early stage regarding the marina proposals, to take account of any operational and flood risk issues.
Council's Response	Reference to the marina is to be removed following the uncertainties for the financial viability of any proposal.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Pages 15-16, Paragraphs 6.16 to 6.18
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	There is support for a leisure destination; such as a marina (6.16 to 6.18) that complements the range of town centre uses and acts as a generator for wider public access through the development site.
Council's Response	Reference to the marina is to be removed following the uncertainties for the financial viability of any proposal.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Page 16, Paragraphs 6.20-6.21
Organisation/Individual	David Leyshon, Ramblers Association
Summary of Representation	We welcome the proposals and look forward to being consulted by the Council on recreational matters, particularly the realignment of the Teesdale Way onto the river bank.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Page 17, Table 2
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	There should be careful consideration given to the layout of any new development on the site, with particular regard to be had to the vulnerability of potential land uses. For example more vulnerable land uses such as residential should be avoided at ground level, and open space should be considered in the highest risk areas.
Council's Response	Text will be included to paragraph 6.3 to coincide with comments made regarding the particular land uses.
Recommendation	Text included to paragraph 6.3.

Section 7: Principles

Paragraph	Section 7
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Group
Summary of Representation	Boathouse Lane is not a virgin, unconstrained Greenfield site and if a successful redevelopment of the site is to be achieved then it is necessary for a degree of pragmatism and flexibility. In particular, the base position against which any assessment of highway matters should be made is the existing situation and the extent to which any redevelopment would be materially better or worse than the current situation.
Council's Response	The engineering concepts described within the Planning and Design Brief are intended to act as a guide to potential developers and the Council. The Brief makes reference to a departure from standard in paragraph 7.1.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.

Paragraph	Page 17, Paragraph 7.1
Organisation/Individual	Peter Nicol, English Partnerships
Summary of Representation	Is it worth mentioning that the A66 is to be widened over the Surtess Bridge rather than picking it up in Table 3?
Council's Response	Agreed.

Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 7.4.
-----------------------	------------------------------

Paragraph	Page 17, Chapter 7
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	Figure 5 identifies the principal vehicular and pedestrian access point to the site. The position of this access is such that the key historic buildings could be further isolated and encircled by roads and road traffic to the detriment of their setting. Whilst this island site is also identified as a potential focal point for Gateway art features and pedestrian activity, great care needs to be exercised in order to make this meaningful. PPS1 and its principles apply.
Council's Response	Agree, this is recognised as a potential design issue.
Recommendation	Additional text added to paragraph 8.26.

Paragraph	Page 18, Paragraph 7.7
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Group
Summary of Representation	The requirement for referral required by a 'material change' in the volume or nature of traffic entering the site the General Development Procedure Order and we do not consider the development will have any impact on the strategic highway network – either A66 or the South Stockton Link.
Council's Response	The Council works closely with the Highways Agency and are aware if the Agency's stringent scrutiny of any development along the trunk road corridor.
Recommendation	No comments necessary.

Section 8: Development Principles

Paragraph	Section 8
Organisation/Individual	Pat Ritchie, One North East
Summary of Representation	The promotion of sustainable development principles (in design, construction and management) is welcomed. References to BREEAM as an environmental standard should ideally be applied to all development rather than simply residential (EcoHomes).
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 8.8.

Paragraph	Section 8
Organisation/Individual	Pat Ritchie, One North East
Summary of Representation	Considered that the design principles need further articulation (ideally through further illustrations) taking cognisance of the local character and townscape qualities as well as the waterside architectural vernacular emerging at North Shore to the north. Expectations relating to the scale, form and massing of development need to be further explained in the context of the townscape and historical analysis i.e. buildings orientated 90 degrees to the river presenting narrow waterside frontages. This type of layout development is of Stockton and creates rhythm along the river as well as maximising visual and physical links to the water and solar gain/natural day lighting opportunities.
Council's Response	Agreed
Recommendation	Additional paragraphs added in paragraph 8.29

Paragraph	Paragraph 8.1
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The proposal does incorporate renewable energy generation or demonstrate how it intends to reduce energy consumption. This is in the spirit of RPG1 policies EN1 and EN7 which encourage renewable energy and energy efficiency. The RSS goes a

	step further by requiring the incorporation of embedded renewable energy in major new development. This proposal would therefore benefit from the incorporation of energy efficiency measures and renewable energy generation.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary
Paragraph	Page 20, Paragraph 8.2
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	Add biodiversity to the list of key issues in the final sentence.
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	Reference to biodiversity added.
Paragraph	Page 20, Paragraph 8.5
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The Agency support the identification of SuDS, the use of renewable energy and the reuse of waste materials as key issues that should be taken into account in the preparation of any development proposal.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Paragraph 8.5
Organisation/Individual	Colin Blackburn, North East Regional Assembly
Summary of Representation	The SPD touches on the provision of Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) which can contribute to minimising the risk of flooding, particularly flash flooding, and also contribute to a reduction in water based pollution. The inclusion of such provision would conform with the objectives of RPG1 policies ENV3, ENV4 and the emerging RSS. The issue is tackled in further details in the Council's Supplementary Guidance Note 3: Sustainable Drainage. The Assembly would support the local planning authority in requiring the incorporation of SUDS if it is deemed to be appropriate.
Council's Response	Support welcomed.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Pages 20-21, Paragraphs 8.5-8.9
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABA @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	There is strong support for the encouragement and promotion of community energy systems, renewables, sustainable urban drainage systems and other energy efficiency measures. In the context of PPS22 it may be appropriate for the Council to set a target (typically 10% of total energy requirements) for on-site renewable energy production as one of the major benefits of comprehensive development. It may also be appropriate to add more detail regarding the special requirements for each of the promoted sustainable technologies-in the form of typical cross sections or similar.
Council's Response	The Council agrees in paragraphs 8.6 and 8.7 that opportunities for renewable energy should be explored and included where appropriate. The Council has not included a specific potential as this is only to be applied where on-site renewable generation is viable given the type of development proposed and should be used to place an undue burden on developers.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Page 21, Paragraph 8.8
Organisation/Individual	Peter Nicol, English Partnerships
Summary of Representation	It seems to cover the sort of things that EP is trying to promote in terms of Sustainability, EcoHomes and good design.
Council's Response	Noted.

Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Page 21, Paragraph 8.10
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	...but challenges to this form should be; 1) ensuring that buildings front onto the water; with a concentration of public uses and active frontage; rather than having the rear 2) achieving pedestrian scale interest and activity along Bridge Street, given the difficulty in the changes in levels from the Victoria Bridge to the waterfront and the bridges abutments and retaining walls limiting the number of access points into new development.
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	These will be included in paragraph 8.16.
Paragraph	Page 22, Paragraph 8.14
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	While there is support for the retention of and enhancement of the settings of groups of listed properties (para 8.13), there are potentially other locally important buildings and site features that may be worthy of retention and/or reused in future development to benefit the local distinctiveness. The detail within the guidance could be improved by undertaking an assessment of existing buildings and structures.
Council's Response	Agreed, although discussion have already been held with Tees Archaeology during the formulation of the draft SPD and consequently reference to the requirement of an initial archaeological and cultural heritage assessment of the existing site and buildings including historic plans and photographs to identify if any historic buildings are worthy of reuse or perhaps require any further in-depth recording prior to demolition.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Pages 22-23, Paragraph 8.13-8.19
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	English Heritage welcomes reference to the existing buildings and the requirements of PPG15: <i>Planning and the Historic Environment</i> . As paragraph 8.15 acknowledges, the settings of listed buildings is also a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	Text amended to include reference to material consideration.
Paragraph	Page 23, Paragraph 8.22
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	Sustainability principles are generally welcomed. There are potential problems in achieving an interesting and varied townscape particularly at a higher density than would normally be the case. Many developments which take an innovative approach to urban form do not conform with traditional back to back distances and it would be helpful if the brief gave an indication of the Council's guidance on this matter.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Text amended to paragraph 8.29.
Paragraph	Page 23, Paragraph 8.22
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	CABE has some concerns regarding some of the design principles as they are currently be drafted in detail:

	1) the minimum spacing standards should be objectives based rather than set as an empirical standard; thus it should be more important to achieve the required levels of privacy rather than minimum distance. It should be possible to achieve a more compact and land efficient urban form of flexibility is given to individual designers and applicants to meet basis density objectives. This is important given the encouragement to promote home zone principles (para 8.28) within the residential elements of the development.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Text amended to paragraph 8.29
Paragraph	Page 23, Paragraph 8.20
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	The Council needs to ensure that any high density eye-catching buildings along Bridge Street do not detract from the appearance and setting of the existing listed buildings.
Council's Response	This is already clearly stated in paragraph 8.26.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Page 24, Paragraph 8.28
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	The creation of home zones is welcomed and allows further creativity and flexibility to the designer. However, this is only acceptable if engineers are going to support the home zone concept all the way through to adoption e.g. if separate service strips adjacent to carriageway surfaces are required then the home zone concept won't work in such a dense and tight site.
Council's Response	The Council adopts a proactive approach to supporting urban design principles including home zone and will give due consideration to any such proposal.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Page 25, Paragraph 8.33
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	Strongly disagree that as far as planting is concerned the "range of species selected should be limited." Instead we recommend that a variety of native species (preferably of local provenance) should be planted, in order to provide maximum biodiversity benefits. It is not acceptable – even in an urban environment – to view planting purely from an architectural perspective.
Council's Response	Agree and in accordance with PPS9.
Recommendation	Text amended to paragraph 8.44.
Paragraph	Page 26, Paragraph 8.37
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	The riparian margin of the proposed linear park could incorporate stretches of suitable river-side planting (will, alder etc) and ideally artificial otter holts. Otters have re-colonised the lower Tees in recent years, and the provision of suitable habitat is entirely appropriate for this BAP species. Furthermore, the presence of such an engaging and charismatic species on the site would enhance the status of the development for businesses, residential and visitors alike.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	An additional sub heading to cover ecological principles within section 8.
Paragraph	Additional info
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The EA suggest that the following site specific information is taken into account: the River Tees at this point contains a good population of resident coarse fish species and migratory salmonids, which move through the system each year. Water quality

	and disturbance of habitat will need to be protected especially during the construction period and we would expect suitable planning conditions to be attached to any planning consent.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	An additional sub heading to cover ecological principles within section 8.

Paragraph	Additional info
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	The EA suggest that the following site specific information is taken into account by anyone who wishes to develop the site: The EA do not hold any ecological information for the site, however there is a high possibility that the invasive plant Japanese knotweed is present due to it growing on nearby sites, including the opposite riverbank and on land along the railway. If the ecological surveys find that it is present the developer will need to make provision for a programme of control in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	An additional sub heading to cover ecological principles within section 8.

Section 9: The Way Forward

Paragraph	Section 9
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	We would suggest the following additions to planning application requirements: 'a ground condition survey and remediation proposals with regard to the potential of contaminated land in accordance with PPS23 and CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination.'
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Additional text included to paragraph 9.5.

Paragraph	Page 26, Paragraph 9.1
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	The draft SPD seeks to provide developers with a clear planning guide, this may be true in part however it would be impossible for a developer to "demonstrate how an individual proposal or phase fits into an overall view of how the site will be developed," for the following reasons: 1) there is no open forum for developers to express their aspirations 2) there is no cohesive preferred land use option plans available to trigger discussions 3) little flexibility with the draft SPD for third party negotiations. On this basis we object to the exclusion of the above identified is limitation to the brief.
Council's Response	The Council has deliberately sought not to demonstrate how an individual proposals or phase fits into an overall masterplan for the area so as to not overburden any potential developers with a vision which may not be realistically delivered by the market. It is disagreed that there is no options to trigger discussion as the Brief sets out the land uses the Council would expect to see on the site. The Brief recognises that the site may need to be developed in phases and encourages landowners and developers to hold discussions with one another. The Council agrees that third party negotiations may be appropriate and this will be included in paragraph 9.3 for clarity.
Recommendation	Text amended to paragraph 9.3.

Paragraph	Paragraph 9.1
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Wetherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	The draft SPD seeks to provide developers with a clear planning guide, this may be true in part however it would be impossible

	for a developer to “demonstrate how an individual proposal or phase fits into an overall view of how the site will be developed,” for the following reasons: 1) there is no open forum for developers to express their aspirations 2) there is no cohesive preferred land use option plans available to trigger discussions 3) little flexibility with the draft SPD for third party negotiations. On this basis we object to the exclusion of the above identified is limitation to the brief.
Council’s Response	The Council has deliberately sought not to demonstrate how an individual proposals or phase fits into an overall masterplan for the area so as to not overburden any potential developers with a vision which may not be realistically delivered by the market. It is disagreed that there is no options to trigger discussion as the Brief sets out the land uses the Council would expect to see on the site. The Brief recognises that the site may need to be developed in phases and encourages landowners and developers to hold discussions with one another. The Council agrees that third party negotiations may be appropriate and this will be included in paragraph 9.3 for clarity.
Recommendation	Text amended to paragraph 9.3

Paragraph	Page 26, Paragraph 9.1
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Weatherall on the behalf of JT Doves
Summary of Representation	The brief states the key objectives will be achieved by undertaking a phased redevelopment of the site however this should [not] be done in a piecemeal fashion. This is of course difficult to achieve as this site is owned by a varied number of interests. In general terms our client supports the aims of the SPD however it is sceptical about the ability to deliver the proposal in a comprehensive fashion.
Council’s Response	The Council acknowledges within the Brief that there a wide number of landowners comprising of the Boathouse Lane site. The Brief urges landowners and any prospective developers to hold negotiations with one another in order to achieve the most sensible way forward.
Recommendation	Text within paragraph 9.3 to be reworded.

Paragraph	Page 26, Paragraph 9.1
Organisation/Individual	Sanderson Weatherall on the behalf of Arriva Plc
Summary of Representation	The brief states the key objectives will be achieved by undertaking a phased redevelopment of the site however this should not be done in a piecemeal fashion. This is of course difficult to achieve as this site is controlled by a variety of landowners. In general terms our client supports the aims of the SPD however is sceptical about the ability to deliver the proposal in a comprehensive fashion.
Council’s Response	The Council acknowledges within the Brief that there a wide number of landowners comprising of the Boathouse Lane and it may be appropriate to phase any development as a consequence. The Brief urges landowners and any prospective developers to hold negotiations with one another in order to achieve the most sensible way forward.
Recommendation	Text within paragraph 9.3 to be reworded.

Paragraph	Pages 26 and 27, Paragraph 9.1 and 9.5
Organisation/Individual	Michael Crilley, CABE @ Tees Valley
Summary of Representation	The Council should retain an overview of design, particularly in the application of principles between different development plots and achieving consistency in design and sustainability standards. While a design code may be one mechanism for achieving the required quality of development (and be a useful means of ensuring consistency of development where the anticipated phasing will result if development of different blocks at different times – para 9.1) this should remain under the editorial control of the council and not become the exclusive responsibility of the landowner.
Council’s Response	Agree that good quality of design will need to be consistent across the development site and this should be considered as part of the planning application.

Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 9.1
Paragraph	Page 27, Paragraph 9.4
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	This section of the report advises that planning applications may be made in full or outline. Where works are proposed in close association with listed buildings, developers should be requires to submit full applications with full details of the impact of the scheme upon those listed buildings.
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	Text amended and added to paragraph 9.4.
Paragraph	Page 27, Paragraph 9.5
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	As well as including the survey and mitigation referred to here, any planning application should be accompanied by the measures referred to above, and in particular a robust survey of current bat usage of the site.
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	Additional text added to paragraph 9.5.
Paragraph	Page 27, Paragraph 9.5
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	It is inescapably the fact that the site is possessed of considerable archaeological interest and potential. It is imperative that Tees Archaeology is involved throughout the planning process and its requirements and views incorporated into the context of any development schemes for the site which ensue.
Council's Response	Noted.
Recommendation	No changes necessary.
Paragraph	Page 28, Paragraph 9.6
Organisation/Individual	Jenny Loring, English Nature
Summary of Representation	As regards "wildlife habitats," survey and mitigation packages should be provided up-front with any planning application, and as far as European protected species are concerned certainly cannot be conditioned by a planning permission.
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	Additional text included to 9.6.
Paragraph	Page 28, Paragraph 9.6
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	English Heritage welcomes reference to archaeological and cultural heritage assessment as one area which would benefit from developer contributions. There is clearly an opportunity, however, for further works of repair and interpretation to be funded by the developers. I would expect your own conservation officer to assist in this regard in identifying a potential schedule of such works.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Text added to paragraph 9.6.
Paragraph	Page 28, Table 3
Organisation/Individual	Blackett, Hart & Pratt on the behalf of Woodford Land
Summary of Representation	It is noted that the Highways Authority are seeking a contribution of £300,000 towards remodelling of existing junctions to

	accommodate the flows from this development. Wish to see sight of the engineering arguments which support an assertion including detailed costings that support the capital sum. I would therefore suggest that this is reflected in a revised planning brief which looks for a contribution, if it is proven necessary, to remodel these junctions. Given the Highway Authority's works as part of the South Stockton Link it is difficult to see why new developments are immediately required in this area.
Council's Response	The sum of £300,000 was based upon an indicative assessment of likely impact upon Riverside Roundabout. Recent traffic modelling work suggests that this is not an unreasonable assessment. Further work is being carried out to verify the level and validity of the actual contribution. However the sum of this figure has been removed as the contribution to any improvement will be a level to align with the nature of particular development and its impact.
Recommendation	Text amended in Table 3.

Paragraph	Page 28, Table 3 Developer Contributions
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	We would suggest the following additions: 'Ground Condition Survey: A survey of ground conditions and contamination will be required, together with an appropriate programme of remediation. We endorse the recently published PPS23 (www.odpm.gov.uk) which states that it is the developers responsibility to ensure the site is safe and suitable for its intended purpose, having regard to previous contamination. The framework to achieve this is to carry out investigations in accordance with CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination. The link for this document is (www.environment-agency.gov.uk/subjects/landquality).
Council's Response	Agree.
Recommendation	Text added to table 3.

Site Appraisal Figure

Paragraph	Page 34, Figure 4
Organisation/Individual	Peter Nicol, English Partnerships
Summary of Representation	Figure 4 The SCS site seems to be shown as including the area EP owns
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Figure 4 amended.

Paragraph	Pages 35-35, Figure 4 and 5
Organisation/Individual	Mr Alan Hunter, English Heritage
Summary of Representation	Both diagrams annotate the listed buildings on the site as grade II listed. The site comprises both grade II* and grade II listed buildings.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Figures 4 and 5 amended.

Access and Layout Principles Figure

Paragraph	Page 35, Figure 5
Organisation/Individual	Suzie Shaw, Environment Agency
Summary of Representation	Given the Key Objectives and the increasing occurrence of otters along the River Tees at Stockton and Thornaby it is necessary for development proposals to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor associated with the River Tees. As a minimum, we suggest that the "Enhancement of Waterfrontage" principle shown on Figure 5: Access & Layout Principles should be expanded in the text of the document making it clear that biodiversity enhancements should be a key part of any proposals

	for the waterfrontage.
Council's Response	Agreed.
Recommendation	Text amended and added to section 8.10.