Summary of Responses

<u>Name</u>	Address/ Authority	Page no	Comment	Suggested outcome
Urban Designer	Gateshead Council	section 8 appendix 1 b)	 That submitted drawings include reference to information about space standards as per the N Tyneside reference as Gateshead and Newcastle now have policies. Also suggest that all submitted proposed floor plan drawings contain the following information. • Furniture Layouts - To demonstrate that all rooms within the property can (a) comfortably accommodate the required basic items of furniture, and (b) provide enough circulation space for the intended occupants to safely navigate rooms and perform basic tasks. Floor Areas – Floor Plan drawings must be annotated to provide this information (in square metres), to include the GIA (Gross Internal Area) of the property; all habitable rooms; and all built-in spaces designed specifically for storage. 	Include reference to space standards as per S Tyneside reference and change wording to include suggested wording.
			 Bedroom Dimensions – Floor Plan drawings also need to provide dimensions of all bedroom widths within the property to demonstrate compliance with the technical requirements of the NDSS. 	
			• House Type Specification - Floor Plan drawings also need to clearly state the number of bedrooms and bed spaces the property will provide, to show the intended number of occupants the house has been designed to accommodate, and also as a statement indicating how the property will be marketed (i.e. a 3b/5p property).	
			I would also suggest including a footnote to the effect of: "The developer should refer to the technical requirements in the NDSS for guidance on how to accurately and correctly obtain these required measurements."	
Urban Designer	Gateshead Council	Page 9 appendix 1	Typo in second bullet point "the steps taken to appraise the context of the development and how the design of the development takes that context into account". This should read, "the steps taken to appraise the context of the site and its surroundings and how the design of the development takes that context into account"	Correct typos
Biodiversity officer	Gateshead Council but agreed with South Tyneside and Sunderland Ecologists	Section 13	 Ecological Survey Assessment and Mitigation Report & Protected Species Survey When could either of these be required? Modification / demolition (including in part) of the following: Permanent agricultural buildings; Buildings with weather boarding, wooden cladding and/or hanging tiles within 200 metres of woodland or water; Pre-1960 buildings within 200 metres of woodland or water and pre-1919 buildings/structures of any age within or immediately adjacent to woodland and/or water; Tunnels, mines, kilns, ice houses, adits, military fortifications, air raid shelters, cellars and similar underground ducts and structures; Bridges, aqueducts and viaducts; Buildings within 50 metres of woodland, water or hedgerows / lines of trees with an obvious connection to woodland or water; Works to fell or lop veteran trees, trees with obvious cracks, holes and cavities, or trees with a diameter greater than a metre at chest height; Major proposals within 500 metres of a pond or adjacent to rivers, streams, canals, lakes or other aquatic habitats such as wetlands; Proposals for wind turbines. Applications affecting: Woodland, or hedgerows / lines of trees with an obvious connection to woodland or water; 	Make suggested changes

	 European protected sites or candidate sites: Special Protection Area (SPA) / Ramsar Site, Special Area of Conservation (SAC);• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Local Wildlife Sites (LWS); Local Nature Reserve (LNR) Wildlife Corridors; Site of Local Conservation Interest (SLCI); Priority habitats as defined in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) (Refer to Local BAPs and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act); A semi-natural habitat. 	
	Exceptions:	
	A survey assessment & mitigation report may be waived if:	
	 Following consultation at the pre-application stage, it is confirmed in writing by the Council that a survey/report is not required; A reasoned risk assessment, undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist, is submitted demonstrating that no protected species are present, or that none would be adversely affected by the proposal; 	
	A survey assessment & mitigation report may be required if:	
	 The Council believe that your specific proposal poses a reasonable likelihood of impacting on protected species and/or habitats even where the criteria above is not triggered. 	
	Please seek pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority for clarification on when a survey or Habitat Regulation Assessment screening opinion (see below) would be required.	
	What information is required?	
	Where a development has the potential to impact on priority and protected habitats or species e.g. bats or Great Crested Newts, appropriate surveys and assessments will be required with the application.	
	Ecological survey and reporting work must comply with BS42020:2013 Biodiversity – code of practice for planning and development and be in accordance with up to date good practice guidance. Please refer to the CIEEM website for details.	
	Failure to provide information on protected species at the outset can significantly delay the processing of your planning application whilst a survey is carried out and could result in a need for design and layout changes that should have been taken into account in the original proposal.	
	Please note certain surveys can only be undertaken at certain times of the year. For further details please contact the Local Planning Authority at pre-application stage.	
	Where a development could impact upon a European Protected Site or candidate site a Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) will be required The HRA is an overall assessment process, which involves a number of stages including screening and Appropriate Assessment. The process seeks to identify any potential 'likely significant effects' (LSE) which may impact upon the designated site, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects.	
	Policy Background	

		Government policy or guidance: • National Planning Policy Framework – Chapter 15 • National Planning Practice Guidance – Natural Environment section	
		Development Plan:	
		Newcastle and Gateshead Core Strategy Policy CS18	
		Newcastle Unitary Development Plan Policies NC1.1, NC1.2, NC1.3 (in part), NC1.4, NC1.5, NC1.6 and NC1.7	
		Gateshead	

				1
			Unitary Development Policies DC1 (d), ENV44, ENV46, ENV47, ENV48, ENV49, ENV50 and ENV51	
			South Tyneside Core Strategy Policies ST1, EA1 and EA3	
			Development Management Policies DM1 and DM7 Area Action Plan Policies SS13 and J11 Interim Supplementary Planning Document 23 – Mitigation Strategy for European Sites https://www.southtyneside.gov.uk/article/36021/Supplementary- Planning-Documents	
			North Tyneside Local Plan (2017) S5.4, DM5.5, DM5.6, DM5.7	
			Area specific requirements and further information:	
			 Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management website https://www.cieem.net/publications-info Bat Conservation Trust http://www.bats.org.uk/ Natural England website https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/natural-england Regional Biodiversity Priorities https://neenp.org.uk/natural-environment/biodiversity-priorities/ 	
Gary Craig	Agent	all	I don't have any particular comment on the content of the revision, but if I had any criticism it is the difficulty of taking in 63 -78 pages to determine what is and is not required (the copy sent to me by South Tyneside was 63 pages long, the Gateshead copy 78 pages?) Could there not be a shortened version with just the basic requirements and perhaps the appendices, and then a separate set of guidance notes that you could refer to if it appears that the various bits of additional information are needed? If not for the whole document, at least to separate the householder requirements? I often get domestic Clients saying to me that they have looked at submitting an application themselves and have been put off by the difficulty of understanding what is required, or they have tried to submit something and it has been referred back to them for further information. Perhaps a simpler version for householders with examples of a red lined site plan, illustrations of the 1-200 site plans, etc? There is not a single illustration in the whole document.	we have a shorter householder checklist on our website which collates the info required and directs to further info if needed. https://www.gateshead. gov.uk/media/6689/Tyn e-and-Wear-Validation- List-Householder- Applications/pdf/Tynean dWearValidationList- HouseholderApplications .pdf?m=6365724990224 00000
Peter Lowe – TMA Architects	Agent		 Many thanks for sending this through. A few thoughts. Not sure if they can be included due to National Policy. In no particular order: Change your scale requirements. For examples the scale of 1:125 should be used for plans and elevations. 1:2000 should be acceptable for location plans. For certain applications an acoustic survey, heritage statement, tree surveys or daylight assessments may be requested. These documents need to be produced by professionals. A list should be made available on your website of all providers in the local area. Together with their estimated fees – possibly and a range between £? - £? Also you should also have a list of all RIBA Architects in the local area for people to see. Together with estimated fees. A minimum standard for drawing quality should be applied. Too many applications have poor quality drawings. I can send you some examples if you require. Design statements should not be required for domestic projects. CIL should only be applicable to large volume house builders. Have a team of Architects to review designs of sensitive applications. 	The comments raised have been noted. Recognised scales are required for validation for ease of scaling. The Validation Checklist cannot require qualifications of authors of documents, only the contents and form. The quality of submission will form part of the planning assessment. Design and Access Statement are not normally required for domestic applications, except where involving heritage assets. The NE RIBA Design Review panel can be requested to consider large applications.
Planning Policy	Gateshead Council	N/A	Has any consideration been given to the prior extraction of minerals in accordance with CSUCP policy CS20 given there is a boroughwide MSA – this becomes a more relevant consideration for larger non or edge-of- urban area sites. This should be something that is covered in the validation checklist (feasibility of mineral extraction statement for sites >1hectare)???	Revised wording in the mineral safeguarding section to include requirements for all authorities.

Summary of Responses

Historic England	All		We welcome the comprehensive requirements for applications affecting the historic environment. The only comments we have are as follow:	Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document
			 On page 9, final bullet for the list relating to Planning Applications, it may be helpful to refer to 'significance' (eg: 'A description of any heritage asset affecting, including its significance, any contribution made by their setting, and' etc.) It may be helpful to provide a link to the Historic England advice on significance on our website, eg: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/constructive-conservation/conservation-principles/ 	
Highways England	South Tyneside Council	All	 (ii) Discretion b) Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan, unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise. Pre-application discussions with the local planning authority are therefore encouraged (see paragraph (v) on page 5 of this document), particularly where the scheme is complex or where the proposal may be in conflict with development plan policy. The pre-application advice service is discretionary and requires a fee to be paid. Mindful of NPPF, it is recommended that the important benefits of pre-application discussions are strengthened and more than simply encouraged. The wording should also clarify at who's discretion pre-application advice is. 	Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document
			 (iii) Review c) Please note that the authorities may need to update and make changes to this publication to comply with legislative changes. Should this occur we will seek to update it on our websites as soon as practicable. Please be aware of this imitation should you choose to print a copy of this publication. 	
			 (iv) Using the Checklists b) Clearly there are some circumstances where applicants will need to discuss the local list requirements with the relevant local planning authority (LPA) before submitting an application. Applicants are strongly encouraged to do this because if an application lacks the information specified by the Government and in the LPAs published lists, the LPA will in general be entitled to invalidate the application and so decline to determine it. [original emphasis] 	
			(v) Pre-application Advice Again, it is recommended that the benefits of pre-application advise be strengthened as per the guidance contained in NPPF (paragraph 39 to 46). Further, statutory consultees should be referenced to (such as Highways England); the benefits that pre-application advice would have on identifying relevant consultees; and the risk of delay to an Application's determination if consultees are not appropriately engaged. A list of potential consultees could be included within an additional Appendix and referred to in the text.	
			Appendix 1 7. Design and Access Statement (if required) Unless detailed within '(v) Pre-application advice' (in which case cross- reference should be made) differentiation should be made between pre- application Planning advice and that offered by the relevant Local Highways Authority in relation to the preparation of a Design and Access Statement, along with the benefits and risks if not appropriately engaged (see further comments below regarding Transport Statements and Assessments).	
			Outline Planning Applications Although the minimum level of information required to be submitted with an outline planning application is identified, notwithstanding this, it would be beneficial to identify that sufficient information needs to be provided to permit the application to be determined. Therefore, additional documentation may be required and the absence of such would result in delay to an application's determination. This further strengthens the benefits of pre-application consultation.	
			8. Application Plans In addition to identifying that all plans should be numbered it would be beneficial to recommend the inclusion of a revision and date also.	
			10. Air Quality Assessment Air quality may impact upon statutory consultees (Highways England) and, therefore, cross-reference is recommended.	

	20. Noise Assessment
	Trunk roads and motorways are referenced within "when is this required"
	but are not identified as representing the Strategic Road Network, as a
	result the link with Highways England within the subsequent reference to
	the strategic road network within "what information is required" may be
	unclear. It is recommended that the wording be amended so that the
	initial identification of trunk roads and motorways be introduced as
	representing the Strategic Road Network and, as such, the responsibility of
	Highways England.
	22 Planning Obligations - Draft Head of Terms
	22. Planning Obligations – Draft Head of Terms Highway works are identified within the list of items planning obligations
	seek to address. However, as Highways England cannot be a signatory to a
	s106 Agreement it is recommended that a footnote be added that provides
	the caveat: "with the exclusion of works at the Strategic Road Network, as
	represented by trunk roads and motorways, unless requested by Highways
	England".
	29. Transport Assessments & Statements, Travel Plans, Parking & Highways
	It is recommended that Transport Assessments / Statements and Travel
	Plans be dealt with separately with parking and highways being excluded
	from the title but included as matters for consideration.
	The wording "your planning application" should be amended to 'a planning
	application', to maintain consistency of wording throughout the document.
	Suggested additional wording:
	These documents are used to determine whether the impact of the
	development is acceptable, in highways and transportation terms.
	Suggested modified wording:
	Transport Assessment (TA):
	A comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues
	relating to a proposed development. It should quantify the travel
	characteristics of the development by all modes of travel, the resulting
	impact on transport infrastructure and identify identifies what measures
	will be required to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel,
	particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public
	transport and what measures will need to be taken to deal with the
	anticipated transport impacts of the development.
	Pre-application scoping is key if a TA is to prove acceptable to the relevant
	highway authorities (not simply that of the authority within which the
	proposed development it located but also neighbouring authorities and
	Highways England, where there exists the potential for an impact to be
	apparent at the Strategic Road Network, as represented by trunk roads
	and motorways). Scoping should comprehensively set out all methodologies, inputs and data by which the development's trip-making at
	the supporting transport networks is to be established. In the absence of
	comprehensive and agreed scoping there is the risk that re-visitation will
	be required before an application's transport impacts and any associated
	mitigation across all modes are agreed, thereby delaying an application's
	determination and increasing an applicant's costs.
	TAs are to be fully supported by evidence with all data referred to and
	referenced provided in full.
	Transport Statement (TS): A simplified version of a transport assessment
	where it is agreed the transport issues arising out of development
	proposals are limited and a full transport assessment is not required.
	However, the same comments regarding scoping and provision of
1	supporting evidence noted above in relation to TAs equally apply to TSs

supporting evidence noted above in relation to TAs equally apply to TSs. Again, as noted above in relation to Design and Access Statements, differentiation should be made between pre-application Planning advise and that offered by the relevant Local Highways Authorities, including reference to Highways England.
 Scope of reports The table of data should additionally include: Identification of queue surveys, within Traffic Surveys "Consultation" should reference "Relevant Highway Authorities" rather than "Local Authority" (explicate reference to Highways England is not required, subject to inclusion of wording above expanding upon relevant highway authorities). Trip Assignment and Trip Distribution order should be swapped.
 Road Safety Audits are incorrectly identified in relation to Parking and should be identified under Mitigation Proposals, along with Walking,

	1		
		Cycling, Horse-Riding Assessment and Review (in relation to any SRI mitigation)	N
		On the basis that the wording modifications suggested above are incorporated:	
		Further, should a development affect the strategic road network, or for any development requiring direct access to the strategic highway network then Highways England should be contacted. Where the need for highw mitigation works are identified as necessary at the Strategic Road Network these must comply with all aspects of In these cases mitigation will nee be designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridg with Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in accordance with GG 119 HD19/15 and Walking, Cycling & Horse-riding Assessment and Review Non-Motorised User Audit in accordance with HD 42/17 HD 42/05 for both outline and detailed applications.	ork, vay vork d to es, d
		 Reference to ", or for any development requiring direct access to th strategic highway network," should be deleted as direct access is contrary to policy and would only be permitted in very exceptional circumstances. 	e
Natural England	All	Air Quality - It is positive that the revised checklist states that air quality assessment should 'take account of potential impacts on sensitive ecological habitats vulnerable to deposition from increased emissions.' clarity this should ideally specify emissions 'to air.' Sensitive habitats m experience nutrient enrichment and eutrophication from increases to deposition from oxides of nitrogen and sulphur, or smothering from increased particulate matter emissions and subsequent deposition.	consideration in For redrafting the document
		Ecology – It should also be noted that species associated with some designated sites receive protection outside of the designated boundary for example land outside of the site boundary where birds associated w Special Protection Areas are found to be feeding or roosting would be considered 'functional land'. This would receive the same protection as land within the designated site, and so the same expectation for avoida and mitigation measures to be put in place would exist.	vith
		Habitat Regulations Assessment – Information on the reasons for which European Sites are designated may also be obtained at Natural England Designated Sites View website: <u>https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/</u>	
		Landscaping – Development may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes (including any local landscape designations) and opportunities for biodiversity net gain. Landscape de should consider local landscape features or characteristics which could incorporated into the development in order to respect and enhance loc landscape character and distinctiveness, in line with any local landscape character assessments. Where the impacts of development are likely to significant, a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment should be provided with the proposal to inform decision making. The Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provide further guidance. <u>https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/technical/glvia3-panel/</u>	be cal e o be d
		Noise – Environmental receptors should be identified as a feature that requires consideration in a noise assessment, particularly industrial or p developments in close proximity to nationally and internationally designated sites.	port

Summary of Responses

Sport England	All Existing site plan	Government that plannin specific info enable Spor which it is co of P.97 of th The checklis It also indica	to the national validation requirements set out within t's Planning Practice Guidance, Sport England recomm ag applications affecting playing field land should prov rmation in line with the below checklist. This informat t England to provide a substantive response to application onsulted. It will also aid the LPA to assess an application the NPPF and relevant Local Plan policies.	nends ide sport tion will ations on on in light plications. should be	Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document	
			-	tions to Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.		
			Document	Presenting details on Required for all applications		
			Consultation Notice	 The development proposed (description), timescales, case officer con and how information can be viewed. 	tact details	
			Existing site plan	Extent of the playing field as defined by <u>The Town and Country Plann</u> (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 Location and nature of existing buildings. Location and nature of existing sports facilities (including the layout of summer and winter playing pitches). Significant features (e.g. trees, slopes, paths, fences, sewers) ¹ .		
			Proposed site plan	 Existing levels across the site¹. Existing levels across the site¹. Location and nature of the proposed development. Extent of playing field area to be lost (including the area covered by th proposed development and any associated works e.g. landscaping). Location and nature of all existing sports facilities (clearly showing any approximation). 		
			Cunnerting	Iocations from the existing plan). 10. Any changes to existing features and levels ¹ . 14. Evicet of plaving field errors to be lead (area in bostone and are point ((abova)	
			Supporting Statements	 11. Extent of playing field area to be lost (area in hectares and see point 6 12. Reason for the chosen location and alternatives considered. 13. Any proposed changes in the provision of indoor and outdoor sports fatthe site (including ancillary facilities). 		
			Drawings	Required in relation to specific policy exceptions 14. Internal layouts and elevations for proposed new, extended or	Exceptions 2,4 & 5	
			Drawings Supporting	 14. Internal layouts and elevations for proposed new, extended or enhanced sports facilities (including relevant ancillary facilities)¹. 15. Current and recent users of the playing field and the nature and 	2,4&5	
			Statements	extent of their use. 16. How the development fits with the findings of any relevant assessment of need and/or sports related strategy (a copy of, or a	1,4&5	
				 web link to, the assessment or strategy should be provided)^{1 2}. 17. How the development will be of benefit to sport (including benefit to existing and potential users)². 	2,4&5	
				 The specification of any ancillary facilities e.g. floodlights¹. The specification of any Artificial Grass Pitch and reason for the 	2,4&5 4&5	
				 chosen surface type². 20. How any replacement area of playing field and ancillary facilities will be delivered (including to what timescale). 	4	
				 21. How, for any replacement area of playing field, equivalent or better quality will be achieved and maintained, including³: a. An assessment of the performance of the existing area; b. The programme of works (including pitch construction) for the creation of the proposed replacement area; c. A management and monitoring plan for the replacement area. 	4	
Coal Authority	All		identified as justification Coal Author We also sup	sed to see that Coal Mining Risk Assessments have be a requirement on the Local Validation List and we su for this requirement and are pleased to see signposti ity website. port the reference to Mineral Safeguarding issues and ements in this regard.	pport the ng to the	Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document
Community Safety Officer / Domestic	South Tyneside		Crime/Disor	pint of view, it would be helpful to include something der, to assist compliance with our statutory duty (s17 order Act 1998), namely:		Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document
Violence Co- ordinator – Scott Bentley			Living) also i crime and e	at the LDF Core Strategy, within Policy ST2 (Sustainable mentions that we will ensure that "the need to design liminate the fear of crime has been addressed" and th ed in the related Development Management Policies.	out	
				nat many other local authorities already have a requir Crime Impact Statement" for some proposals.	ement to	
			account exis designed to safety and s concerns ab	ly involves a statement of how the application has tak sting crime in the area and how the development has both address issues of crime and minimise its impact ecurity of the area. This can also assist in allaying any out proposed developments. Some authorities sugge tion can be included within the Design & Access State	been on the public est that	
			Such a state	ment could include:		
			developsan asses	sment of crime and disorder issues in the vicinity of the ment site; sment of the development proposal in terms of its like and disorder;		
			• suggeste to crime	ed design solutions that will reduce the proposal's vulu and disorder (for example consideration given to des and hours of use); and	•	

		 information on the consideration of achieving Secured By Design accreditation. Different authorities have a range of thresholds that require a Crime Impact Statement, but some of the common themes include: All 'major' planning applications/developments (including housing developments of more than a specified number of dwellings, or commercial developments of more than a specified numbers of square metres); Applications for crime sensitive developments (e.g. ATM's); All applications involving car parking for more than a specified number of vehicles; Other minor developments which may increase the risk of crime or which are sited in an area where crime and disorder is a particular issue. Restaurants, hot food takeaways, pubs and night clubs. 	
Northumbria n Water	All	We wish to take this opportunity to recommend that you and your collaborating Local Authorities include the requirement for a drainage strategy or layout to be submitted as standard, with any development proposal for 3+ houses. This request follows internal discussions within Northumbrian Water about how we can more effectively respond to planning applications. It also ties in with the central policy push to remove pre-commencement conditions from approvals and allow for quicker site delivery. If we were to have Surface Water and Foul drainage strategies submitted as part of a planning application it would remove the need for us to condition that requirement and for applicants to seek discharge at a later date.	Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document. However currently no such threshold exists. No statutory obligation for LLFAs to consider minor development except minors in a flood risk area or near a watercourse.
Agent - Maria Ferguson	Newcastle	 Thank you for the email in respect of consultation on the validation checklist. The only observation I have is that the noise survey for changes of use should clarify that where this is near to or affects noise sensitive properties, not a general requirement. Also, the D&A statement you say should contain various pieces of information such as heritage assets that are affected and planning matters. Often, even though you don't always require a planning statement for smaller schemes, it is desirable to deal with those issues and applicants may elect to provide this information to assist the determination of the application. Often an architect will prepare this, and a planning consultant a planning statement. The requirements for a D&A statement and heritage statement should be sufficient to cover everything else. 	Views taken into consideration in redrafting the document. For smaller applications it is possible to include a range of supporting documents within a single planning statement, by agreement with the relevant LPA.