## **Cassop-cum-Quarrington Neighbourhood Plan**

## **Reg.16 Consultation Responses**

## Representation made by Durham County Council as part of Regulation 16 Submission Draft publication and submitted to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Suggested Amendment
Under paragraph 2.44 the Plan sets down current permissions for residential development in the plan area. Two additional schemes have received approval and could be added to this list - 40 dwellings under DM/20/00895/OUT and an additional 20 dwellings under DM/19/02248/FPA.  This change will improve the accuracy of the Plan.
The Council have concerns about the following area which is identified as Local Green Space in the draft Plan.
LGS4 (John's Hare Wood)
Land within proposed LGS4 is allocated for employment use in the County Durham Plan and potentially required for future expansion of adjacent businesses. The site highlighted red is within council ownership, while the site highlighted blue is within private ownership. It is requested that the area highlighted in red is removed from the proposed Local Green Space.
Bowbarn Dank North Industrial Estate  Charles Church Hassa
Sinks Shelty

	Policy wording
	Policy CCQ2 is predominately about protection, however it could also emphasise enhancement opportunities including in relation to biodiversity and protected landscapes.
	To this end the Plan may consider mapping of biodiversity resources. A Green Infrastructure Plan may be useful showing how and where development can improve and/or create greenspaces and corridors for people and nature.
	The Plan may also consider addressing enhancement of existing wildlife areas and potential to include buffer zones / protected areas around wildlife sites to maintain ecological linkages.
Policy CCQ4	The Council are supportive of the overall ambitions of this Policy, however, there are some concerns around its application, despite the explanatory table provided under paragraph 6.35. The Parish Council may wish to include some visual examples to aid clarity.
	In terms of the individual criteria, for example, it may be difficult for decision-makers to ensure 'delight and wellbeing' which is included under criteria (a). The table suggests this could be via the 'creative integration of natural features into development, both for beauty and wellbeing reasons, but also in their own right for supporting and enhancing biodiversity'. However no further illustration is provided which may make it difficult to achieve this requirement.
	Under criteria (c) there is a requirement to improve the negative qualities of a site and its setting. It is considered that this may be difficult to achieve in relation to the setting, which may include third party land and property outside of the influence of the applicant. A caveat may therefore be added stating that this element of the policy would only apply 'where appropriate'.