

Summary from Durham County Council Consultations Report

Page no.	Name of consultee	Comments	Response from Durham CC Preferred Options Report
Q1	Do you think this is the right spatial vision for County Durham?		
11	Sedgefield Town Council	Agree in principle; Support reopening of Leamside rail line; Concern about wind turbines	LTP supports reopening of Leamside; Policy 22 deals with this
Q3	Do you agree that 38,200 is the right number of new homes		
124	Sedgefield Town Council	Agree with number (300) proposed for Sedgefield. Local community should input into exact locations	30,000 new houses by 2030 is the minimum requirement. Policy 16 allows for development on unallocated sites that will increase this number.
150	Stockton on Tees BC	concern at Sedgefield allocation (300) – impact on A19/A689 junction	DCC under duty to cooperate will continue to discuss with Stockton council.
236	Diocesan Board of Finance Agent -Smiths Gore (own part of Eden Drive site)	Think housing allocation for Sedgefield should be higher than 300,owing to high demand and high market interest. Seek increase and urgent timetable .	Sedgefield allocation increased to 440.
Q6	Do you support the strategy for South Durham?		

412	Sedgefield Town Council	Emphasised need for local people to determine	Local communities will be given opportunity to comment through consultation process. Neighbourhood Plan may be developed by local communities to shape the development of an area.
428	Julia Bowles Sedgefield Village Residents Forum	Previous comments raised by this group have been ignored. Need to establish local view.	Now being given opportunity to comment.
429	Gladedale Developments Agent – Signet Planning (interest in land to east of Eden Drive)	Capacity of SHLAA sites incorrectly identified. FS/123 is now a suitable site for development as SF/124 is allocated 'Green'. Additional housing required to support Netpark development – suggest up to 700 units. Opportunity for mixed use development at his end of Sedgefield.	See additional evidence paper (Non strategic Housing allocations). Increase to 450 units reflects Netpark requirement.
430	Storey Land	Need for more than 300 houses in Sedgefield.	Increase to 450 plus additional 24ha at Netpark.
438	Sedgefield Borough Homes	Support policy. Need for affordable housing in Sedgefield given high house prices.	Policy 31 supports a range of house types and tenures on all sites.
441	Sedgefield Civic Trust	Opposition to any development on SF/124 (Three cornered field)	SF/124 not selected as preferred site.
443	Diocese Agent – Smiths Gore	Support need for higher number of units	Increased allocation for Sedgefield to 450.
Q12	Do you support development of Netpark as a strategic		

	Employment site		
528	Sedgefield Town Council	Yes. Also support protection of Sedgefield Industrial Estate.	Sedgefield Industrial Estate protected for employment purposes.
	<i>Others</i>	<i>Greenfield site so shouldn't be allowed; lack of sustainable transport links; too big</i>	<i>Less land has been allocated than suggested in RSS.</i>
Q21	Executive Housing Sites		
655	Sedgefield Town Council	Sedgefield is a suitable location for executive housing. Need to consult local community.	
680	Gladedale Developments Agent – Signet Planning	Support need for executive housing in Sedgefield. Criteria too prescriptive. SF/123 meets threshold and should be considered.	See Executive Housing Site Selection Paper.
709	Storey Land	Support executive housing site in Sedgefield SF/ 122.	See Non Strategic Housing Allocations paper
731	Diocese Smiths Gore	Support executive housing in Sedgefield as part of high quality, mixed communities, not exclusive and isolated plots. Identify suitable land on SE fringe of Sedgefield, in church ownership.	see Executive Housing site selection paper.